

Performance Practice Review

Volume 7
Number 2 *Fall*

Article 6

1994

Some thoughts about "last words and overdotting"

Stephen E. Hefling

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.claremont.edu/ppr>



Part of the [Music Practice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hefling, Stephen E. (1994) "Some thoughts about "last words and overdotting", *Performance Practice Review*. Vol. 7: No. 2, Article 6. DOI: 10.5642/perfpr.199407.02.06
Available at: <https://scholarship.claremont.edu/ppr/vol7/iss2/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Current Journals at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Performance Practice Review by an authorized editor of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

Some Thoughts about "Last Words on Overdotting"

Stephen E. Hefling

One can only be grateful for such a high-minded, thorough, and ultimately complimentary review as the one David Fuller has written. That a specialist of his caliber would conclude by declaring my book "definitive" is more than I dared hope. I am especially glad—and justifiably so, I believe—that he has exonerated me of the harshest charges leveled by my erstwhile mentor and friend, the late Frederick Neumann.¹ Now that three of the principal conversants on the subject of rhythmic alteration have reviewed my work, I can say of Mr. Fuller's contributions to the discussion what I felt I ought not to say sooner (lest I be too closely identified with the "left"): except for certain significant details, his *New Grove* and *New Harvard* dictionary articles are generally fine summaries of the problems and their probable solutions; moreover, I owe the identification of many important sources to his bibliographies and notes. For a number of years I did not like the biting tone and cryptic documentation of his influential article "Dotting, the 'French Style,' and Frederick Neumann's Counter-Reformation";² but upon rereading it

¹ My own response to Neumann will appear in *Historical Performance* 7/2 (Fall 1994).

² *Early Music* 5 (1977): 517-43.

near the end of my own long preoccupation with primary sources and secondary discussions of rhythmic alteration, I understood why, given the restrictions of a short article, one might write as he did. That essay was undoubtedly a stimulus to further research and discussion of matters that had long been controversial; so, too, is his review of my *Rhythmic Alteration*, despite its "Last Words" title. In the spirit of promoting further inquiry and dialogue, I welcome the opportunity to comment on several matters Mr. Fuller has raised. (In the citations that follow, "F" is used as an abbreviation for Fuller's review, while "H" refers to my *Rhythmic Alteration*.)

Let us begin with why Hefling did not write "the book that Hefling did not" (F, 122): because I am not persuaded it can be done. With very few exceptions, music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is preserved only in notation—and save for theoretical sources that counsel otherwise, we would render the written rhythms according to the standard rules of rhythmic notation (which were virtually the same as those common today). I do not grasp how any imagination, whether transcendent or profoundly instructed, can authoritatively imagine "backwards" from the absence of data to "a description of the rhythms," and thence to their customary notation and its alteration in performance—especially given that the customs of rhythmic alteration were flexible, varying from piece to piece and performance to performance. At the opposite boundary of the broad field Fuller surveys from Olympus stand the organ works of Nicolas Gigault, heavily laden with notated dotting—"awful" music, perhaps, but a favorite topic for Fuller because he is "sure how every passage was meant to be played" (F, 122). But I am far less sanguine about such a source: I greatly doubt that each of Gigault's painstakingly notated dots was meant to mandate 3:1 inequality; and if he varied the ratios—how? Where Fuller and I are in agreement, I believe, is that all such matters come into focus and are brought to life through the efforts of educated performers of good taste who arrive at their readings through careful weighing ("consciously" or not) of many contextually inter-related variables (cf. H, xi-xii, and F, 122).

The principal limitation Fuller finds in my book is "in the matter of the evaluation of the French sources" (F, 125 ff.). A full-scale comparative study of all French sources on all aspects of performance practice would certainly be welcome, as Fuller suggests (although I think this can hardly be accomplished by a single individual). But as regards inequality and overdotting, before we dispatch our doctoral students to the archives, we might do well to ponder just what sort of information would substantially revise our grasp of these issues. Mr. Fuller's bittersweet tale of Neumann and Morel de Lescer is a case in point: despite three full and interesting sentences of biographical information on Morel, we really know nothing more about the significance

of his commentary beyond (1) what he wrote, and (2) how that is related to other French treatises. From these perspectives, however, it is immediately apparent that Morel was quite competent, that he provided more details about certain matters than did other writers (notably about what I have termed overdotting concomitant with inequality), and also that this information is indeed corroborated by other treatises, both earlier and later (Hotteterre, Metoyen, and Engramelle). In short, the intelligibility of Morel's writing transcends specific times and places. True, his status as *maître de musique* meant that Neumann could not dismiss Morel as a hick; but I suspect that only a researcher with an agenda like Neumann's would want to reject sources for such reasons. A counterexample is François Couperin, undoubtedly among the greatest musicians of the eighteenth century—yet he is disconcertingly vague on inequality (and many other matters); nor is his French especially elegant.

More to the point, as Fuller himself has rightly observed, the great majority of the French tutors are elementary, and directed to children or beginning amateurs; by and large, "they answer only the easy questions."³ Combing this material for unusual bits of information directly related to performance issues was, I believe, a worthwhile exercise, but I would question whether further background on many of the authors—if, indeed, data are available—will greatly illuminate the content of such treatises. Of course it is always desirable to identify explicit plagiarisms when possible, and I regret not having caught those Mr. Fuller cites (F, 126-27—although I might note that Vague's descriptions of musical genres and Rameau's rules for harpsichord playing are rather beside the point). Yet in a certain sense many French tutors from about 1720 through 1790 are plagiarism *en masse*—if this is a reflection of musical common practice (as most students of French performance practice seem to believe), then the occasional verbatim borrowing would seem of little account. Fuller draws attention to the interesting and prolific writer Michel Corrette, about whom he provided a fine entry in *The New Grove* (one of a great many that, as I note with regret on p. xiii of my preface, I could not explicitly acknowledge) the dates I attribute to Corrette's treatises come from that article. Now I do not "accuse" Corrette of inconsistency, but simply note (H, 38) that he "presents inconsistent views on the issue of national style and inequality," which is indeed the case. I am not, however, aware of a correlation between Corrette's brief comments on this matter and the proposed dates of his tutors. Thanks to Fuller's *The New Grove* entry, we know that Corrette went to England (but not when); that, however, does not prove he was reporting on English practice when, in one of his many tutors, he recommends inequality for his

³ *The New Grove Dictionary of Musical Instruments*, s.v. "Notes inégales," 2: 776.

own (previously?) published collection of English vaudevilles and contredances; he may simply have been hawking his own wares. If Fuller has further insight on these and similar issues raised in his review, they will of course be welcome.

It is less than accurate for Fuller to claim that my presentation of the French sources disregards chronology (F, 123; my chronological arrangement of them in the bibliography is a strong signal to the contrary). To be sure, there are well over 100 documents; a narrative chronological tour of them would, I believe, be deadly boring to any but the most habitual addict (of which, I can gratefully say, I am not one). The large number of sources plus the extensive overlaps among them made presentation by topic the only reasonable *modus operandi*. Within each topical division, however, the reader will find that the discussion proceeds essentially in chronological order, with a few exceptions that, I believe, clarify more than they disorient. All of the information summed up in tables is also presented chronologically. In working through the sources I was ever alert for distinct signs of developing trends, changes in practice, and the like—but, with very few exceptions duly noted, such developments in the custom of *notes inégales* are not apparent from the sources. Fuller may find this difficult to believe, but neither has he provided us with hints about the putative evolution of the practice. Engramelle's hectoring claim that the performing style of his day would disgust Lully, Corelli, Couperin, and Rameau is intriguing, but chiefly hearsay (and therefore not repeated in *Rhythmic Alteration*): Lully and Corelli were long dead when Engramelle was born (1727), and if he actually heard Couperin, Engramelle was no more than six years old at the time. Nor do Engramelle's detailed commentaries and barrel-organ diagrams offer any fundamentally new and different information about the practice of inequality.⁴ Here again, fresh insights from Fuller will be welcome.

Many (though not all) of the doubts and opinions Fuller raises concerning *notes inégales*—e.g., their relation to notated dots, the question of short-long inequality, Couperin's *pointé-coulé*, etc.—are appropriately qualified by "I think," "I find," and the like; and many of these hypotheses have already appeared in Fuller's writings. But I remind readers that such statements are indeed what he thinks: What do the sources say? For example: "[Hefling] takes too seriously the long lists of exceptions to inequality that

⁴ Cf. Fuller, "Mechanical Musical Instruments as a Source for the Study of *Notes inégales*," *Musical Box Society International* 10/5 (1974): 281-93 (repr., Cleveland: Divisions, 1979, with sound recording), and also George Houle, *Meter in Music, 1600-1800* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987, with sound recording), 110-23.

one can piece together from different sources, and he does not take written dotting seriously enough as a clue to the performance of undotted passages" (F, 130). I can only wonder why Fuller supposes I take the exceptions to inequality too seriously, since I have offered no opinion about them. That I took the trouble to report them (accurately, I believe, for the first time) was no less than the proper job of anyone seeking to provide a comprehensive account of inequality; this is not a matter of what "one can piece together," but rather what the documents actually contain. And the problem of unnotated inequality vs. written-out dotting, which Fuller has raised repeatedly, is a particularly thorny matter for which the sources simply do not provide a clear answer: I have thrice quoted the trenchant observation of Pierre Marcou, writing as late as 1782, that "among people of the art . . . there is not perfect agreement on this matter"—and indeed, there was not (see H, 32-35 and *passim*). Here I have already commented briefly (p. 134 above) on Fuller's favorite case in point, the "awful" works of Gigault: should such persistent dotting be 3:1—the sharpest degree of inequality explicitly documented—or milder, in the manner of Nivers's "half-dots"—or varied throughout the piece? No matter what Fuller or I may think, neither of us knows for sure. Then there is the matter of short-long inequality: to my knowledge, no one, including Fuller, has uncovered any positive evidence beyond what is cited in *Rhythmic Alteration*. Notated "Lombardic" rhythms are ubiquitous in French music, but to derive from them a purported unwritten custom of performance, for which there is but a single unequivocal theoretical source (Loulié, 1696), is questionable at best. Couperin (and a few others) resorted to a special sign for short-long inequality—a slur with a dot above the second of two paired notes—but he did not call it "*pointé-coulé*" (or even "*coulé-pointé*"). Thus, unlike Fuller (and many unnamed others), I consider it rather unlikely that Couperin uses this term to mandate short-long inequality for his "Courante à l'Italiéne" in the *Concerts royaux*; he did not define it thus; he does not, to my knowledge, use it elsewhere; and no treatise known to me defines it at all. Nor would a lot of "Lombardic" rhythms identify a courante as Italian: what is Italian in this piece is the nearly continuous eighth-note motion à la Corelli—really a corrente rather than a courante.⁵ Read from the perspective of all that the treatises do say about *notes inégales*, the most likely meaning of *pointé-coulé* is trochaic inequality plus slurs; since neither is common in the Italian corrente, special instructions were needed. Similarly, there is not a bit of evidence known to me which would support Fuller's current conjecture that slurs, in and of themselves, may suggest short-long inequality in descending diatonic passages (F, 130); his previous assertion that slurs have no rhythmic signifi-

⁵ Cf. also *The New Harvard Dictionary of Music*, s.v. "Courante" by Bruce Gustafson, esp. p. 211, col. 2.

cance correctly represents the absence of such a notion in the treatises. As regards Quantz's advocacy of inequality, I do not grasp why Fuller proposes that "perhaps the resemblance of his rules to French ones is more apparent than real" (F, 125): the long-short patterns, the degree of alteration (less than the value of a written dot), the descent of inequality to the smallest value present, and its cancellation by dots and strokes are all characteristically French, as I have noted (H, 43-44). The "few idiosyncrasies" that Quantz introduces are not major deviations from French practice—they are merely not to be found in any French tutors. I have no doubt that Quantz was indeed talking about true *notes inégales*.

With Quantz we come to the German sources presented in *Rhythmic Alteration*: they are notably fewer in number than the French, and we indeed know a good deal more about the fifteen German authors in question. But the main point to emerge from that background information is that "the custom of overdotting apparently spread from Dresden to Berlin, Leipzig, and Halle: nearly all of the German writers are linked, and in most cases their advocacy of overdotting can be traced back either to Dresden and/or Quantz, or to Berlin" (H, 83; cf. also table 6-1 on p. 140). That, of course, suggests that overdotting in Germany was something more than the spotty galant soloistic mannerism Neumann believed it to be. When all of the evidence is taken into account, I do not think it is "talking oneself into a conviction" (F, 124-25) to posit that French performance style was known in Dresden (ca. 1709-40), and that it spread to Berlin when Frederick the Great brought Quantz, the Grauns, and Benda from Dresden to the Prussian capital (H, 43, 47-48, 83, and 116). Fuller inadequately summarizes the evidence: it is not merely that Quantz preferred the mixed Franco-Italian manner of playing taught him by Pisendel, or that he advocated French *notes inégales* (without identifying the custom as French; F, 125). Rather, Quantz repeatedly points out distinctions between French and Italian composition and performance; his is the most style-conscious tutor of the eighteenth century. Nor is that surprising, given that both Italian opera and French dance music were seriously cultivated in Dresden. Quantz learned his French style first-hand; his flute teacher Buffardin was a Frenchman, and for nearly two decades (1709-28) the Dresden orchestra was under the leadership of the French-trained concertmaster and ballet master J. B. Volumier, whom Quantz witnessed in action for more than a dozen years. Quantz's *Lebenslauf* specifically states that Volumier introduced French-style execution in the orchestra⁶—which would certainly involve *notes inégales* plus concomitant overdotting—and we know that the orchestra's repertoire included

⁶ See Edward R. Reilly's introduction to his translation of *Quantz, On Playing the Flute*, 2nd ed. (New York: Schirmer Books, 1985), xiii.

dozens of French suites. Moreover, during his six-month visit to Paris in 1726-27, Quantz heard and became acquainted with several of the best Parisian performers of the day. Frederick the Great lured his Dresden musicians, including Quantz, to Berlin as part of his project to emulate and surpass the Dresden Hofkapelle; the king even required his opera composers Graun and Agricola to write in the style of Hasse, whose works he had heard in Dresden years earlier. Like Dresden, the Berlin court maintained a French dance troop; what Quantz writes about French dances undoubtedly reflects what he had been hearing and seeing for many years (even though such music was going out of fashion elsewhere). And when Charles Burney visited Berlin in 1772, he declared Quantz's taste to be forty years behind the times: Such was the preference of Quantz's arch-conservative royal flute pupil, to whom the *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen* is dedicated. Thus, as Reilly suggested some time ago, it would certainly appear that what Quantz wrote in 1752 reflects what was current in Dresden between about 1720 and 1740.⁷ And there can be little doubt that Quantz knew what he was talking about in his discussions of French music and its performance. What I have just sketched (for which more documentation is provided in H) is a reconstruction (rather than a "development") based on dialogue of question and answer, as is all of history (cf. H, xi); but there is nothing particularly "elaborate" about it; nor does it involve anything like "black-market logic" (*Erschleichung*).

And now a few words about those pesky translations (dubbed "consistently accurate" by another reviewer⁸); these in turn, as in Fuller's discussion, will bring us to a number of terminological issues concerning rhythmic alteration. I gladly acknowledge that Fuller has identified a few infelicities and errors (one of which is significant, and will be addressed below); these I shall certainly emend if a second edition ever goes to press. Having read many purportedly idiomatic translations that actually obscure a great deal of meaning, I am willing to risk the charge of "literal-mindedness" (F, 127 ff.). But Fuller's objections also contain, I think, a good bit of fruitless hair-splitting, plus, in some cases, what one might term "selective understanding." The prime example of the former procedure is his insistence that *minuets de caractere* be translated "character-minuets" rather than "minuets of character." To my ear, "character-minuets" carries with it the anachronistic baggage of "character-piece," a type of music reaching its zenith in works of Mendelssohn and Schumann—not, I think, what Engramelle had in

⁷ Op. cit., xv; idem, *Quantz and His Versuch; Three Studies* (New York: Galaxy Music, 1971), 38.

⁸ Steven Zohn, *Music & Letters* 75 (1994): 446.

mind.⁹ Another bit of needless nit-picking is Fuller's proposed "hopping" or "skipping" for *sautillemens*, which I translate as "leaps"; Bacilly is clearly talking about rhythm, not intervals between pitches (and at what altitude, pray, does a leap diminish to a hop or skip?). A *marche* is a *Marsch* is a march, and while not even I would translate *marcher* that literally, the verb connotes more than mere "movement." Fuller's irritation with my frequent rendition of *pointer* as "to point" is, I think, a notable case of selective understanding. (I am not, in any event, "spooked" by cognates [F, 129], but only cognizant of their common roots; see also below). Uniform translation of *pointer* as "to dot" simply will not do, because in modern English musical parlance "to dot" means to add a dot that yields a 3:1 rhythmic ratio. But *pointer* in the context of *notes inégales* generally does not mandate a 3:1 ratio—a point (so to say) that Neumann got right years ago, and one that I have extensively documented as well (see H, 17-19 and *passim*): indeed, in 1775 Pierre Duval explicitly complained that "*pointer* is improperly used to mean making eighths unequal." Now it is just prior to that discussion that I first translate *pointer* as "to point" (H, 12): the repeated use of "render unequal" strikes me as quite cumbersome, whereas in English "point" can mean to punctuate, mark or articulate, or to give added emphasis or piquancy to (as in "point up a remark")—all expressions that, to some degree, characterize the rhythmic spice of French inequality (see also below). Perhaps an explanatory note (yet another!) would have been appropriate, but I don't believe anyone reading in context could miss my point (unless, perhaps, he or she wished to).

The phrase "l'on passeroit fort vite sur la seconde & sur la troisieme" (quoted in H, 15), which I translate as "[one] would pass quite quickly over the second and fourth," correctly characterizes the way treatise writers use *passer les croches* to describe inequality: elongate the odd-numbered notes and pass quickly (and/or lightly) over the even; there is simply no reason to use any other English verb. When treatise writers discuss what transpires in a *chant*, one cannot always be sure they are speaking of "melody" only; thus, in some cases "song" may be preferable (especially to the more prosaic term "piece"). *Marquer* most certainly is the verb Jean Rousseau uses to denote inequality—otherwise, Jean Rousseau is not talking about inequality at all (although Fuller lists him as a source in both editions of his *New*

⁹ I agree with Fuller, however, that what Engramelle means is simply "genre-pieces," which other writers term *airs de mouvement* (and note 20 on pp. 164-65 of H will direct the reader to a useful discussion of that term by Jean Saint-Arroman).

Grove article on *notes inégales*). *Marquer* appears five times in the passage of Rousseau I quote (H, 165), and it means the same thing in each instance; whether such "marking" is solely rhythmic, or perhaps also agogic, cannot be decisively determined. That is because *marquer*, like the English verb "mark," has multiple shades of meaning: to mark, brand, stigmatize, indicate, denote, etc.; and the past participle *marqué*, like "marked," can mean marked, distinct, distinctive, decided, etc. More precise understanding emerges only in context (although sometimes not markedly so); accordingly, I believe a conscientious translator faced with delicate terminological issues (such as those surrounding *notes inégales*) serves his English readers best by not overfocusing the meaning of the word. The situation is not straightforward; and before deriding the paragraph I devote to it as "confused," Fuller might recall that he himself has written "'Mesuré', 'marqué' and 'martelé' had meanings of their own [—viz.?—] which might or might not imply equality in a given situation."¹⁰ Currently, however, he claims that *marqué* cannot mean equal, and is not used in that sense (F, 129). The basis for such an absolute about-face eludes me, and so, for the present, I stand by my conclusion that "the term has no consistent meaning with respect to inequality and must be interpreted in context" (H, 22).

The passage of Hotteterre's *L'art de preluder* (1719, p. 58) paraphrased in the first three lines of H, 23, reads as follows: "Cette Mesure se marque par un 2. Simple . . . : elle se bat a 2 temps egaux. Elle est ordinairement vive et piquée. On l'employe dans le debut des Ouvertures d'Opera, d[ans] les Entrées de Ballet, les marches, les bourées, gavottes . . . &c." As regards *ouvertures*, this can only be taken to refer to their opening sections; the ensuing quick section is, after all, frequently in triple or compound meter (rather than 2). The other sorts of pieces Hotteterre lists here are indeed quick, but he gives no indication that they are "overdotted throughout" (F, 128). That inference is entirely Fuller's own, and unjustified: the incipit of the *bourée*, for example, that Hotteterre cites here contains no dotting at all. Line 12 on the same page in H discusses an entirely different writer (Boüin), who is of course entitled to different views about the character of an *ouverture*.

It would seem Mr. Fuller is somewhat piqued by my challenge of his sweeping claim that 'Piqué' usually meant sharply dotted, but one or two writers used it to mean equal and staccato."¹¹ The known sources do not confirm this. As regards Jean-Jacques Rousseau's definition of *piqué*, I was

¹⁰ *The New Grove Dictionary of Musical Instruments*, s.v. "Notes inégales," 2: 777.

¹¹ *The New Grove*, 13: 421, cited in H, 173, n. 29.

probably incorrect in reading "le Pointé" as a grammatical inconsistency (of which there are dozens in the French treatises), rather than an abstract participial noun. But I am not yet persuaded (nor are several French scholars I consulted) that Rousseau is presenting two different definitions of the word (after all, many French adjectives are also used adverbially, yet without marked differences in meaning). Even if he were, it would have to be shown why so late and singular a source as Rousseau (1768) ought to be globally applied. Fuller has not shown this, and, I believe, cannot; as I have noted (H, 171, n. 16), even in 1771 the influential *Dictionnaire de Trévoux* continued to accept Brossard's definition (1705) of *piquer* as "staccato." There is no magic wand to make "terminological puzzles" disappear. If one plays Dandrieu's "La lyre d'Orphée" "sharply dotted," as Fuller wishes, one does so (1) in the absence of any notated dotting of the eighths; (2) without clear evidence that *piqué* commonly meant strongly dotted; and (3) in a context of disjunct eighths leaping by third, fourth, and even octave, despite the fact that at least thirteen writers suggest inequality is limited to conjunct motion, and six of those, including the notable figures Loulié, Hotteterre, François Couperin, and Montéclair, state this limitation explicitly. In addition, as I have observed, (4) there is the matter of imitating the lyre: I do not know just what sort of instrument Dandrieu had in mind, but garden-variety lyres lack the resonating structure of a fine French harpsichord; to imitate the lyre at the keyboard, I should think, one would play staccato. On Fuller's interpretation, one would certainly have to wonder what sorts of emotional contexts would move Orpheus to pluck away in the frenetic rhythms of overdotting.

But more problematic—baroque, even—is Fuller's reading of the passage concerning *piqué* in the very interesting but anonymous *Nouvelle methode pour apprendre à jouer du violon* of ca. 1760 (F, 129). There is no "misunderstanding" in my translation of *articulé* as "articulated": the original meaning of *articuler* in fact comes from the Latin verb *articulare*, meaning "to divide into distinct parts" or "articulate," and used most commonly (solely, according to some authorities) with respect to discourse—i.e., "to utter distinctly." In addition to this, the French *articuler* can also mean "to connect by joint," typically in a biological context, as when bones are connected by joints, or leaves and stems by nodes—but note that such usage does not imply seamless, uniform connection. *Détaché* means detached (the opposite of *attaché*); in eighteenth-century musical usage it ordinarily indicates that separate (and sometimes staccato) bow- or tongue-strokes are used, and, most importantly, that inequality is canceled. (This is apparently because *notes inégales* are ordinarily paired two by two, the short note

passing smoothly to the long.)¹² Now the anonymous *Nouvelle methode* uses *détaché* in just this way: there is simply no justification for Fuller's invoking the nineteenth-century, post-Tourte notion of *détaché* bowing as seamless up- and down-strokes;¹³ indeed, that anachronistic definition very quickly necessitates that Fuller weasel around the ensuing contradictions—"unfortunately for consistency," as he puts it. No, first and foremost, our anonymous author's *notes articulées* are "articulated"—rendered distinctive, or marked (or even "jointed," if you really want) by unequal execution: "*articulées en longues et breves*" (see H, p. 176, n. 71). When he wants to specify the close connection between the shorter and longer of two *notes articulées*, he uses the more limited verb *joindre* (from Latin *jungere*), meaning "to put things together in such a way that they touch," or "to join"; the 32nd note is thus to be *jointé*, joined (but not slurred), to the following dotted sixteenth.¹⁴ And there can be little doubt that by *piquer* he means the way of playing the entire dotted figure—not just the joining of the little note and the dotted one: we know this because he tells us such connection is made essentially in the same manner that the shorter of two ordinary *notes articulées*—i.e., notes that are unequal but not *piquées*—is joined to the longer. Ergo: "Here *piquer* clearly means detached articulation; it is also associated with dotted rhythms, as in Loulié's definition, but the dots are notated (as Loulié suggested they properly should be)" (H, 24). Having established this once again, I shall acknowledge my own suspicions that the passage in question might be a case of "galant" overdotting (which was going on in Germany around this time); in addition (depending upon the tempo), the execution of these instructions on the violin may end up sounding very close to the overdotting Quantz or Leopold Mozart prescribes. But the bottom line is: the anonymous French tutor does not expressly indicate shortening of the little note, or lengthening of what precedes it, whereas the German writers expressly do. To dispense, for the moment, with the issue of *piquer*: I did not, and do not, claim that the case is closed (see H, 24). But I think both "Olympians" and "leftists" who want

¹² See H, 21 and 23, and Jean Saint-Arroman, *L'interprétation de la musique française, 1661-1789*, vol. 1: *Dictionnaire d'interprétation* (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1983), 128-30.

¹³ See *New Grove*, s. v. "Bow" by David Boyden, 3: 134, as well as Robin Stowell, *Violin Technique and Performance Practice in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 180-97.

¹⁴ It would appear that Fuller may be conflating the meanings of *articuler* and *joindre* in this passage to arrive more quickly at his goal of identifying *piquer* as "exaggeration of the dotted effect."

piqué to justify increased use of strong inequality and overdotted must find stronger evidence: I have shown all that I could find, and it's not much.

Now for some German sources. Fuller's insinuation (F, 128) that I have "misread this whole passage" of Marpurg that appears on H, 106, is unwarranted.¹⁵ The performance custom of overdotted is seemingly irrational—that is, lacking in reasonableness, coherence, and clarity—in that it requires musicians to treat aspects of rhythmic notation, for which there were and are longstanding rules of interpretation, in a manner that is contrary to those rules; nor has this contrary manner ever been codified as explicitly as the original rules of notation. This is what Marpurg objects to; as I have noted on the same page, "he censures the inconsistency between notation and performance, not sharply dotted rhythms per se . . ." The German verb *ansprechen* (literally "to speak to") means to address, speak to, or accost, not "to stress"; for whatever reason, Tromlitz chose the expression that one does not address—i.e., one virtually ignores—a group of several little notes after a dotted eighth or sixteenth; I find no reason to suppress his nuance.

In translating the "Ouvverture" article of Sulzer's *Allgemeine Theorie*—and incidentally, it's by Kirnberger and Schulz (not just Schulz), as will shortly be reconfirmed—I could not bring myself to render "außer dem großen Bach, noch andre seines Namens . . . sich hervorgethan haben" as "besides the great Bach, others of his name . . . have also distinguished themselves," because that seemed not to make sense: for writers in Berlin in 1775, "other Bachs" would almost certainly mean Carl Philipp Emanuel, Wilhelm Friedemann, or perhaps Johann Christian, none of whom, to my knowledge, wrote French overtures.¹⁶ But I was mistaken in not looking backwards: one overture by Johann Ludwig Bach (1677-1731) plus four by Johann Bernhard Bach (1676-1749) have survived, and parts for at least three (and probably all four) of those by Johann Bernhard were prepared by Johann Sebastian and his copyists in Leipzig, prior to 1731.¹⁷ Between 1739 and

¹⁵ It was suggested to me by a bilingual music theorist that "Ohne das" could well be an orthographic variant of *ohnedaß* ("besides," "all the same," etc.); the difference in meaning is in any case minor.

¹⁶ I am grateful to Dr. Darrel Berg (St. Louis) and Dr. Peter Wollny (Bach-Archiv, Leipzig) for reconfirming that none of these Bachs wrote French overtures (personal communications to the present author).

¹⁷ See the prefaces to the four overtures of Johann Bernhard Bach, ed. Hermann Max (Stuttgart: Carus-Verlag, 1985-88), and Christoph Wolff, *The New Grove Bach Family* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1983), 40.

1741, Kirnberger was a student of "the great Bach," who was then in his second stint as director of the Leipzig Collegium; quite possibly, then, Kirnberger had heard or played some of these works by "other Bachs" (or perhaps he encountered them later in C. P. E. Bach's collection). This information not only provides rationale for the most obvious translation of the passage in question, but also further authenticates Kirnberger and Schulz's account of the overture. And it is worth noting that each of the overtures by J. L. and J. B. Bach just mentioned is readily subject to overdotting.

Let me close with brief commentary upon the apparatus of the book. Some readers have found the bibliography "excellent,"¹⁸ while to others, like Fuller, it seems cumbersome. (Running heads would certainly have helped, but unfortunately, for reasons uncertain, the publisher dropped these after the second proofs.) Still, I cannot help but think the format adopted may ultimately prove more useful than the usual uncategorized alphabetical arrangement. But I see no reason why a book like mine should take on the costly job of reproducing either the long and often fanciful full titles of treatises or their current distribution in surviving copies:¹⁹ specialists who want that information know how to find it in *RISM* and elsewhere. Similarly, in the age of on-line library catalogues, it hardly seems essential that researchers tax themselves with chasing down every photo-facsimile of a printed source ever issued; facsimiles come and go quickly, as I noted in the preface (H, xiii), and they do not (or certainly should not!) alter the content of the original. The book's index follows the recommendation of *The Chicago Manual* that simple reference notes need not be indexed. This will probably annoy only those who search for themselves in indices; in fairness to Mr. Fuller, however, I probably owe him at least two more entries than he got, so here they are: 137, 197-98 n. 41.

¹⁸ E. g., Michael Collins, *Notes* 50 (1994): 1387.

¹⁹ Information about the numbers and locations of surviving copies can be subject to many conjectural interpretations, none of which amounts to much unless the precise provenance of a given copy can be established (which is rare). And even then, we often do not know who read it.