Air (les tronpestes de isse)

Isis, 1677

D-Rtt Inc. IIIc/4 (Regensburg), no. 2, fol. 1v
LWV 54/12

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of D’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.\footnote{See Chung, “Lully, D’Anglebert and the Transmission of 17th-Century French Harpsichord Music,” 586–92.} The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.\footnote{For example, see Ronald Broude. “Composition, Performance, and Text in Solo Music of the French Baroque,” \textit{Text: An Interdisciplinary Annual of Textual Studies} 15 (2002): 25.}

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2, 4, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 2 (fol. 1v, Hand A), les tronpestes de isse (C) [Air from *Isis* (1677) LWV 54/12]

M. 1  lh  time signature missing
Le Marié et la mariée (la marie)

Ballet des plaisirs, 1655

D-Rtt Inc. IIIc/4 (Regensburg), no. 6, fols. 4v–5r

LWV 2/4

(a) see commentary

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.2
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of D’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3–5, 18, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 6 (fols. 4v–5r, Hand A), la marie (G) [“Le Marié et la mariée” from Ballet des plaisirs (1655) LWV 2/4]

- M. 1 lh time signature missing
- M. 10 lh3 sharp missing

- M. 17 lh1-2 notes on top of one another:
WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.3
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of d’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Editorial Remarks

This piece is in rondeau form and editorial *reprise* symbols, indicated by $\%$, have been supplied to clarify the repetition scheme.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---


WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.3
In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3–4, 7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 11 (fol. 7r, Hand A), rondo de belerofon (C) [Trompettes from *Bellerophon* (1679) LWV 57/19]

M. 12 rh3  a’-sharp (i.e. a second higher)

M. 17 lh2  sharp missing
Sourdines
Armide, 1686

D-Rtt Inc. IIIc/4 (Regensburg), no. 17, fols. 11v–12r
LWV 71/39

© David Chung, 2014
Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014

(a) one bar crossed out between bars 13 and 15 in Source
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of D’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Editorial Remarks

This piece is not a copy of *D’Anglebert-1689*. Editorial repeat signs have been supplied at measures 2 and 10 to clarify the repetition scheme.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 10–15, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 17 (fols. 11v–12r, Hand C), [untitled] (g) [Sourdines from *Armide* (1686) LWV 71/39]

M. 13–4 one measure crossed out between measures 13 and 14

M. 14 lhU1 a second lower in source: c’

M. 19 rh

M. 22 rh first chord: ties missing
Marche des Sacrificateurs

_Cadmus et Hermione, 1673_

_D-Rtt Inc. IIIc/4 (Regensburg), no. 18, fols. 12v–13v_

LWV 49/42

© David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.5
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of D’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Editorial Remarks

All vertical dashed lines are reproduced from the Source. The upper stave of measure 6 provides explicit evidence of flexible dotting, in which a dotted quarter note is followed by three (slightly under-dotted) sixteenth notes.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.\(^1\) The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.\(^2\)

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 18 (fols. 12v–13v, Hand C), [untitled] (C) [Marche des Sacrificateurs from *Cadmus et Hermione* (1673) LWV 49/42]

M. 3 lhU1 rest missing
Entrée d’Apollon
Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1680

D-Rtt Inc. IIIc/4 (Regensburg), no. 19, fols. 14r–15r
LWV 59/58

© David Chung, 2014

(a) see commentary

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.6
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of d’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Editorial Remarks

This piece is not a copy of *D’Anglebert-1689*. An editorial repeat sign has been supplied at measure 11 to clarify the repetition scheme.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 7–10, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 19 (fols. 14r–15r, Hand C), [untitled] (g) [Entrée d’Apollon from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1680) LWV 59/58 (g)]

M. 10
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of d’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Editorial Remarks

This piece is in rondeau form and editorial *reprise* symbols, indicated by $\%$, have been supplied to clarify the repetition scheme.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 4, 7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 23 (fols. 20v–21r, Hand D), [untitled] (C) [Trompettes from *Bellerophon* (1679) LWV 57/19]

M. 27 lh notes missing. Current reading taken from measure 1
Sourdines (Solmeil d’armide)

Armide, 1686

D-Rtt Inc. IIIc/4 (Regensburg), no. 27, fols. 23v–24v

LWV 71/39

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of D’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Editorial Remarks

This piece is not a copy of D’Anglebert-1689. Editorial repeat signs have been supplied at measures 2 and 10 to clarify the repetition scheme.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 10–15, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 27 (fols. 23v–24v, Hand D), Solmeil d’armide (g) [Sourdines from Armide (1686) LWV 71/39]

M. 4 lhU1 dot missing
M. 13 lhL3 rest missing
Chaconne des Scaramouches (chaconne des arlequeins)

*Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, 1670

*D-Rtt* Inc. IIIc/4 (Regensburg), no. 28, fols. 24v–25v

LWV 43/36

© David Chung, 2014
(a) a second lower in Source: c
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of D’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Editorial Remarks

The reprise signs at measures 12 and 44 are transferred from Lully’s instrumental version (Exemplar: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. F. 578). This piece ends on measure 22, and the performer should substitute a suitable ending.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 6–8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 28 (fols. 24v–25v, Hand D), chaconne des arlequeins (G) [Chaconne des Scaramouches from *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* (1670) LWV 43/36]

M. 12 rh   \( \overline{\text{C-L}} \)
M. 28 lh2   a second lower in Source: c’
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of D’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Editorial Remarks

This piece is a copy of *D’Anglebert-1689*, including D’Anglebert’s double. The courante is not known to have been derived from Lully’s stage works. One version for melody and bass instruments has been preserved in a 1695 “Philidor” manuscript (*F-Pn*: Rés. F. 533).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 6, 21, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 30 (fols. 27v–28r, Hand D), [untitled] (g) [Courante de Lully, after D’Anglebert/Lully (1689) LWV 75/24 (g)]

M. 6  rh1 sharp next to d’ (lowest note of chord)
M. 10 rhU1 dot missing
    lhU1 dot missing
    lhL4 note and tie missing
M. 18 rhU1 dot missing
    lhU1 dot missing
    lhL4 note and tie missing
M. 22 rhU1 dot missing
M. 30 lhM1 sharp (next to f) missing
M. 33 lh2 flat missing
M. 36 rhU1 tie missing
    lhU1 tie missing
Passacaille (Passacaille d’Armide)

Armide, 1686

D-Rtt Inc. IIIc/4 (Regensburg), no. 33, fols. 33r–38v

LWV 71/61

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of D’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 4, 17, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 33 (fols. 33r–38v, Hand E), Passacaille d’Armide (g) [Passacaille from Armide (1686) LWV 71/61 (g)]

M. 13 rh5 tie missing
M. 15 rhU4 ornament below note (no space above in Source)
M. 19 lhL1 flat missing
M. 21 lhL1 dot missing
M. 38 lhL1 dot missing
M. 40 lh1 half note
M. 45 rh1–2 two quarter notes
M. 51 lhL1-2 flats missing
M. 56 rhL3 dot missing
M. 67 lhL1 flat missing
M. 90 lh2 flat missing
M. 91 lhL3 flat missing
M. 104 lh1 accidental from source is technically redundant
M. 113 rhL2 g’
M. 116 lh1 flat missing
M. 130 rh1 flat missing
M. 137 rhU1 dot missing
M. 139 lhL1 flat missing
M. 145 lhL1 flat missing
Prélude (Prelude de psiché)
*Psyché*, 1678

*D-Rtt Inc. IIIc/4 (Regensburg), no. 44, fols. 55v–56r*

LWV 56/23

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirteen Lully pieces, entered by five hands (Gustafson’s Hands A, B, C, D and E), all very competent, although Hand C is somewhat hasty.

The pieces by Hand C (nos. 18–20) form a small Lully section drawn from different works. The Lully Courante (no. 20, incomplete) is a copy of D’Anglebert’s 1689 print. The arrangements in other hands appear either as isolated movements (Hand A, no. 6; Hand B, no. 17; Hand D, no. 23) or in composite suites, i.e. pieces in the same key, but from different sources and by different composers (Hand A, nos. 2 and 11; Hand D, nos. 27–28, 30; Hand E, nos. 33 and 44).


Editorial Remarks

Repeat sign at measure 2 is editorial.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3–5, 18, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 44 (fols. 55v–56r, Hand E), Prelude de psiché (d) [Prélude from *Psyché* (1678) LWV 56/23]

M. 15  rhM1  “c”
La descente de Cybelle (dessente de Cibelle de l’opera d’Atis)

*Atys*, 1676

*US-BEm MS 1371 (Couperin-Turin), no. 29, fols. 59v–61r*  
*LWV 53/38*

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)  
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.13
Source

*US-BEm*: Berkeley, University of California, Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, MS 1371 (Turin, ca. 1695).

Six pieces, two with *doubles*, from Lully’s stage music entered by Marc Roger Normand (“Couperin de Turin”) (1663–1734).

Except for the Chaconne de Galatée (LWV 73/32), which is almost an exact copy of D’Anglebert’s print (1689) but transposed down a second to C major, it is likely that, as Moroney suggests, Couperin might have been responsible for all of the arrangements, and the two *doubles*. The arrangements are dispersed between two key groups (A minor and C major). Of special interest is the *double* with the embellished bass in the *basse roulante* version of no. 29 (LWV 53/58).


Edition: WLSCM, six pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 29, 38, 43, 45, 46, 48).

Editorial remarks

Notes crossed out (mm. 15–6, 32 and 38), reproduced within brackets in this edition, were probably intended for a more advanced player.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 50–1, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 29 (fols. 59v–61r), dessente de Cibelle de l’opera d’Atis (a) [“La descente de Cybelle” from *Atys* (1676) LWV 53/38 (a)]

- M. 8 rhL3 ornament above a’ (i.e. between a’ and e’’)
- M. 15 rhL1 dot missing
- M. 15–6 rh notes within brackets crossed out
- M. 26 rhM1 dot missing
  - rhL1 dot missing
- M. 32 rhL1 note within bracket crossed out
- M. 38 rhL1 note within bracket crossed out
- M. 56 rhL1 dot missing
- M. 67 rhL1 sharp missing
Menuet (Menuet d’Aubois de l’opera de Roland)

Roland, 1685

US-BEm MS 1371 (Couperin-Turin), no. 38, fol. 72r
LWV 65/63

© David Chung, 2014
Source

**US-BEm:** Berkeley, University of California, Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, MS 1371 (Turin, ca. 1695).

Six pieces, two with *doubles*, from Lully’s stage music entered by Marc Roger Normand (‘Couperin de Turin’) (1663–1734).

Except for the Chaconne de Galatée (LWV 73/32), which is almost an exact copy of D’Anglebert’s print (1689) but transposed down a second to C major, it is likely that, as Moroney suggests, Couperin might have been responsible for all of the arrangements, and the two *doubles*. The arrangements are dispersed between two key groups (A minor and C major). Of special interest is the *double* with the embellished bass in the *basse roulante* version of no. 29 (LWV 53/58).


Edition: WLSCM, six pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 29, 38, 43, 45, 46, 48).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3/4” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 3–4, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 38 (fol. 72r), Menuet d’Aubois de l’opera de Roland (C) [Menuet from *Roland* (1685) LWV 65/63 (C)]

[No comments]
Air de Trompette

*Isis, 1677*

US-BEm MS 1371 (Couperin-Turin), no. 43, fols. 76v–77r

LWV 54/12

© David Chung, 2014

---

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)

Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.15
Double de Trompette

Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014
Source

US-BEm: Berkeley, University of California, Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, MS 1371 (Turin, ca. 1695).

Six pieces, two with doubles, from Lully’s stage music entered by Marc Roger Normand (“Couperin de Turin”) (1663–1734).

Except for the Chaconne de Galatée (LWV 73/32), which is almost an exact copy of D’Anglebert’s print (1689) but transposed down a second to C major, it is likely that, as Moroney suggests, Couperin might have been responsible for all of the arrangements, and the two doubles. The arrangements are dispersed between two key groups (A minor and C major). Of special interest is the double with the embellished bass in the basse roulante version of no. 29 (LWV 53/58).


Edition: WLSCM, six pieces, two with doubles (nos. 29, 38, 43, 45, 46, 48).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2, 4, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 43 (fols. 76v–77r), Air de Trompette (C) [Air de Trompette from *Ivis* (1677) LWV 54/12 (C)]

[No comments]
Rigaudon (Rigodon de l’opera d’Acis et Galatée)

Acis et Galatée, 1686

US-BEm MS 1371 (Couperin-Turin), no. 45, fol. 78v
LWV 73/6

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*US-BEm:* Berkeley, University of California, Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, MS 1371 (Turin, ca. 1695).

Six pieces, two with *doubles*, from Lully’s stage music entered by Marc Roger Normand (“Couperin de Turin”) (1663–1734).

Except for the Chaconne de Galatée (LWV 73/32), which is almost an exact copy of D’Anglebert’s print (1689) but transposed down a second to C major, it is likely that, as Moroney suggests, Couperin might have been responsible for all of the arrangements, and the two *doubles*. The arrangements are dispersed between two key groups (A minor and C major). Of special interest is the *double* with the embellished bass in the *basse roulante* version of no. 29 (LWV 53/58).


Edition: WLSCM, six pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 29, 38, 43, 45, 46, 48).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 45 (fol. 78v), Rigodon de l’opera d’Acis et Galatée (C) [Rigaudon from *Acis et Galatée* (1686) LWV 73/6 (C)]

[No comments]
Second Air

Acis et Galatée, 1686

US-BEm MS 1371 (Couperin-Turin), no. 46, fol. 79r
LWV 73/7

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_US-BEm_: Berkeley, University of California, Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, MS 1371 (Turin, ca. 1695).

Six pieces, two with _doubles_, from Lully’s stage music entered by Marc Roger Normand (‘‘Couperin de Turin’’) (1663–1734).

Except for the Chaconne de Galatée (LWV 73/32), which is almost an exact copy of D’Anglebert’s print (1689) but transposed down a second to C major, it is likely that, as Moroney suggests, Couperin might have been responsible for all of the arrangements, and the two _doubles_. The arrangements are dispersed between two key groups (A minor and C major). Of special interest is the _double_ with the embellished bass in the _basse roulante_ version of no. 29 (LWV 53/58).


_Edition_: WLSCM, six pieces, two with _doubles_ (nos. 29, 38, 43, 45, 46, 48).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 46 (fol. 79r), Second Air (C) [Rigaudon from *Acis et Galatée* (1686) LWV 73/7 (C)]

[No comments]
Chaconne (Chaconne de Galatée)

Acis et Galatée, 1686

US-BEm MS 1371 (Couperin-Turin), no. 48, fols. 80v–81r
LWV 73/32

Lentement

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_US-BEm_: Berkeley, University of California, Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, MS 1371 (Turin, ca. 1695).

Six pieces, two with _doubles_, from Lully’s stage music entered by Marc Roger Normand (“Couperin de Turin”) (1663–1734).

Except for the Chaconne de Galatée (LWV 73/32), which is almost an exact copy of D’Anglebert’s print (1689) but transposed down a second to C major, it is likely that, as Moroney suggests, Couperin might have been responsible for all of the arrangements, and the two _doubles_. The arrangements are dispersed between two key groups (A minor and C major). Of special interest is the _double_ with the embellished bass in the _basse roulante_ version of no. 29 (LWV 53/58).


_Edition_: WLSCM, six pieces, two with _doubles_ (nos. 29, 38, 43, 45, 46, 48).

Editorial Remarks

This piece is essentially a copy of _D’Anglebert-1689_, but transposed down a major second to C major. This piece ends on m. 9, as indicated by “_fin_”, and the player should provide a suitable ending.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3/4” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 15–6, 18, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 48 (fols. 80v–81r), Chaconne de Galatée (C) [Chaconne from *Acis et Galatée* (1686) LWV 73/32 (D)]

M. 7 lhU2 sharp missing
C’est l’amour (Air Rolandi)

Roland, 1685

*D-Lr Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Lüneburg-1198), no. 38, p. 64
LWV 65/13

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_D-Lr_: Lüneburg, Ratsbücherei, Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Germany, 1687).

Twelve pieces from Lully, entered by two scribes. Six pieces were competently entered by the German composer and organist Christian Flor (1626–1697), Gustafson’s Hand A. By contrast, Hand B is hesitant and crude.

The six Lully pieces by Flor (Hand A) are found amid a large group of small dances (nos. 34–59), mostly minuets, between the composed suites. The remaining six, by Hand B, were entered later in the source. Of these, four are dance melodies.


Editorial Remarks

Lully’s orchestral prototype is barred every two half notes, following the time signature.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.\textsuperscript{1} The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.\textsuperscript{2}

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 5, 7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 38 (p. 64), Air Rolandi (d) [C’est l’amour from *Roland* (1685) LWV 65/13 (d)]

M. 2  rhL1  sharp missing
Menuet

**Persée, 1682**

*D-Lr Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Lüneburg-1198), no. 43, p. 69
LWV 60/72

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*D-Lr*: Lüneburg, Ratsbücherei, Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Germany, 1687).

Twelve pieces from Lully, entered by two scribes. Six pieces were competently entered by the German composer and organist Christian Flor (1626–1697), Gustafson’s Hand A. By contrast, Hand B is hesitant and crude.

The six Lully pieces by Flor (Hand A) are found amid a large group of small dances (nos. 34–59), mostly minuets, between the composed suites. The remaining six, by Hand B, were entered later in the source. Of these, four are dance melodies.


Editorial Remarks

Lully’s orchestral prototype is barred every three quarter notes, following the time signature.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2, 8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 43 (p. 69), Menuet (D) [Menuet from Persée (1682) LWV 60/72 (D)]
[No comments]
Menuet (Menuet Les Ceours)

Atys, 1676

*D-Lr Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Lüneburg-1198), no. 53, p. 79
LWV 53/48

© David Chung, 2014
Source

D-Lr: Lüneburg, Ratsbücherei, Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Germany, 1687).

Twelve pieces from Lully, entered by two scribes. Six pieces were competently entered by the German composer and organist Christian Flor (1626–1697), Gustafson’s Hand A. By contrast, Hand B is hesitant and crude.

The six Lully pieces by Flor (Hand A) are found amid a large group of small dances (nos. 34–59), mostly minuets, between the composed suites. The remaining six, by Hand B, were entered later in the source. Of these, four are dance melodies.


Editorial Remarks

Lully’s orchestral prototype is barred every three quarter notes, following the time signature.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (m. 12, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 53 (p. 79), Menuet Les Ceours (g) [Menuet from *Atys* (1676) LWV 53/48 (g)]
M. 7 lhU2 natural missing
Gavotte (Gavotte de Phaeton)

Phaéton, 1683

D-Lr Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Lüneburg-1198), no. 56, p. 82

LWV 61/27

(a) editorial sharp supplied from Lully’s first edition (Paris, 1683)

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)

Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.22
Source

*D-Lr*: Lüneburg, Ratsbücherei, Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Germany, 1687).

Twelve pieces from Lully, entered by two scribes. Six pieces were competently entered by the German composer and organist Christian Flor (1626–1697), Gustafson’s Hand A. By contrast, Hand B is hesitant and crude.

The six Lully pieces by Flor (Hand A) are found amid a large group of small dances (nos. 34–59), mostly minuets, between the composed suites. The remaining six, by Hand B, were entered later in the source. Of these, four are dance melodies.


Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2–3, 5, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 56 (p. 82), Gavotte de Phaeton (C) [Gavotte from *Phaéton* (1683) LWV 61/27 (C)]
Menuet
Noce de Village, 1685

D-Lr Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Lüneburg-1198), no. 58, p. 84
LWV 70/3

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_D-Lr_: Lüneburg, Ratsbücherei, Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Germany, 1687).

Twelve pieces from Lully, entered by two scribes. Six pieces were competently entered by the German composer and organist Christian Flor (1626–1697), Gustafson’s Hand A. By contrast, Hand B is hesitant and crude.

The six Lully pieces by Flor (Hand A) are found amid a large group of small dances (nos. 34–59), mostly minuets, between the composed suites. The remaining six, by Hand B, were entered later in the source. Of these, four are dance melodies.


Editorial Remarks

Lully’s orchestral prototype is barred every three quarter notes, following the time signature.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (m. 3, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 58 (p. 84), Menuet (C) [Menuet from Noce de Village (1685) LWV 70/3 (C)]
[No comments]
Menuet

Bellerophon, 1679

D-Lr Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Lüneburg-1198), no. 59, p. 85
LWV 57/25

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*D-Lr*: Lüneburg, Ratsbücherei, Mus. ant. pract. 1198 (Germany, 1687).

Twelve pieces from Lully, entered by two scribes. Six pieces were competently entered by the German composer and organist Christian Flor (1626–1697), Gustafson’s Hand A. By contrast, Hand B is hesitant and crude.

The six Lully pieces by Flor (Hand A) are found amid a large group of small dances (nos. 34–59), mostly minuets, between the composed suites. The remaining six, by Hand B, were entered later in the source. Of these, four are dance melodies.


Editorial Remarks

Lully’s orchestral prototype is barred every three quarter notes, following the time signature.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 4, 11, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 59 (p. 85), Menuet (a) [Meneut from Bellerophon (1679) LWV 57/25 (a)]
M. 8  lhU4  e’ on upper staff
M. 12  lhU6  sharp missing
Gigue
*Bellerophon*, 1679

*GB-Cu MS Add. 9565, no. 13, pp. 35–7*

LWV 57/8

(a) redundant stem removed. See commentary.
Source

*GB-Cu*: Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 9565 (Lyons, post-1693).

Six Lully arrangements, one of which (LWV 61/40, pp. 60–3) is incomplete (and is hence omitted from this edition), entered by an unidentified hand. The hand is hasty and makes careless mistakes, such as the omission of notes and barlines. It is possible that the scribe was working from memory. In one piece (LWV 39/1), the scribe aborted the copying after five bars of music (p. 52) and, probably on realizing the erroneous rhythms, started afresh on the next page (p. 53). In another piece (LWV 73/32, pp. 38–40), four bars of music halfway through the piece were copied a second time.

The six arrangements by Jean-Baptiste Lully and two by Louis de Lully are grouped toward the end of this miscellaneous collection of 21 pieces. Identified harpsichord composers include Jacques Champion Chambonnières, Nicolas Lebègue, and Élizabeth Jacquet de La Guerre.

Literature: See the Cambridge University Library Catalogue for an inventory of this source.

Edition: WLSCM: 5 pieces (nos. 13–4, 16–8).

Editorial Remarks

Lully’s prototype (exemplar: *F-Pn Vm*² 21) is in 6/4 time. In MS Add. 9565, the music, in 6/8, was incorrectly barred in 3/8. All barlines in this edition are from Add. 9565, but those superfluous ones are broken through staves.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 13 (pp. 35–7), Gigue (F) [Gigue from *Bellerophon* (1679) LWV 57/8 (B₃)]

M. 1 rh time signature partly missing
    lh time signature missing
M. 2 lh1 dots missing
M. 4 lhL1 dot missing
M. 5 lh dots missing
M. 6 lh dots missing
M. 7 lhL1 dot missing
M. 8 lhL1 dot missing
M. 11 rh1 dot missing
M. 17 lhL1 dot missing
M. 18 lhL1 dot missing
M. 27 rh1 dot missing
M. 29 lh2–3 notes blurred
M. 31 lhU1 dot missing
M. 32 lhU2 stem missing
Chaconne (Chaconne de galatee)
*Acis et Galatée*, 1686

GB-Cu MS Add. 9565, no. 14, pp. 38–40
LWV 73/32

(a) notes blurred  
(b) note blurred
Source

*GB-Cu*: Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 9565 (Lyons, post-1693).

Six Lully arrangements, one of which (LWV 61/40, pp. 60–63) is incomplete (and is hence omitted from this edition), entered by an unidentified hand. The hand is hasty and makes careless mistakes, such as the omission of notes and barlines. It is possible that the scribe was working from memory. In one piece (LWV 39/1), the scribe aborted the copying after five bars of music (p. 52) and, probably on realizing the erroneous rhythms, started afresh on the next page (p. 53). In another piece (LWV 73/32, pp. 38–40), four bars of music halfway through the piece were copied a second time.

The six arrangements by Jean-Baptiste Lully and two by Louis de Lully are grouped toward the end of this miscellaneous collection of 21 pieces. Identified harpsichord composers include Jacques Champion Chambonnières, Nicolas Lebègue, and Élizabeth Jacquet de La Guerre.

Literature: See the Cambridge University Library Catalogue for an inventory of this source.

Edition: WLSCM: 5 pieces (nos. 13–4, 16–8).

Editorial Remarks

This version is essentially a copy of *D’Anglebert-1689*, transposed down a second (cf. *Couperin-Turin*, no. 48). Measures 17–20 were first entered in a disorderly fashion and then recopied on the staff below.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.\(^1\) The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.\(^2\)

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 4, 15–6, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 14 (pp. 38–40), Chaconne de galatee (C) [Chaconne from *Acis et Galatée* (1686) LWV 73/32 (D)]

- M. 10 lh  last chord: notes blurred
- M. 19 lhL1 note blurred
- M. 24 lhL1 dot missing
- M. 41 lhU1 dot missing
Les Songes funestes (Lessonges funestes datis)

Atys, 1676

GB-Cu MS Add. 9565, no. 16, pp. 46–8
LWV 53/62

© David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.27
Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014

(a) corrupted readings in Source. See critical notes.

(b) corrupted readings in Source. See critical notes.

(c) corrupted readings in Source. See critical notes.

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.27
Source

*GB-Cu*: Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 9565 (Lyons, post-1693).

Six Lully arrangements, one of which (LWV 61/40, pp. 60–63) is incomplete (and is hence omitted from this edition), entered by an unidentified hand. The hand is hasty and makes careless mistakes, such as the omission of notes and barlines. It is possible that the scribe was working from memory. In one piece (LWV 39/1), the scribe aborted the copying after five bars of music (p. 52) and, probably on realizing the erroneous rhythms, started afresh on the next page (p. 53). In another piece (LWV 73/32, pp. 38–40), four bars of music halfway through the piece were copied a second time.

The six arrangements by Jean-Baptiste Lully and two by Louis de Lully are grouped toward the end of this miscellaneous collection of 21 pieces. Identified harpsichord composers include Jacques Champion Chambonnières, Nicolas Lebègue, and Élizabeth Jacquet de La Guerre.

Literature: See the Cambridge University Library Catalogue for an inventory of this source.

Edition: WLSCM: 5 pieces (nos. 13–4, 16–8).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 16 (pp. 46–8), Lessonges funestes datis (C) [Les Songes funestes from *Atys* (1676) LWV 53/62 (B₃)]

- M. 1 lhU1 rest missing
- M. 2 lhU1 dot missing
- M. 6 lhU3 unclear
- lhL4 unclear
- M. 8 rhL3 dots missing
- M. 10 lhU2 rest missing

M. 11–3 incorrect rhythm:

M. 16 lh5–6

M. 21 rh1 ties missing
rhU3    rest missing
lhU1    tie missing
lhL7–11
La Dessente de Mars (Ladessente De mars)

Thésée, 1675

GB-Cu MS Add. 9565, no. 17, pp. 49–51
LWV 51/5

(a) [Trompettes, Violons & Timballes]

© David Chung, 2014

(a) Instrumentations and repetition markings within brackets supplied from GB-Lb Hirsch II 552 (Lully's first edition)

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.28
Source

GB-Cu: Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 9565 (Lyons, post-1693).

Six Lully arrangements, one of which (LWV 61/40, pp. 60–63) is incomplete (and is hence omitted from this edition), entered by an unidentified hand. The hand is hasty and makes careless mistakes, such as the omission of notes and barlines. It is possible that the scribe was working from memory. In one piece (LWV 39/1), the scribe aborted the copying after five bars of music (p. 52) and, probably on realizing the erroneous rhythms, started afresh on the next page (p. 53). In another piece (LWV 73/32, pp. 38–40), four bars of music halfway through the piece were copied a second time.

The six arrangements by Jean-Baptiste Lully and two by Louis de Lully are grouped toward the end of this miscellaneous collection of 21 pieces. Identified harpsichord composers include Jacques Champion Chambonnières, Nicolas Lebègue, and Élizabeth Jacquet de La Guerre.

Literature: See the Cambridge University Library Catalogue for an inventory of this source.

Edition: WLSCM: 5 pieces (nos. 13–4, 16–8).

Editorial Remarks

Instrumentations within brackets are supplied from the first edition of Lully’s orchestral version (Exemplar: GB-Lbl Hirsch II 552). The editorial suggestion in m. 41 to go back to the beginning for a reprise of six measures derives from Lully’s version.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.


WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.28
In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 8–9, 23, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 17 (pp. 49–51), Ladessente De mars (C) [La Dessente de Mars from Thésée (1675) LWV 51/5 (C)]
M. 9 lhU1 dot missing
M. 17 lhL3 stem missing
M. 18 rhL1 dot missing
M. 19 rhU1 dot missing
   lhU1 dot missing
M. 26 lhL1 dot missing
M. 29 rhU1 dot missing
   lhU1 dot missing
Ouverture (ouverture de la grotte)

La Grotte de Versailles, 1668

GB-Cu MS Add. 9565, no. 18, pp. 52–6
LWV 39/1

(a) see commentary

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*GB-Cu*: Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 9565 (Lyons, post-1693).

Six Lully arrangements, one of which (LWV 61/40, pp. 60–63) is incomplete (and is hence omitted from this edition), entered by an unidentified hand. The hand is hasty and makes careless mistakes, such as the omission of notes and barlines. It is possible that the scribe was working from memory. In one piece (LWV 39/1), the scribe aborted the copying after five bars of music (p. 52) and, probably on realizing the erroneous rhythms, started afresh on the next page (p. 53). In another piece (LWV 73/32, pp. 38–40), four bars of music halfway through the piece were copied a second time.

The six arrangements by Jean-Baptiste Lully and two by Louis de Lully are grouped toward the end of this miscellaneous collection of 21 pieces. Identified harpsichord composers include Jacques Champion Chambonnières, Nicolas Lebègue, and Élizabeth Jacquet de La Guerre.

Literature: See the Cambridge University Library Catalogue for an inventory of this source.

Edition: WLSCM: 5 pieces (nos. 13–4, 16–8).

Editorial Remarks

The scribe first began on page 52, for six measures, and stopped probably on noticing that the rhythms were incorrect (from m. 2). He re-entered the entire piece on page 53.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In both “2” and “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 7, 9–10, 12, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 18 (pp. 52–6), ouverture de la grotte (g) [Ouverture from La Grotte de Versailles (1668) LWV 39/1 (g)]

- M. 8 lhL4 natural missing
- M. 10 rh2 rest missing
- M. 11 rh+lh time signatures missing
- M. 14 lh5 flat missing
- M. 16–8 lhU1 dots missing
- M. 17 rh1 tie missing
- M. 18 rh2 note missing
- M. 19 rh dot missing
- M. 27 rh1 dot missing
- M. 33–4 lhU1 dots missing
- M. 44 lh time signature missing
- M. 48 rhL3 dot missing
lhU1  tie missing
lhU2  note missing
Chaconne

Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme, 1670

B-Bc MS 13878, no. 4, pp. 4–6
LWV 43/36

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 13878 (Brussels, post 1701, after Dieupart’s *Six suites*).

Two Lully arrangements entered by one unidentified hand. Nine pieces toward the end of the book are concordant with Charles Dieupart’s *Six suites*, published in Amsterdam in 1701. The readings are not identical with the print, suggesting that the scribe could have been copying from earlier manuscript versions. The Lully Chaconne (no. 4) is followed by another arrangement, an overture from Agostino Stefanni’s *Orlando generoso* (1691). The other Lully piece is an isolated entry that appears after an unidentified piece titled “De puis que tes faveurs,” which is probably also an arrangement.

Edition: WLSCM: 2 pieces (nos. 4, 8).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 3, 5–8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 4 (p. 4–6), Chaconne (G) [Chaconne des Scaramouches from Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme (1670) LWV 43/36 (G)]
M. 7 rh4 natural missing
M. 43 lh1 quarter note
M. 48 lh1 dot missing
Chaconne

Atys, 1676

B-Bc MS 13878, no. 8, pp. 14–6
LWV 53/47

© David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.31
(a) $f'$ on upper staff
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 13878 (Brussels, post 1701, after Dieupart’s *Six suites*).

Two Lully arrangements entered by one unidentified hand. Nine pieces toward the end of the book are concordant with Charles Dieupart’s *Six suites*, published in Amsterdam in 1701. The readings are not identical with the print, suggesting that the scribe could have been copying from earlier manuscript versions. The Lully Chaconne (no. 4) is followed by another arrangement, an overture from Agostino Stefanni’s *Orlando generoso* (1691). The other Lully piece is an isolated entry that appears after an unidentified piece titled “De puis que tes faveurs,” which is probably also an arrangement.

Edition: WLSCM: 2 pieces (nos. 4, 8).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1–2, 5–6, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 8 (pp. 14–6), [Untitled] (g) [Chaconne from *Atys* (1676) LWV 53/47 (g)]

- M. 1 lhL1 dot missing
- M. 4 lhL1 dot missing
- M. 5 lhL1 dot missing
- M. 8 lhL1 dot missing
- M. 17 lhL1 dot missing
- M. 24 lhU3 \( f' \) on upper staff
  - lhL1 dot missing
- M. 34 rhL3 flat missing?
- M. 45 lhL1 dot missing
- M. 48 rhU1 dot missing
- M. 55 lhL1 dot missing
Entré des Basques (Canary)

Le Temple de la Paix, 1685

US-BEm MS 770 (LaBarre-6), no. 33, p. 338
LWV 69/24

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Two arrangements entered by the Berkeley La Barre. The hand is the same as Hand I of Parville, Hand A of LaBarre-11, and Hand B of Menetou. The hand is professional and uniformly elegant, showing special care for the precise placement of notes and ornaments.

The two Lully pieces are later editions in what is primarily a collection of vocal scores of Lully’s operas.


Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 5–8, 10, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

p. 338 (no. 33), Canary (C) [Entrée des Basques from *Le Temple de la Paix* (1685) LWV 69/24 (C)]
M. 22 lh1 quarter note

M. 24 rh
Dans nos bois (Dans nos bois de Mr de Lully)

Trios de la Chambre du Roi

US-BEm MS 775 (LaBarre-11), p. 205
LWV 35/4

© David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.33
Source

US-BEm: Berkeley, University of California, Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, MS 775 (Paris, post 1724).

Three arrangements entered by the Berkeley La Barre (see LaBarre-6 above).

Two of the three arrangements in LaBarre-11 are drawn directly from D’Anglebert-1689.


Editorial Remarks

This piece is a copy of D’Anglebert-1689.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2–3, 6–7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

p. 205, Dans nos bois de Mr de Lully (C) [Dans nos bois (menue) from *Trios de la Chambre du Roi* (n.d.) LWV 35/4 (C)]
[No comments]
Chaconne (Chaconne de Galatée de Mr de Lully)

*Acis et Galatée*, 1686

*US-BEm MS 775 (LaBarre-11), pp. 206–7
LWV 73/32*

© David Chung, 2014
(a) erroneous note a'' (above f-sharp) removed. See commentary.

(b) two eighth notes
Source

US-BEm: Berkeley, University of California, Jean Gray Hargrove Music Library, MS 775 (Paris, post 1724).

Three arrangements entered by the Berkeley La Barre (see LaBarre-6 above).

Two of the three arrangements in LaBarre-11 are drawn directly from D’Anglebert-1689.


Editorial Remarks

This piece is essentially a copy of D’Anglebert-1689.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 4, 15–6, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

p. 206, Chaconne de Galatée de Mr de Lully (D) [Chaconne from Acis et Galatée (1686) (D) LWV 73/32]
M. 4 lhL1 rest missing
M. 32 rh1
M. 40 rhL3–4 quarter notes:
Chaconne (Chaconne des magitions)
*Ballet des Muses, 1666*

*F-Psg MS 2374 (Paignon), no. 12, fols. 8v-9r*

LWV 32/–

---

(a) note within bracket, taken from m. 30, for second time only *(petitte Reprise)*

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.35
Source

*F-Psg*: Paris, Bibliothèque Saint-Geneviève, MS 2374 (France, Paris?), 1716).

One arrangement entered by an unidentified French hand, possibly the teacher of Mademoiselle Paignon.

As in *LaPierre*, pedagogical activity is very visible in this source, which was compiled for Mademoiselle Paignon. The first section (nos. 1–14) was entered by the primary hand, which is possibly that of the teacher. In this section, only two pieces have been identified, and both belong to the seventeenth century: Lebègue’s widely-circulated Gavotte (no. 11) with the *double* by Louis Couperin and the Chaconne des Magitions from Lully’s *Ballet des Muses* (1666) (no. 12). The manuscript is linked to Clérambault through his “Regles D’accompagnement” at the end of the book (fols. 1Ar–8Ar), but any possible involvement of Clérambault in copying or making the arrangement cannot be proven at this stage.


Edition: WLSCM, one piece (no. 12).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 3, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 12 (fols. 8v–9r), Chaconne des magitions (C) [Chaconne from Ballet des Muses (1666) LWV 32/- (B)]
M. 8 rh erroneous double barline in right-hand staff removed
M. 23 “8” missing
   lhU1 note within bracket, taken from m. 30, for petite Reprise only
M. 29 rhL1 rest missing
M. 30 “8” missing
Les Trompettes
Psyché, 1671

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 2, p. 7
LWV 45/36

© David Chung, 2014

(a) Ending (mm. 7–8) reconstructed from the first edition of Lully’s orchestral version (Paris, 1720). See editorial remarks.
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial Remarks

Time signature of this keyboard version is taken from Lully’s orchestral prototype (*F-Pn* Rés. F. 1706), which is in D major. Music was apparently entered in haste, and ending is missing. Current ending reconstructed from the first edition of Lully’s version (Paris, 1720), which was brought out by Ballard almost 40 years after the work was first performed.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces...
for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 3–5, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 2 (p. 7, Hand E), [untitled] (C) [Les Trompettes from *Psyché* (1671), LWV 45/36 (D)]

M. 1 time signatures missing
M. 5 lhU2 dot missing
M. 7–8 music missing (see editorial remarks above)

---

Rondeau (Pauvre baptiste)

Hercule amoureux, 1662

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 9, pp. 16–7
LWV 17/27

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*Source*

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial Remarks

This piece is in rondeau form and the *reprise* symbols, indicated by $\$, have been re-positioned to clarify the repetition scheme.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French ¹ See Chung, “Lully, D’Anglebert and the Transmission of 17th-Century French Harpsichord Music,” 586–92.
repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tremblement</th>
<th>Pincé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Tremblement Example" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Pincé Example" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In “3” and “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3–6, 10, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégalés* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 9 (pp. 16–7, Hand A), Pauvre baptiste (a) [Rondeau from *Hercule amoureux* (1662) LWV 17/27 (g)]

- M. 16 followed by an empty measure containing ♭. Empty measure removed, and ♭ moved to end of measure 16.
- M. 27 followed by an empty measure containing ♭. Empty measure removed, and ♭ moved to end of measure 27.

---

Gavotte (La Gauotte du ballet)

Ballet des Muses, 1666

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 26, pp. 36, 42

LWV 32/7

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial Remarks

The *double* [not by Lully] is on p. 42. It is separated from the Gavotte (p. 36) by 4 pieces (5 pages).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance music that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and


WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.38
The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

![Tremblement and Pincé Diagrams]

In “3” and “*” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 13–5, 19–20, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 26 (pp. 36, 42, Hand A), La Gauotte du ballet (G) [Gavotte from *Ballet des Muses* (1666) LWV 32/7 (Bv)]

- M. 13 lhU2 dot missing
- lhU3 rest missing

---

Menuet (Les Menüz de St. Germain)

Ballet des Muses, 1666

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 27, p. 37
LWV 32/8–9

© David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.39
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial Remarks
This piece is in rondeau form and the placement of the *reprise* symbols, indicated by %, has been tacitly adjusted to clarify the repetition scheme.

Performance Notes
In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and


WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)  
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.39
The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” and “é” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 6, 10, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 27 (p. 37, Hand A), Les Menüz de St. Germain (G) [Menuet from *Ballet des Muses* (1666) LWV 32/8–9 (B3)]


---

Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.40
Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.40
Source

*B*-Bc: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels*-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial Remarks

Only mm. 1–12 are concordant with Lully’s instrumental prototype (*F*-Pn Rés. F. 507), and the music continues with about 15 short segments of technical exercises. In all likelihood, the keyboard piece makes concrete teaching materials. The number at the end of each segment indicates the number of repetitions expected for each segment.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces.
for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, tremblements are indicated by wavy lines above notes and pincés by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” and “é” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 8, 11, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 41 (pp. 59–63, Hand A), La Guerre (C) [La Guerre from Ballet d’Alcidiane (1658) LWV 9/24 (D)]
M. 63 lhU2 erroneous tie (to g in m. 64) removed

Les Mariniers
Le Grand Divertissement Royal de Versailles, 1668

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 45, pp. 66–7
LWV 38/6

© David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.41
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, tremblements are indicated by wavy lines above notes and pincés by the same wavy lines below notes.

Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 45 (pp. 66–7, Hand A), Les Mariniers (C) [Les Mariniers from Le Grand Divertissement Royal de Versailles (1668) LWV 38/6 (F)]
Menuet (Les flustes)

Le Grand Divertissement Royal de Versailles, 1668

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 47, p. 68
LWV 38/2

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_B-Bc_: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with _doubles_, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the _brisé_ texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote _tremblements_ and the same wavy lines below notes to denote _pincés_. In the case of Hand E, the _pincé_ is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (Alceste) and 1681 (Le Triomphe de l’amour). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with _doubles_ (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

```
Tremblement

\[ \text{\includegraphics{tremblement.png}} \]

Pincé

\[ \text{\includegraphics{pince.png}} \]

Port de voix

\[ \text{\includegraphics{portdevoix.png}} \]

Cadence Coulé Harpegement

\[ \text{\includegraphics{cadence.png}} \]
```

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 10–11) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 47 (p. 68, Hand A), Les flustes (C) [Menuet from *Le Grand Divertissement Royal de Versailles* (1668) LWV 38/2 (F)]

[No comments]
Les Suisses

Ballet de L’Impatience, 1661

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 48, p. 69
LWV 14/42

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.\(^1\) The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.\(^2\)

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 48 (p. 69, Hand A), Les Suisses (F) [Les Suisses from *Ballet de L’Impatience* (1661) LWV 14/42 (G)]

[No comments]
Menuet (Menüet)
Ballet de Flore, 1669

B-Be MS 27220, no. 53, p. 78
LWV 40/39

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3, 7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 53 (p. 78, Hand A), Menüet (C) [Menuet from *Ballet de Flore* (1669) LWV 40/39 (C)]
[No comments]
Bourrée (Bourée)

*Le Carnaval, Mascarade, 1668*

*B-Be MS 27220, no. 60, pp. 92–3
LWV 36/5*

---

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3–4, 8–9, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 60 (pp. 92–3, Hand A), Bourée (d) [Bourrée from *Le Carnaval, Mascarade* (1668) LWV 36/5 (g)]


Menuet (Menüet)

Ballet de Flore, 1669

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 61, p. 93
LWV 40/11

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hasty and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (m. 13) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 61 (p. 93, Hand A), Menüet (d) [Menuet from *Ballet de Flore* (1669) LWV 40/11 (g)]
M. 19 barline missing
Courante (Courante du Ballet)

*Ballet de Flore*, 1669

*B-Bc MS 27220, no. 62, p. 94
LWV 40/5*
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 5, 19, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 62 (p. 94, Hand A), Courante du Ballet (a) [Courante from *Ballet de Flore* (1669) LWV 40/5 (d)]

- M. 1  rh1  dot missing in the facsimile edition (Geneva: Minkoff, 2003)
Bourrée (Bourée du ballet)  
*Ballet de Flore, 1669*

*B-Bc MS 27220, no. 63, p. 95  
LWV 40/7*

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l'amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.  


---

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.48
The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3, 6–7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 63 (p. 95, Hand A), Bourée du ballet (a) [Bourrée from *Ballet de Flore* (1669) LWV 40/7 (d)]
[No comments]
Ballet

Le Carnaval, Mascarade, 1668

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 64, p. 96
LWV 36/4

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

- **Tremblement**
- **Pincé**

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (m. 15) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 64 (p. 96, Hand A), Ballet (d) [Ballet from *Le Carnaval, Mascarade* (1668) LWV 36/4 (g)]

M. 3  rh1  dot missing
Source

B-Bc: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the brisé texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote tremblements and the same wavy lines below notes to denote pincés. In the case of Hand E, the pincé is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (Alceste) and 1681 (Le Triomphe de l’amour). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.\(^1\) The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.\(^2\)

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, tremblements are indicated by wavy lines above notes and pincés by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (m. 15) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 65 (p. 97, Hand A), Menuet (d) [Menuet from *Ballet des Muses* (1666) LWV 32/27 (d)]
M. 13 barline missing
M. 23 barline missing
Menuet (Menüet)

Les Amants magnifiques, 1670

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 66, p. 98
LWV 42/20

© David Chung, 2014
Source

B-Bc: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the brisé texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote tremblements and the same wavy lines below notes to denote pincés. In the case of Hand E, the pincé is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (Alceste) and 1681 (Le Triomphe de l’amour). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial Remarks

Lully’s orchestral prototype (F-Pn Rés. F. 1710(1)) is barred every three quarter notes, following the time signature.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French

repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, tremblements are indicated by wavy lines above notes and pincés by the same wavy lines below notes.

![Tremblement and Pincé Examples](image)

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 9–11) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 66 (p. 98, Hand A), Menüet (F) [Menuet from *Les Amants magnifiques* (1670) LWV 42/20 (F)]

[No comments]

---

Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the brisé texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote tremblements and the same wavy lines below notes to denote pincés. In the case of Hand E, the pincé is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

![Ornament Symbols](image)

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 67 (pp. 99–100, Hand A), 1. Ballet (C) [Les Pêcheurs de corail from *Les Amants magnifiques* (1670) LWV 42/4 (C)]

[No comments]
Air de Neptune (2. Ballet)

Les Amants magnifiques, 1670

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 68, pp. 100–1
LWV 42/6

© David Chung, 2014
Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014

Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 10, 13–4, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 68 (pp. 100–1, Hand A), 2. Ballet (C) [Air de Neptune from *Les Amants magnifiques* (1670) LWV 42/6 (F)]
[No comments]
Marche (3. Ballet)
Ballet de Flore, 1669

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 69, pp. 102–3
LWV 40/33

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B*-Bc: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2–6, 8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 69 (pp. 102–3, Hand A), 3. Ballet (C) [Marche from *Ballet de Flore* (1669) LWV 40/33 (C)]

10    rh4    ornament blotted out by ink
Les Hommes et femmes armés (Les hommes arméz | 4. Ballet)

Les Amants magnifiques, 1670

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 71, pp. 104–5
LWV 42/31

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_B-Bc_: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with _doubles_, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the _brisé_ texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote _tremblements_ and the same wavy lines below notes to denote _pincés_. In the case of Hand E, the _pincé_ is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 ( _Alceste_ ) and 1681 ( _Le Triomphe de l’amour_ ). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in _Brussels-27220_ were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


_Editions_: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with _doubles_ (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. _1_ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others. _2_

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1–2, 5–10, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 71 (pp. 104–5, Hand A), Les hommes arméz | 4. Ballet (C) [Les Hommes et femmes armés from *Les Amants magnifiques* (1670) LWV 42/31 (D)]
[No comments]
Les Maistres à dancer (Les Maistres a dancer)
Le Divertissement de Chambord, 1669

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 72, pp. 106–7
LWV 41/6

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. 1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others. 2

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, tremblements are indicated by wavy lines above notes and pincés by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 16, 20, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 72 (pp. 106–7, Hand A), Les Maistres a dancer (d) [Les Maistres à dancer from Le Divertissement de Chambord (1669) LWV 41/6 (g)]

Les Combattans
Le Divertissement de Chambord, 1669

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 73, p. 108
LWV 41/7

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 8, 12–3, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 73 (p. 108, Hand A), Les Combattans (F) [Les Combattans from *Le Divertissement de Chambord* (1669) LWV 41/7 (F)]

[No comments]
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 23–5, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 76 (pp. 112–4, Hand A), Joüissons des plaisirs (g) [Joüissons des plaisirs from *Les Amants magnifiques* (1670) LWV 42/21 (g)]

M. 20 lhU1 dot removed
Menuet (Menüet)

Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme, 1670

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 81, p. 118
LWV 43/37

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 14, 17, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 81 (p. 118, Hand A), Menüet (C) [Menuet from *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* (1670) LWV 43/37 (C)]

M. 23 barline missing
Menuet (Menüet)

Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme, 1670

© David Chung, 2014
Source

B-Bc: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the brisé texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote tremblements and the same wavy lines below notes to denote pincés. In the case of Hand E, the pincé is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (Alceste) and 1681 (Le Triomphe de l’amour). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial Remarks

Lully’s orchestral prototype (F-Pn Rés F-578) is barred every three quarter notes, following the time signature.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French

repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.\(^2\)

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tremblement</th>
<th>Pincé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Tremblement Icon" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Pincé Icon" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2–5, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 82 (p. 119, Hand A), Menüet (C) [Menuet from *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* (1670) LWV 43/38 (C)]

[No comments]

---

Premier Menuet (1. Menüet)

Psyché, 1671

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 87, p. 128
LWV 45/7

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the brisé texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote tremblements and the same wavy lines below notes to denote pincés. In the case of Hand E, the pincé is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l'amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial remarks

Lully’s orchestral prototype (*F-Pn* Rés F-1706) is barred every three quarter notes, following the time signature.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French
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repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, tremblements are indicated by wavy lines above notes and pincés by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2, 4, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 87 (p. 128, Hand A), 1. Menüet (C) [Premier Menuet from Psyché (1671) LWV 45/7 (C)]

M. 2 rh2 flat missing
M. 4 rh2 flat missing

---

Deuxième Menuet (2. Menüet)

Psyché, 1671

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 88, p. 129
LWV 45/6

© David Chung, 2014
Source

B-Bc: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the brisé texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote tremblements and the same wavy lines below notes to denote pincés. In the case of Hand E, the pincé is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (Alceste) and 1681 (Le Triomphe de l’amour). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial remarks

(1) First and second repeats at measures 3 and 5 indicated by a pair of “+” signs.
(2) Lully’s orchestral prototype (F-Pn Rés F-1706) is barred every three quarter notes, following the time signature.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces
for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, tremblements are indicated by wavy lines above notes and pincés by the same wavy lines below notes.

### Critical Notes

No. 88 (p. 129, Hand A), 2. Menüet (C) [Deuxième Menuet from Psyché (1671) LWV 45/6 (C)]
[No comments]

---

Aimable jeunesse (Aymable Jeunesse)

Psyché, 1671

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 89, pp. 130–1
LWV 45/16

(a) see commentary

(b) see commentary
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


**Editions**: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

**Performance Notes**

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 6, 16, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 89 (pp. 130–1, Hand A), Aymable Jeunesse (a) [Aimable jeunesse from *Psyché* (1671) LWV 45/16 (a)]

M. 17 rh3

M. 21 rhU4
Gavotte (Apollon)

Psyché, 1671

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 90, pp. 131–2
LWV 45/25

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).*

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, tremblements are indicated by wavy lines above notes and pincés by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 5, 13, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 90 (pp. 131–2, Hand A), Apollon (a) [Gavotte from Psyché (1671) LWV 45/25 (d)]

[No comments]
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, *tremblements* are indicated by wavy lines above notes and *pincés* by the same wavy lines below notes.

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 91 (pp. 133–4, Hand A), Les Bacchanalles (D) [Les Bacchanalles from *Psyché* (1671) LWV 45/28 (F)]

[No comments]
Second Air (Les fées)

_Psyché, 1671_

*B-Bc MS 27220, no. 92, pp. 134–5
LWV 45/30*

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial Remarks

Lully’s orchestral prototype (*F-Pn* Rés. F. 1706) is barred in every three quarter notes, following the time signature.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French

repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2, 5, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 92 (pp. 134–5, Hand A), Les fées (D) [Second Air from Psyché (1671) LWV 45/30 (F)]

M. 6 lhU1 d’ in faded ink

---

Les Trompettes (Les Rondeaux des Trompettes)

*Psyché*, 1671

*B-Bc MS 27220, no. 93, pp. 136–7
LWV 45/36*

© David Chung, 2014

Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014
Source

B-Bc: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the brisé texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote tremblements and the same wavy lines below notes to denote pincés. In the case of Hand E, the pincé is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (Alceste) and 1681 (Le Triomphe de l’amour). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial Remarks

This piece is in rondeau form and the reprise symbols, indicated by $\%,$ have been re-positioned to clarify the repetition scheme.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French


WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.67
The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, tremblements are indicated by wavy lines above notes and pincés by the same wavy lines below notes.

**Tremblement**

---

**Pincé**

---

**Port de voix**

---

**Cadence**

---

**Coulé**

---

**Harpegement**

---

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 3, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 93 (pp. 136–7, Hand A), Les Rondeaux des Trompettes (D) [Les Trompettes from Psyché (1671) LWV 45/36 (D)]


---

Deuxième Air des Trompettes (2. Air des Trompettes)

Psyché, 1671

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 93a, p. 138
LWV 45/37

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_B-Bc_: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the _brisé_ texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote _tremblements_ and the same wavy lines below notes to denote _pincés_. In the case of Hand E, the _pincé_ is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (_Alceste_) and 1681 (_Le Triomphe de l’amour_). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in _Brussels-27220_ were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources. In this piece, tremblements are indicated by wavy lines above notes and pincés by the same wavy lines below notes.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3–4, 9, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 93a (p. 138, Hand A), 2. Air des Trompettes (D) [Deuxième Air des Trompettes from Psyché (1671) LWV 45/37 (D)]
[No comments]
Ouverture (Ouverture proserpine)

Proserpine, 1680

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 97, pp. 146–9

LWV 58/1

© David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlsclm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.69
Source

*B-Bc:* Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels*-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In both “2” and “6/4” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2–3, 16, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 97 (pp. 146–9, Hand E), Ouverture proserpine (d) [Ouverture from *Proserpine* (1680) LWV 58/1 (d)]

- M. 9  rhL1  tie missing
- M. 11  lh2  quarter note
- M. 12  rh1  ties missing
  - lh  time signature missing
  - lhU3  dot missing
  - lhL1  dot missing
- M. 13  lh1  note for second time [i.e. *Reprise*] only
- M. 40  rh11  note missing
- M. 47  lh  time signature missing
- M. 48  measure missing
Menuet (menuet)

*Bellerophon, 1679*

*B-Bc MS 27220, no. 98, pp. 150–1
LWV 57/7*
Source

B-Bc: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the brisé texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote tremblements and the same wavy lines below notes to denote pincés. In the case of Hand E, the pincé is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (Alceste) and 1681 (Le Triomphe de l’amour). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial Remarks

The double (mm. 16–30) was not by Lully.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3, 8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 98 (pp. 150–1, Hand E), menuet (d) [Menuet from *Bellerophon* (1679) LWV 57/7 (d)]

M. 4  lhL1  dotted half note
M. 5  lhU1  dot missing
M. 13 lhU1  dot missing

---

Les Amazones

Bellerophon, 1679

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 102, pp. 205–4
LWV 57/23

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Editorial Remarks

The music is wrongly barred in “2/4” time for the first three measures. The superfluous barlines are indicted by dotted lines in this edition.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French

---

Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tremblement</th>
<th>Pincé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}}) or (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}}) or (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}})</td>
<td>(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}}) or (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}}) or (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}}) or (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}}) or (\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port de voix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cadence</th>
<th>Coulé</th>
<th>Harpegement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}})</td>
<td>(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}})</td>
<td>(\text{\texttt{\textbackslash t}})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on the rhythmic convention and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 102 (pp. 205–4, Hand E), Les Amazones (C) [Les Amazones from *Bellerophon* (1679) LWV 57/23 (C)]

- M. 1 lh time signature missing
- M. 18 rh1 dots missing
- M. 21 lhL6–7 notes unclear (hasty handwriting)

---

Ouverture (Atis Ouverture)

Atys, 1676

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 103, pp. 203–200
LWV 53/1

© David Chung, 2014
Source

B-Bc: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the brisé texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote tremblements and the same wavy lines below notes to denote pincés. In the case of Hand E, the pincé is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (Alceste) and 1681 (Le Triomphe de l’amour). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In both “e” and “3/2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 6, 17, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 103 (pp. 203–200, Hand E), Atis Ouverture (g) [Ouverture from *Atys* (1676) LWV 53/1 (g)]
M. 4 rhL1  *d’* in middle of measure
M. 10 lhU1  c’ in middle of measure
M. 25 lh2–4 notes doubled a third higher removed
M. 41 rh  barline missing
Ouverture (Alceste Ouverture)

Alceste, 1674

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 104, pp. 199–195
LWV 50/1

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.\(^1\) The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.\(^2\)

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In both “e” and “6/4” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3, 17–8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 104 (pp. 199–195, Hand E), Alceste Ouverture (a) [Ouverture from *Alceste* (1674) LWV 50/1 (a)]

M. 23 lhM1  sharp missing
M. 41 lhL4  sharp missing
M. 44      barline missing
Ouverture (ouverture du triomfe de lamour)

Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 105, pp. 195–189
LWV 59/1

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_B-Bc:_ Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with doubles, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the brisé texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote tremblements and the same wavy lines below notes to denote pincés. In the case of Hand E, the pincé is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (_Alceste_) and 1681 (_Le Triomphe de l’amour_). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with doubles (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “é” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1–5, 7–9, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 105 (pp. 195–189, Hand E), Ouverture du triomphe de l’amour (F) [Ouverture from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1681), LWV 59/1 (F)]

- M. 8 lhL1 rest missing
- M. 15 rhL1 rest missing
- M. 15 lhL1 repeat barline editorial
- M. 17 rhL3 dot removed
- M. 23 lhL2 natural missing
- M. 26 lhL3 dash across tie (tie cancelled?)
- M. 33 rh5 natural missing; “+” above note
- M. 46 lhU1 “+” above note (copyist’s mark, or ornament?)
- M. 51 lhU2 leger line missing; pitch inferred from its position
- lhL7 natural missing
- M. 57 lhL1–4 notes missing
- M. 58 lhL2 time signature missing
- M. 58 lhL2 rest missing
- M. 59 lhL2 time signature missing
Les Vents (Les vents)

_Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681_

_B-Be MS 27220, no. 111, pp. 163–157
LWV 59/25_

© David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.75
### Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hasty and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

### Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.\(^1\) The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.\(^2\)

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on the rhythmic convention and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 111 (pp. 163–157, Hand E), Les vents (g) [Les Vents from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1681) LWV 59/25 (g)]

- M. 11  rhL1  dot missing
- M. 12  lhL3–4  two quarter notes
- M. 18  rh1  ties missing
Gavotte (Gauotte)

*Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681*

*B-Bc MS 27220, no. 112, pp. 161–160  
LWV 59/26*

© David Chung, 2014

(a) see critical notes

(b) see critical notes
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “é” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1–5, 7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 112 (pp. 161–160, Hand E), Gauotte (g) [Gavotte from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1681) LWV 59/26 (g)]

M. 12 lh

15 rh
Entrée (entree)

Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681

B-Bc MS 27220, no. 113, pp. 160–159
LWV 59/20

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.77
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in *Brussels-27220* were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2, 4, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 113 (pp. 160–159, Hand E), entree (G) [Entrée from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1681) LWV 59/20 (G)]
M. 8 lhL1–2 missing
Les Trompettes (Les trompettes)

*Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681*

*B-Bc MS 27220, no. 114, pp. 158–155
LWV 59/14*

© David Chung, 2014

---

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.78
Source

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3–7, 10–15, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 114 (pp. 158–159, Hand E), Les trompettes (C) [Les Trompettes, from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1681) LWV 59/14 (D)]

- M. 15 rhL1 dot missing (\(b’\))
- M. 48 lhL1 rest missing
- M. 49 rhL1 dot missing (\(b’\))
- M. 53 rh extra c” (last note) crossed out:
Bourrée (Bourree)

*Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681*

_B-Bc MS 27220, no. 115, pp. 155–154_

_LWV 59/13_

© David Chung, 2014
(a) Readings in mm. 21–4 corrupted. Current ending reconstructed from Lully’s first edition (Ballard 1681).
**Source**

*B-Bc*: Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal: MS 27220 (Brussels, post 1678).

Forty-five arrangements, one incomplete and two with *doubles*, entered by two unidentified (French?) hands (Hands A and E). Fuller has identified Hand A as the same as that in two organ manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. 476 (see below) and Rés. 2094, both of which are linked to the Parisian organist Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers (ca. 1632–1714) and his circle. The scribe is very competent, and is particularly scrupulous in notating the intricate details of the *brisé* texture. The handwriting of the later scribe (Hand E) is hastier and less refined. The two scribes demonstrate different traditions of notating ornaments. The first scribe uses wavy lines above notes to denote *tremblements* and the same wavy lines below notes to denote *pincés*. In the case of Hand E, the *pincé* is represented by a stroke across a wavy line.

The Lully arrangements entered by the primary (and more professional) hand (Hand A) were chosen from ballets and operas from up to 1678, and the rest (by the later Hand E) were drawn from works from between 1674 (*Alceste*) and 1681 (*Le Triomphe de l’amour*). Exceptionally, 21 arrangements (nearly half of the total number) in Brussels-27220 were transposed to other keys, and some were sequenced into key groups with pieces drawn from diverse sources.


Editions: WLSCM, forty-four pieces, two with *doubles* (nos. 2, 9, 26–7, 41, 45, 47–8, 53, 60–9, 71–3, 76, 81–2, 87–93a, 97, 98, 102–5, 111–5).

**Performance Notes**

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2–4, 8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 115 (pp. 155–154, Hand E), Bourree (d) [Bourrée from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1681) LWV 59/13 (d)]

- M. 5 lhL1 note missing
- M. 6 rhU2 tie missing
- M. 10 lhU1 dot missing
- M. 16 lh1 tie missing

M. 21–4  *B-Bc* MS 27220:
Current ending reconstructed from Lully’s first edition (Ballard, 1681, exemplar: *F-Pn Vm* 59)
Ouverture (Ouverture de la Grote de Versaille)

*La Grotte de Versailles, 1668*

F-Pn Rés. F. 933, no. 3, fol. 3v
LWV 39/1

© David Chung, 2014

(a) a second higher: g
Source


Seven arrangements entered by one primary unidentified French hand.

Rés-F-933 demonstrates the continuing influence of Lully among harpsichordists into the eighteenth century. With the exception of the Lully arrangements, the only seventeenth-century harpsichordists are represented by the oft-copied gavotte by Hardel, with Louis Couperin’s double. Arrangements from Campra and Destouches equal those from Lully in number. Nos. 1–4 form a small Lully section in this otherwise miscellaneous collection.


Editions: Chung 2004, two pieces (nos. 1, 2); WLSCM, five pieces (nos. 3, 4, 7, 23–4).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In both “6” and “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 7, 9–10, 13, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 3 (fol. 3v), Ouverture de la Grote de Versaille (g) [Ouverture from *La Grotte de Versailles* (1668) LWV39/1 (g)]

- M. 5 lhL2 a second higher: g
- M. 15 lh5 flat missing
- M. 33 lhL1 rest missing
- M. 48 rhU2 note missing
- M. 49 lhL1–2 rests missing
Source


Seven arrangements entered by one primary unidentified French hand.

Rés-F-933 demonstrates the continuing influence of Lully among harpsichordists into the eighteenth century. With the exception of the Lully arrangements, the only seventeenth-century harpsichordists are represented by the oft-copied gavotte by Hardel, with Louis Couperin’s double. Arrangements from Campra and Destouches equal those from Lully in number. Nos. 1–4 form a small Lully section in this otherwise miscellaneous collection.


Editions: Chung 2004, two pieces (nos. 1, 2); WLSCM, five pieces (nos. 3, 4, 7, 23–4).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 4, 9–10, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 4 (fol. 4r), [untitled] [Chaconne from *Acis et Galatée* (1686) (D) LWV 73/32] [No comments]
Chaconne (chaconne de scaramouche)

*Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme, 1670*

_F-Pn_ Rés. F. 933, no. 7, fol. 8r

LWV 43/36

© David Chung, 2014
(a) copied from mm. 11–23
Source


Seven arrangements entered by one primary unidentified French hand.

_Rés-F-933_ demonstrates the continuing influence of Lully among harpsichordists into the eighteenth century. With the exception of the Lully arrangements, the only seventeenth-century harpsichordists are represented by the oft-copied gavotte by Hardel, with Louis Couperin’s _double_. Arrangements from Campra and Destouches equal those from Lully in number. Nos. 1–4 form a small Lully section in this otherwise miscellaneous collection.


Editions: Chung 2004, two pieces (nos. 1, 2); WLSCM, five pieces (nos. 3, 4, 7, 23–4).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 6–8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 7 (fol. 8r), Chaconne de Scaramouche (G) [Chaconne from *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* (1670) LWV 43/36 (G)]

- M. 5 lhL1 dot missing
- M. 29 lhL1 dot missing
- M. 38 lhU3 rest missing
- M. 43 lhU1 rest missing
- M. 44–54 copied from mm. 11–23
- M. 56 “fin” in m. 23 in Source
  lhL1–2 rests missing
Vous ne devez plus attendre (vous ne devés plus attendre)

*Amadis*, 1684

*F-Pn* Rés. F. 933, 23, fol. 16r

LWV 63/36
Source


Seven arrangements entered by one primary unidentified French hand.

_Rés-F-933_ demonstrates the continuing influence of Lully among harpsichordists into the eighteenth century. With the exception of the Lully arrangements, the only seventeenth-century harpsichordists are represented by the oft-copied gavotte by Hardel, with Louis Couperin’s _double_. Arrangements from Campra and Destouches equal those from Lully in number. Nos. 1–4 form a small Lully section in this otherwise miscellaneous collection.


Editions: Chung 2004, two pieces (nos. 1, 2); WLSCM, five pieces (nos. 3, 4, 7, 23–4).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 14, 17, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 23 (fol. 16r), vous ne devés plus attendre (g) [Vous ne devez plus attendre from Amadis (1684) LWV 63/36 (g)]

- M. 23 lhU2 flat missing
- M. 28 lhL3 sharp missing
- M. 30 lhU2 sharp missing
Ouverture (ouverture disis)

Isis, 1677

F-Pn Rés. F. 933, no. 24, fols. 16v–17r
LWV 54/1

(a) a second lower: c'
(b) a semitone lower: e-flat’

(c) a third higher (next to e)
(d) a third higher (next to g)
Source


Seven arrangements entered by one primary unidentified French hand.

*Rés-F-933* demonstrates the continuing influence of Lully among harpsichordists into the eighteenth century. With the exception of the Lully arrangements, the only seventeenth-century harpsichordists are represented by the oft-copied gavotte by Hardel, with Louis Couperin’s *double*. Arrangements from Campra and Destouches equal those from Lully in number. Nos. 1–4 form a small Lully section in this otherwise miscellaneous collection.


Editions: Chung 2004, two pieces (nos. 1, 2); WLSCM, five pieces (nos. 3, 4, 7, 23–4).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In both “2” and “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 18–9, 28, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 24 (fols. 16v–17r), Ouverture d’isis (g) [Ouverture from *Isis* (1677) LWV 54/1 (g)]

- M. 2  rhL2  rest missing
- M. 3  lhL1  a second lower: e’
- M. 5  lhM1  flat missing
- M. 15 rhL1–2  rests missing
- M. 16 rhL1–2  rests missing
- M. 28 lhU2  rest missing
- M. 34 lhL1–2  flats missing
- M. 41 lhU1  a semitone lower: e-flat’
- M. 54 lhL2  sharp a third higher (next to e)
- M. 68 lhL2  natural a third higher (next to g)
- M. 76 lhL1–2  rests missing
Menuet (Menuet du L opera pour jouer sur Le Clauessin)

*Alceste, 1674*

*Menuet* (Menuet du L opera pour jouer sur Le Clauessin)

*Alceste, 1674*

F-Pn Rés. F. 1091, no. 1, p. 16

LWV 50/9

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_F-Pn_: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. F. 1091 (France, post 1715).

Eight Lully arrangements, entered by an unidentified French hand, which might be best described as utilitarian. The handwriting is not calligraphic. The music, which appears to have been entered quickly, is however, highly legible and very playable at sight.

The short Lully keyboard pieces were drawn from two operas: _Cadmus_ (1673) and _Alceste_ (1674). They form a harpsichord section in a manuscript that otherwise contains Italian and French vocal music (including airs by Lully).


Edition: WLSCM, eight pieces (nos. 1–4, 6–9).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 9, 11, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégaux* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 1 (p. 16), Menuet du L opera pour jouer sur Le Clauessin (g) [Menuet from *Alceste* (1674) LWV 50/9 (g)]

M. 12  rh1  sharp missing
M. 20  lh3  a third higher: F
Menuet (Menuet de L opera de cadmus)

*Cadmus et Hermione, 1673*

F-Pn Rés. F. 1091, no. 2, pp. 16–7

LWV 49/57

© David Chung, 2014

Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)

Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.86
Source


Eight Lully arrangements, entered by an unidentified French hand, which might be best described as utilitarian. The handwriting is not calligraphic. The music, which appears to have been entered quickly, is however, highly legible and very playable at sight.

The short Lully keyboard pieces were drawn from two operas: *Cadmus* (1673) and *Alceste* (1674). They form a harpsichord section in a manuscript that otherwise contains Italian and French vocal music (including airs by Lully).


Edition: WLSCM, eight pieces (nos. 1–4, 6–9).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3, 8, 10, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 2 (pp. 16–7), Menuet de L opera de cadmus (a) [Menuet from *Cadmus et Hermione* (1673) LWV 49/57 (a)]

20  rh2  sharp missing

22  lhU2  sharp missing
Jeunes Cœurs

Alceste, 1674

F-Pn Rés. F. 1091, no. 3, p. 17
LWV 50/31

(a) reconstructed from F-Pn Rés. F. 1701 (Lully’s prototype). See commentary for reading in F-Pn Rés. F. 1091.
Source


Eight Lully arrangements, entered by an unidentified French hand, which might be best described as utilitarian. The handwriting is not calligraphic. The music, which appears to have been entered quickly, is however, highly legible and very playable at sight.

The short Lully keyboard pieces were drawn from two operas: Cadmus (1673) and Alceste (1674). They form a harpsichord section in a manuscript that otherwise contains Italian and French vocal music (including airs by Lully).


Edition: WLSCM, eight pieces (nos. 1–4, 6–9).

Editorial remarks

(1) Incorrect key signature with f-sharps in source; (2) The editorial petite reprise in measures 10–4 is inferred from GB-Lbl I.306.c (Lully’s first edition).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “é” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2, 6–7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 3, [untitled] (a) [Jeunes Cœurs from *Alceste* (1674) LWV 50/31 (a)]

M. 2  Rés. F. 1091:

Current reading reconstructed from *F–Pn* Rés. F. 1701 (Lully’s prototype)

M. 5  rh1  “ut” on top of note
rh2  “si” on top of note
M. 22  lhU2  sharp missing
Dans nos bois
Trios de la Chambre du Roi, 1667

F-Pn Rés. F. 1091, no. 4, p. 18
LWV 35/4

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_F-Pn_: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. F. 1091 (France, post 1715).

Eight Lully arrangements, entered by an unidentified French hand, which might be best described as utilitarian. The handwriting is not calligraphic. The music, which appears to have been entered quickly, is however, highly legible and very playable at sight.

The short Lully keyboard pieces were drawn from two operas: _Cadmus_ (1673) and _Alceste_ (1674). They form a harpsichord section in a manuscript that otherwise contains Italian and French vocal music (including airs by Lully).


Edition: WLSCM, eight pieces (nos. 1–4, 6–9).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3, 7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 4 (p. 18), dans nos bois (G) [“Menuet dans nos bois” from *Trios pour le coucher du roi*, LWV 35/4 (C)]
M. 24 lhU1 dot missing
Entrée du basque (l’air du basque de l’opera du cadmus)

_Cadmus et Hermione, 1673_

_F-Pn Rés. F. 1091, no. 6, p. 19
LWV 49/54

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_F-Pn_: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. F. 1091 (France, post 1715).

Eight Lully arrangements, entered by an unidentified French hand, which might be best described as utilitarian. The handwriting is not calligraphic. The music, which appears to have been entered quickly, is however, highly legible and very playable at sight.

The short Lully keyboard pieces were drawn from two operas: _Cadmus_ (1673) and _Alceste_ (1674). They form a harpsichord section in a manuscript that otherwise contains Italian and French vocal music (including airs by Lully).


Edition: WLSCM, eight pieces (nos. 1–4, 6–9).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “é” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 7, 12, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 6 (p. 19), l’air du basque de l opera du cadmus (G) [Entrée du basque from Cadmus et Hermione (1673) LWV 49/54 (C)]
M. 2 rh3 dot missing
M. 3 lhM1 quarter note
M. 14 rh1 dot removed
M. 17 lhU1 dot missing
M. 21 lhL2 note (d) missing
M. 22 lhU1 dot missing
Amants, aimez vos chaînes (autre)
Cadmus et Hermione, 1673

F-Pn Rés. F. 1091, no. 7, p. 19
LWV 49/56

© David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.90
Source


Eight Lully arrangements, entered by an unidentified French hand, which might be best described as utilitarian. The handwriting is not calligraphic. The music, which appears to have been entered quickly, is however, highly legible and very playable at sight.

The short Lully keyboard pieces were drawn from two operas: *Cadmus* (1673) and *Alceste* (1674). They form a harpsichord section in a manuscript that otherwise contains Italian and French vocal music (including airs by Lully).


Edition: WLSCM, eight pieces (nos. 1–4, 6–9).

Editorial Remarks

Both strains are shortened in this keyboard version. In strain A, Lully’s version (*GB-Lbl* Hirsch II 537) doubles the length, and in strain B, Lully’s version continues for six measures longer by repeating measures 14–20 (the editorial *petite reprise*).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 6, 15, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 7, autre (a) [“Amants, amiez vos chaînes” from *Cadmus et Hermione* (1673) LWV 49/56 (a)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>lhU1</td>
<td>dot missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>lhL1</td>
<td>dot missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>rh2</td>
<td>sharp missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heureux qui peux plaire (heureux qui peux plaire)

_Cadmus et Hermione, 1673_

_F-Pn_ Rés. F. 1091, no. 8, p. 20
_LWV 49/14_

(c) David Chung, 2014

(a) _d": dotted quarter note

(b) dotted quarter note and two sixteenth notes
Source

_F-Pn_: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Rés. F. 1091 (France, post 1715).

Eight Lully arrangements, entered by an unidentified French hand, which might be best described as utilitarian. The handwriting is not calligraphic. The music, which appears to have been entered quickly, is however, highly legible and very playable at sight.

The short Lully keyboard pieces were drawn from two operas: _Cadmus_ (1673) and _Alceste_ (1674). They form a harpsichord section in a manuscript that otherwise contains Italian and French vocal music (including airs by Lully).


Edition: WLSCM, eight pieces (nos. 1–4, 6–9).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3, 7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 8 (p. 20), heureux qui peux plaire (g) [Heureux qui peux plaire from *Cadmus et Hermione* (1673) *LWV 49/14* (g)]

M. 5 lhU1 dot missing

M. 8 rhL1 dotted quarter note

M. 8 rhL2 dot missing

M. 19 *F-Pn* Rés. F. 1091:
Premier Air du basque (L air du basque de L opera desnirb)

Alceste, 1674

F-Pn Rés. F. 1091, no. 9, p. 20
LWV 50/81

© David Chung, 2014

Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014

Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.92
Source


Eight Lully arrangements, entered by an unidentified French hand, which might be best described as utilitarian. The handwriting is not calligraphic. The music, which appears to have been entered quickly, is however, highly legible and very playable at sight.

The short Lully keyboard pieces were drawn from two operas: *Cadmus* (1673) and *Alceste* (1674). They form a harpsichord section in a manuscript that otherwise contains Italian and French vocal music (including airs by Lully).


Edition: WLSCM, eight pieces (nos. 1–4, 6–9).

Performance Notes

The editorial *petite reprise* in mm. 11–5 derives from *GB-Lbl* I.306.c (first edition of Lully’s opera).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “e” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3, 9, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 9 (p. 20), L air du basque de L opera desnirb (g) [Premier Air du basque from *Alceste* (1674) LWV 50/81 (g)]

- M. 4 lhL1 flat missing
- M. 13 rhL3 note missing
- M. 14 lhU2 flat missing
Chaconne (Chacone de Phaëton)

Phaëton, 1683

F-T MS 2682 (Troyes), fols. 64v–67r

LWV 61/40

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*F-T*: Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 2682 (Troyes?, post 1689/90).

Two pieces from Lully by an unidentified French hand.

The Lully pieces, both with vocal texts between staves, appear to be odd entries in this book, which consists primarily of organ pieces from diverse sources.


Editorial Remarks

Text between staves (“Amis, Le verre en main…”) omitted in this edition.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 4, 9–16, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

Fols. 64v–67r, Chacone de Phaëton (G) [Chaconne from Phaëton (1683) LWV 61/40 (G)]

M. 42 rh2 sharp missing
M. 43 lhU2 sharp missing
M. 83 lhU2 b (a second lower)
M. 84 lhU1 b (a second lower)
M. 157 lh1 dot missing
Cœurs accablez (Du mesme)

Amadis, 1684

F-T MS 2682 (Troyes), fol. 67v
LWV 63/58

© David Chung, 2014
Source

F-T: Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 2682 (Troyes?, post 1689/90).

Two pieces from Lully by an unidentified French hand.

The Lully pieces, both with vocal texts between staves, appear to be odd entries in this book, which consists primarily of organ pieces from diverse sources.


Editorial Remarks

Text between staves ("Cœurs accablez de rigueurs inhumaines…") omitted in this edition.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 4, 14–7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

fol. 67v, Du mesme (G) [Cœurs accablez from Amadis (1684) LWV 63/58 (G)]
[No comments]
Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscecm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.95
Source


Seven arrangements entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1712). This is the same hand as that in Babell (see Babell above for details.)

Many pieces in Tenbury (dated 1701) were recopied virtually verbatim into Babell (dated 1702), including six out of seven of the Lully arrangements and the majority of the French contents, although the ordering of pieces in the two manuscripts is unrelated. The main difference lies in the use of different symbols to represent the trill. In Tenbury, the French tremblement sign was apparently anglicized under the guise of the double-stroke. The following list shows the relationship of the Lully arrangements between Tenbury and Babell:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenbury</th>
<th>Babell</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Work of Lully</th>
<th>LWV</th>
<th>key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Air d’Armide</td>
<td>Armide (1686)</td>
<td>71/39</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Ouverture</td>
<td>Flore (1669)</td>
<td>40/1</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Les Lutins</td>
<td>Thésée (1675)</td>
<td>51/53</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Chaconne de Galatée</td>
<td>Acis (1686)</td>
<td>73/32</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Les mariez</td>
<td>Flore (1669)</td>
<td>40/18</td>
<td>B♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Les Espagnols</td>
<td>Bourgeois (1670)</td>
<td>43/27</td>
<td>B♭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Edition: WLSCM, one piece (no. 46). The remaining six virtually duplicate versions already included in Babell.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the
performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 46 (fols. 36v–37r), La Discorde (G) [La Discorde from Proserpine (1680) LWV 58/3 (G)]
M. 7 lhU4 sharp missing
M. 11 lhL2 natural missing

Ouverture (Grotte Versaille Ouverture Grave)

La Grotte de Versailles, 1668

F-Pn Rés. Vma ms. 1071(1) (Vitré), pp.154–5
LWV 39/1

© David Chung, 2014
Source


One overture by Lully, entered by an unidentified French hand (Bédard’s Hand C).

This book, which contains 204 pieces of mostly organ music, provides some evidence for the view that Lullian overtures were played on the organ during the _ancien régime_.


Edition: WLSCM, one piece (Bédard no. 171, pp. 154–55).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In both “6” and “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 8, 10–1, 13–4, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

pp. 154–5, Grotte Versaille Ouverture Grave (g) [Ouverture from La Grotte de Versailles (1668) LWV 39/1 (g)]

- M. 9 lhU3 natural missing
- M. 11 lh5-8 notes reconstructed from F-Pn Rés. F. 532 (prototype of Lully’s original)
- M. 12 time signatures missing
- M. 16 rhL5 flat missing
- M. 35 rhU1 dot missing
- M. 38 lhL1 rest missing
- M. 39 rh1 sharp missing
- M. 41–3 lhL1 dots missing
- M. 45 lhL2 rest missing
- M. 46 lh time signature missing
- rhU3 dot missing
- M. 48 lhL1 sharp missing

lhL2-4

M. 50 “Excellente” (written on empty staves after last measure) removed
La Beauté la plus sévère. Gavotte (La beaute la plus seure)

Atys, 1676

F-Pn Vm7-6307(1), no. 10, pp. 16–7
LWV 53/75

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_F-Pn_: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Vm7-6307(1) (France, post 1687).

Two arrangements entered by two unidentified French hands (Hands B and E). Hand B (no. 10) is more competent and is possibly the teacher of the other hands.

The Lully pieces form part of this miscellaneous collection of viol, vocal and harpsichord music.


Edition: WLSCM, two pieces (nos. 10, 12).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “œ” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 7, 9–10, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 10 (pp. 16–7, Hand B), La beaute la plus seuere (C) [La Beauté la plus sevère (gavotte) from *Atys* (1676) LWV 53/75 (C)]

[No comments]
Trompettes

_Psychoé, 1671_

_F-Pn Vm7-6307(1), no. 12, pp. 22–3
LWV 45/36_
Source

_F-Pn_: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Vm7-6307(1) (France, post 1687).

Two arrangements entered by two unidentified French hands (Hands B and E). Hand B (no. 10) is more competent and is possibly the teacher of the other hands.

The Lully pieces form part of this miscellaneous collection of viol, vocal and harpsichord music.


Edition: WLSCM, two pieces (nos. 10, 12).

Editorial Remarks

This piece is in rondeau form and editorial _reprise_ symbols, indicated by †, have been supplied to clarify the repetition scheme.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 12 (pp. 22–3, Hand E), [untitled] (C) [Trompettes from *Psyché* (1671) LWV 45/36 (C)]
[No comments]
Ouverture (Ouverture de Lopera d'isis)

Isis, 1677

F-Pn Vm7-6307(2), no. 5, pp. 13–5
LWV 54/1

© David Chung, 2014
Source

F-Pn: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Vm7-6307(2) (France, post 1724?).

Seven arrangements entered by one unidentified French hand. Some traces of the arranger’s working method can be detected. Stems of the (right-hand) melody point upwards, not downwards (see pp. 14–5), suggesting that the arranger worked by laying out the outer voices before filling in the other parts. Notes with leger lines between staves sometimes run into each other’s orbit, which would have been avoided by a careful copyist, but is not untypical of an arranger working from scratch.

The Lully arrangements are the only pieces identified in this small collection of twelve pieces. No. 11 is an allemande that is attributed to Lully in Schwerin-619 (no. 48) but its origin cannot be traced.


Editions: Chung 2004, two pieces (nos. 8, 10); WLSCM, five pieces (nos. 5, 6, 7, 9, 11).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.2

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In both “2” and “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 15, 18–9, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 5 (pp. 13–5), Ouverture de Lopera d isis (g) [Ouverture from *Isis* (1677) LWV 54/1 (g)]

- M. 31 rhL3 rest missing
- M. 37 rhL1 rest missing
- M. 40 rhL1 rest missing
- M. 41 rhL1 rest missing
- M. 45 rhL1 rest missing
- M. 58 lhU1–2 rests missing
Premier Air pour les Muses (air du mesme opera)

Isis, 1677

F-Pn Vm7-6307(2), no. 6, pp. 15–6
LWV 54/10

© David Chung, 2014
Source

*F-Pn*: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Vm7-6307(2) (France, post 1724?).

Seven arrangements entered by one unidentified French hand. Some traces of the arranger’s working method can be detected. Stems of the (right-hand) melody point upwards, not downwards (see pp. 14–5), suggesting that the arranger worked by laying out the outer voices before filling in the other parts. Notes with leger lines between staves sometimes run into each other’s orbit, which would have been avoided by a careful copyist, but is not untypical of an arranger working from scratch.

The Lully arrangements are the only pieces identified in this small collection of twelve pieces. No. 11 is an allemande that is attributed to Lully in *Schwerin-619* (no. 48) but its origin cannot be traced.


Editions: Chung 2004, two pieces (nos. 8, 10); WLSCM, five pieces (nos. 5, 6, 7, 9, 11).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3–5, 9–10, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 6 (pp. 15–6), air du mesme opera (g) [Premier Air pour les Muses from *Isis* (1677) LWV 54/10 (g)]

[No comments]
Second Air. Bourrée (bourée)

Isis, 1677

F-Pn Vm7-6307(2), no. 7, pp. 16–7
LWV 54/35

© David Chung, 2014
Source

_F-Pn_: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Vm7-6307(2) (France, post 1724?).

Seven arrangements entered by one unidentified French hand. Some traces of the arranger’s working method can be detected. Stems of the (right-hand) melody point upwards, not downwards (see pp. 14–5), suggesting that the arranger worked by laying out the outer voices before filling in the other parts. Notes with leger lines between staves sometimes run into each other’s orbit, which would have been avoided by a careful copyist, but is not untypical of an arranger working from scratch.

The Lully arrangements are the only pieces identified in this small collection of twelve pieces. No. 11 is an allemande that is attributed to Lully in _Schwerin-619_ (no. 48) but its origin cannot be traced.


Editions: Chung 2004, two pieces (nos. 8, 10); WLSCM, five pieces (nos. 5, 6, 7, 9, 11).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 4–5, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 7 (pp. 16–7), bourée (g) [Second Air (bourrée) from *Isis* (1677) LWV 54/35 (g)]
[No comments]
Suivons l’amour (menuet du mesme opera)

Amadis, 1684

_F-Pn Vm7-6307(2), no. 9, p. 19_
_LWV 63/12_

© David Chung, 2014
Source

F-Pn: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Vm7-6307(2) (France, post 1724?).

Seven arrangements entered by one unidentified French hand. Some traces of the arranger’s working method can be detected. Stems of the (right-hand) melody point upwards, not downwards (see pp. 14–5), suggesting that the arranger worked by laying out the outer voices before filling in the other parts. Notes with leger lines between staves sometimes run into each other’s orbit, which would have been avoided by a careful copyist, but is not untypical of an arranger working from scratch.

The Lully arrangements are the only pieces identified in this small collection of twelve pieces. No. 11 is an allemande that is attributed to Lully in Schwerin-619 (no. 48) but its origin cannot be traced.


Editions: Chung 2004, two pieces (nos. 8, 10); WLSCM, five pieces (nos. 5, 6, 7, 9, 11).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 12, 15, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 9 (p. 19), menuet du mesme opera (G) [Suivons l’amour from *Amadis* (1684) LWV 63/12 (G)]

M. 1 lhM1 dot missing
Allemande (Lallemande)

F-Pn Vm7-6307(2), no. 11, p. 21

Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.103
Source

*F-Pn*: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Vm7-6307(2) (France, post 1724?).

Seven arrangements entered by one unidentified French hand. Some traces of the arranger’s working method can be detected. Stems of the (right-hand) melody point upwards, not downwards (see pp. 14–5), suggesting that the arranger worked by laying out the outer voices before filling in the other parts. Notes with leger lines between staves sometimes run into each other’s orbit, which would have been avoided by a careful copyist, but is not untypical of an arranger working from scratch.

The Lully arrangements are the only pieces identified in this small collection of twelve pieces. No. 11 is an allemande that is attributed to Lully in *Schwerin-619* (no. 48) but its origin cannot be traced.


Editions: Chung 2004, two pieces (nos. 8, 10); WLSCM, five pieces (nos. 5, 6, 7, 9, 11).

Editorial Remarks
This piece is not known to have been derived from Lully’s stage works, and no instrumental version of this piece is known to exist.

Performance Notes
In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 11 (p. 21), Lallemand (D) [Allemande (n.d.) (D)]
[No comments]
Ouverture (Ouverture de Psyché)

Pysché, 1671

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 57, p. 40
LWV 45/1

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury*.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suittes,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suittes de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into *Babell*. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in *Babell* also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Editorial Remarks

The last measure is supplied by the Editor. The player should feel free to substitute a suitable ending for this piece.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways,
by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.²

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In both “2” and “6/4” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 17–8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 57 (p. 40), Ouverture de Psyché (C) [Ouverture from Psyché (1671) LWV 45/1 (C)]
M. 42 measure missing

Chaconne (Chaconne de Galatée)
*Acis et Galatée, 1686*

*GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 97, p. 70*
LWV 73/32

---

Web Library of Seventeenth-Century Music (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.105
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suittes,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suites de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 9, 17–20, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 97 (p. 70), Chaconne de Galatée (D) [Chaconne from *Acis et Galatée* (1686) LWV 73/32 (D)]
M. 12   lhU1    a second lower: g’

---

Le Printemps (Air pr Le Printemps)

Phaéton, 1683

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 120, p. 87
LWV 61/57

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury.*

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suittes,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suittes de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into *Babell.* Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in *Babell* also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Editorial Remarks

The second strain is repeated thrice. Editorial repeat barlines and measure 31 have been supplied to clarify the repetition scheme.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces.
for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1–2, 6–8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 120 (p. 87), Air pr Le Printemps (g) [Le Printemps from Phaéton (1683) LWV 61/57 (g)]
M. 15 rhL1 flat missing
M. 26 rhL1 g’
   lhU2 d
M. 31 measure missing

Preparons nous (Preparons nous pour la fête Nouvelle)

Le Temple de la Paix, 1685

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 123, pp. 90–1
LWV 69/2

© David Chung, 2014

Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury*.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suittes,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suittes de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into *Babell*. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in *Babell* also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Editorial Remarks

This piece ends on m. 14, as indicated by “fin”, and the player should substitute a suitable ending.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways,
by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.\(^1\) The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.\(^2\)

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

---

### Critical Notes

No. 123 (pp. 90–1), Preparons nous pour la féste Nouvelle (g) [“Preparons nous” from Le Temple de la Paix (1685) LWV 69/2 (g)]

- M. 18 rhL2 natural missing
- M. 20 rhL2 natural missing
- M. 22 rhL2 natural missing

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Hand</th>
<th>Note Type</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. 23</td>
<td>lhU2</td>
<td>note missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. 26</td>
<td>lhU2</td>
<td>note missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. 46</td>
<td>rhL1</td>
<td>natural missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. 51</td>
<td>rhL2</td>
<td>natural missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. 53</td>
<td>rhL2</td>
<td>natural missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. 57</td>
<td>lhU2</td>
<td>note missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Les Sourdines (Air d’Armide. Sourdines | tres doux)

Armide, 1686

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 124, p. 91
LWV 71/39

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury*.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suittes de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into *Babell*. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in *Babell* also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Editorial Remarks

The music, in “6/4”, is incorrectly barred in “3” time throughout. In this edition, superfluous barlines from *Babell* are displayed as dotted lines.

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation.
modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “6/4” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 9, 14, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 124 (p. 91), Air d’Armide | Sourdines | tres doux (g) [Les Sourdines from Armide (1686) LWV 71/39 (g)]
M. 8 lhU4 tie missing
M. 15 rh2–3 notes missing
M. 31 rhL2 a second lower: b-flat’

Entrée d’Apollon

*Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681*

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 129, p. 95
LWV 59/58

Reprise
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suittes,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suittes de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French

repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and others.\(^2\)

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tremblement</th>
<th>Pincé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Tremblement Example" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Pincé Example" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port de voix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Port de voix Example" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 7, 9, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 129 (p. 95), Entrée d’Apollon (g) [Entrée d’Apollon from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1681) LWV 59/58 (g)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>lhL2</th>
<th>lhM1</th>
<th>lhL1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rest missing</td>
<td>natural missing</td>
<td>rest missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chaconne (Les zephirs Echo)

Atys, 1676

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 132, p. 97
LWV 53/47

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury*.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suites de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1–2, 5–6, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 132 (p. 97), Les zephirs | Echo (g) [Entrée des zéphirs, from Atys (1676) LWV 53/47 (g)]

- M. 11 lhL1–2 rests missing
- M. 15 lhL1–2 rests missing
- M. 26 lhU2 a third lower: f
- M. 37 lhU1 rest missing

---

Gavotte (Gavotte d’Orithie)

*Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681*

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 133, p. 98

LWV 59/26

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury*.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suittes de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into *Babell*. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in *Babell* also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1–4, 6, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 133 (p. 98), Gavotte d’Orithie (g) [Gavotte from Le Triomphe de l’Amour (1681) LWV 59/26 (g)] [No comments]

---

Entrée d’Endimion

*Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681*

*GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 134, p. 98*

LWV 59/35

© David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.112
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suittes,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suites de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 3, 10, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 134 (p. 98), Entrée d’Endimion (g) [Entrée d’Endimion from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1681) LWV 59/35 (g)]

M. 25 rhU1 dot missing

---

Premier Air pour la Jeunesse (Air pour la Jeunesse)

Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 135, pp. 98–9
LWV 59/69

© David Chung, 2014
Keyboard Arrangements of Music by Jean-Baptiste Lully, ed. David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury*.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suites de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into *Babell*. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in *Babell* also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 17–8, 30, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 135 (pp. 98–9), Air pour la Jeunesse (g) [Premier Air pour la Jeunesse from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1681) LWV 59/69 (g)]
[No comments]

---

Deuxième Air en rondeau (2me Air. Rondeau)
Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 136, p. 99
LWV 59/71

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suites de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 136 (p. 99), 2me Air | Rondeau (g) [Deuxième Air en rondeau from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1681) LWV 59/71 (g)]

M. 6  rhU1 dot missing  
     lhU1 dot missing  
M. 20 rhU1 dot missing  
     lhU1 dot missing  
M. 30 rhU1 dot missing  
     rhL1 rest missing  
     lhU1 dot missing

Passacaille (Passacaille D’Armide)

Armide, 1686

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 138, pp. 100–2
LWV 71/61

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury*.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suittes de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into *Babell*. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in *Babell* also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 4, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 138 (p. 100–2), Passacaille D’Armide (g) [Passacaille from *Armide* (1686) LWV 71/61 (g)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>LH</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>lhU2</td>
<td></td>
<td>rest missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>lhM2</td>
<td></td>
<td>tie missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>lhU3</td>
<td></td>
<td>e’-flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>rhL1</td>
<td></td>
<td>rest missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>rhL1</td>
<td></td>
<td>rest missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>rhL1</td>
<td></td>
<td>rest missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>rhU1</td>
<td></td>
<td>dot missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Ouverture (Ouverture du Ballet de Flore)
Ballet de Flore, 1669

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 143, pp. 104–5
LWV 40/1

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suittes de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 143 (pp. 104–5), Ouverture du Ballet de Flore (d) [Ouverture from *Ballet de Flore* (1669) LWV 40/1 (d)]

- M. 3 rh4 natural missing
- M. 20 lhL2 rest missing
- M. 24 lhL1 sharp missing
- M. 32 measure missing

---

Les Ombres (Allemande)
Ballet de la Naissance des Venus, 1665

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 154, p. 112
LWV 27/45

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suites de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSMC, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 154 (p. 112), Allemande (a) [Les Ombres from Ballet de la Naissance de Venus (1665) LWV 27/45 (g)]
M. 33  rhL1–2  rests missing

---

Ouverture (Ouverture de Roland)

Roland, 1685

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 182, pp. 134–5
LWV 65/1

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suittes de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689. The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In both “2” and “6/4” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2, 4, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 182 (pp. 134–5), Ouverture de Roland (d) [Ouverture from *Roland* (1685) LWV 65/1(d)]

- M. 21 lhM2 dot missing
- M. 22 lhM2 dot missing
- M. 26 lhU2 rest missing
- M. 33 lhL7 *b-flat* ?
- M. 34 rhU2 a second higher: *f’*
- M. 36 lhU2 dot missing
- M. 65 rhU2– notes supplied from m. 24

---

Ouverture (Ouverture de Bellerophon)

Bellerophon, 1679

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 199, p. 147
LWV 57/1

© David Chung, 2014

WEB LIBRARY OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC (www.sscm-wlscm.org)
Monuments of Seventeenth-Century Music Vol. 1.119
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suites de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

The Editor considers that eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 3–4, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 199 (p. 147), Ouverture de Bellerophon (C) [Ouverture from *Bellerophon* (1679) LWV 57/1 (C)]

M. 41 rhU2-5 notes supplied from m. 15

---

Chaconne (Chaconne D’Amadis)
Amadis, 1684

GB-Lbl MS Add. 39569, no. 209, pp. 154–8
LWV 63/67

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suittes,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suittes de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In both “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 4, 7–9, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 209 (pp. 154–8), Chaconne d’Amadis (C) [Chaconne from *Amadis* (1684) LWV 63/67 (C)]

M. 32  lhU2  note missing

lhL2  rest missing

---

La Marche (La marche des Insulaires)

Roland, 1685

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 217, pp. 164–5
LWV 65/21

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suittes,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suittes de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 5, 11–2, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 217 (pp. 164–5), La marche des Insulaires (D) [La Marche from *Roland* (1685) LWV 65/21 (D)]

M. 6 lh2 Source:
M. 10 lhM2 dot missing
M. 17 lh1, 3 c’-natural

---

Second Air
Roland, 1685

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 218, p. 165
LWV 65/24

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suites de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 218 (p. 165), Second Air (D) [Second Air from *Roland* (1685) LWV 65/24 (D)]

1. lhL1 note supplied from m. 10 (after c-sharp’)

---

Ouverture (Ouverture du Triomphe de L’Amour)

Le Triomphe de l’Amour, 1681

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 231, pp. 172–3

LWV 59/1

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury*.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suites de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into *Babell*. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in *Babell* also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In "2" time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1–5, 7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 231 (pp. 172–3), Ouverture du Triomphe de L’Amour (F) [Ouverture from *Le Triomphe de l’Amour* (1681) LWV 59/1 (F)]

- M. 2 lhU1 tie removed
- M. 3 lhU1 a second higher: f
- M. 16 “Reprise” transferred from middle of m. 15
- M. 58 rhU2-4 notes missing

---

Prelude (Prelude de Thésée)

Thésée, 1675

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 233, p. 174
LWV 51/50

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suites de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSMC, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “œ” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1–9, 11–3, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 233 (p. 174), Prelude de Thesée (F) [Prelude from Thésée (1675) LWV 51/50 (F)]

[No comments]
Les Démons (Premier air pour Les Lutins)

*Thésée, 1675*

`GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 234, pp. 174–5
LWV 51/53`

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury*.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suittes,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suittes de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into *Babell*. Each key group is carefully designated “suitte” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in *Babell* also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

The Editor considers that the convention of inequality does not apply to this piece. Further advice on performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 234 (pp. 174–5), Premier air pour Les Lutins (F) [Les Démons from *Thésée* (1675) LWV 51/53 (F)] [No comments]

---

Second Air
*Thésée, 1675*

*GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 235, p. 175*

LWV 51/55

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suittes de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 2–3, 5, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 235 (p. 175), Second Air (F) [Seond Air from *Thésée* (1675) LWV 51/55 (F)]
[No comments]

---

Chaconne (Chaconne Italienne pr. les Triuelins et les scaramouches)

*Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, 1670

*GB-Lbl* MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 258, p. 189

LWV 43/36

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suittes de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1, 6–8, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

Critical Notes

No. 258 (p. 189), Chaconne Italienne pr les Triuelins et les scaramouches (G) [Chaconne from Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme (1670) LWV 43/36 (G)]
M. 30 lhU2 a second lower: d

---

Le Marié et la mariée (Les mariez)
*Ballet de Flore, 1669*

*GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 268, p. 198*

LWV 40/18

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury*.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suites de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into *Babell*. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in *Babell* also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.1 The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

---

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “2” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 1–5, 7, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 268 (p. 198), *Les Mariez* [Le Marié et la mariée from *Ballet de Flore* (1669) LWV 40/18 (B.3)]

M. 10 lhU1 rest missing
M. 13 lhU1 natural missing

---

Les Espagnols

Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme, 1670

GB-Lbl MS. Add. 39569 (Babell), no. 269, p. 198

LWV 43/27

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in *Tenbury*.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suites,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s *Six Suites de clavessin* (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into *Babell*. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in *Babell* also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLSCM, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 10, 14, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of notes inégales and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

**Critical Notes**

No. 269 (p. 198), Les Espagnols (B3) [Les Espagnols from *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* (1670) LWV 43/27 (B3)]

[No comments]

---

Passacaille (Passacaille D’Achile)

*Achille et Polixène, 1687*

*GB-Lbl MS Add. 39569, no. 280, pp. 244–6

LWV 74/9

© David Chung, 2014
Source


Thirty-three Lully pieces entered by Charles Babel (ca. 1634–1716) whose hand is neat and consistent. Same hand as that in Tenbury.

The Lully pieces are sequenced into Babel’s compiled “suittes,” a term evidently taken from Dieupart’s Six Suites de clavessin (Amsterdam, 1701), from which twenty-three pieces were copied into Babell. Each key group is carefully designated “suite” with a number. Thirteen (out of 29) of the suites contain Lully arrangements, and seven use the overture as an opening movement (nos. 7, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, and 27). On the basis of concordances, it appears that many of the arrangements in Babell also circulated in central Parisian sources. Gustafson brings up the possibility that Babel, rather than making his own arrangements, could have assembled his Lully arrangements from sources that also contain the remainder of his Parisian repertory.


Edition: Harris 2009, one piece (no. 131); Chung 2004, six pieces (nos. 128, 130, 131, 152, 243, 263); WLS, twenty-seven pieces (nos. 57, 97, 120, 123–4, 129, 132–6, 138, 143, 154, 182, 199, 209, 217–8, 231, 233–5, 258, 268–9, 280).

Performance Notes

In the seventeenth century, the notation is under-prescriptive by modern standard and some elements of the performance may only be partially indicated or not indicated at all. Generally speaking, the performer has the discretion to supply in performance much that is not indicated in the source, such as by adding ornaments as well as melodic and rhythmic fillers, by spreading chords in a variety of ways, by embellishing the cadences, and sometimes even by enriching the texture with points of imitation. The modern performer can take lessons from D’Anglebert, who re-edited a selection of his autograph pieces for publication in 1689.¹ The performance attitude and elusive nature of the seventeenth-century French repertory has been exhaustively discussed by David Fuller, Ronald Broude, Bruce Gustafson, and

The player can refer to the table below for guidance on the interpretation of ornament symbols commonly found in manuscript sources.

In “3” time, eighth notes in conjunct motion (mm. 85–92, 98–100, etc.) should be rendered long and short successively as if notated in dotted values. Further advice on the rhythmic convention of *notes inégales* and other performance practice issues can be found in the “Introduction”.

### Critical Notes

No. 280 (pp. 244–6), Passacaille d’Achile (A) [Passacaille from *Achille et Polixène* (1687) LWV 74/9 (A)]

[No comments]