



Research Article

UDC 78.034.7:781.68

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26176/mosconsv.2023.52.1.04>

## On Dating de Saint Lambert's Treatises on Harpsichord Playing

Alexei A. Panov<sup>1</sup>

Ivan V. Rosanoff<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Saint Petersburg State University,  
7–9 Universitetskaya Emb., St. Petersburg 199034, Russia

<sup>2</sup> Rimsky-Korsakov Saint Petersburg State Conservatory,  
3 Teatralnaya Sq., St. Petersburg 190000, Russia

<sup>1</sup> a.panov@spbu.ru ✉, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4053-4512>

<sup>2</sup> i.rozanov@spbu.ru ✉, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6768-6831>

**Abstract:** In the newly revealed complete *Dictionnaire des termes* published in 1701 by Sébastien de Brossard there is a list of more than 60 “*Auteurs qui ont écrit en François*”, whose works he has personally “seen, read, and examined”. De Saint Lambert is named among them. This definitely proves that one of de Saint Lambert's works had been published before 1701. This recently unveiled evidence and the diachronic examination of practically all possibly available historic and contemporary sources, showed that in some points the current view should be changed. In harpsichord teaching and performance, in thorough-bass accompaniment the treatises of de Saint Lambert, F. Couperin and J.-P. Rameau are the basic instruction editions. Only de Saint Lambert and his two treatises bring forth many bio-bibliographic questions, i.e. *Les principes du clavecin* (the dates of publication have been proved to be 1697 and 1702), *Nouveau traité de l'accompagnement* is Paris 1707; and the publication of the *Traité de l'accompagnement* (1680) is under question whether it was a “myth” or it indeed existed according to the historical evidence.

**Keywords:** Sébastien de Brossard, de Saint Lambert, harpsichord, accompaniment, French baroque music, French harpsichord music, French baroque treatises on music, musical bibliography, musical lexicography

**Acknowledgements:** Our thanks to Dr. M. N. Karski (Paris 8 Université Vincennes Saint-Denis), to Prof. S. Béchy, to Sr. archivist R. Vettori (Academia Filarmonica di Bologna), Sr. D. Ravetti, Sr. C. Targa and Sr. R. Marchi (Museo internazionale e biblioteca della musica di Bologna), who kindly helped in obtaining copies of the historical documents.

**For citation:** Panov, Alexei A., and Ivan V. Rosanoff. 2023. “On Dating de Saint Lambert's Treatises on Harpsichord Playing.” *Nauchnyy vestnik Moskovskoy konservatorii / Journal of Moscow Conservatory* 14, no. 1 (March): 104–33. <https://doi.org/10.26176/mosconsv.2023.52.1.04>.

Научная статья

## К вопросу о времени первых публикаций клавесинных трактатов де Сен Ламбера

Алексей Анатольевич Панов<sup>1</sup>

Иван Васильевич Розанов<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Университетская наб., 7–9,  
Санкт-Петербург 199034, Российская Федерация

<sup>2</sup> Санкт-Петербургская государственная консерватория имени Н. А. Римского-Корсакова,  
Театральная площадь, 3, Санкт-Петербург 190000, Российская Федерация

<sup>1</sup> a.panov@spbu.ru ✉, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4053-4512>

<sup>2</sup> i.rosanov@spbu.ru ✉, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6768-6831>

**Аннотация:** В заключительном разделе введенного недавно в научный оборот полного издания музыкального словаря Себастьяна де Броссара 1701 года содержится список из 60 «авторов, которые писали на французском языке» и труды которых де Броссар лично «смотрел, читал и анализировал». В числе этих авторов упоминается де Сен Ламбер — музыкант эпохи барокко, теоретические труды которого, наряду с трактатами Ф. Куперена и Ж. Ф. Рамо, содержат важнейшие сведения о французском клавесинном искусстве эпохи. Отсюда следует, что один, либо оба клавесинных трактата де Сен Ламбера были опубликованы ранее 1701 года. Данное свидетельство, а также результаты исследования в диахронической последовательности прямых и косвенных указаний из исторических источников убеждают в том, что (1) хорошо известное издание знаменитого трактата де Сен Ламбера «Основы клавесина» 1702 года не является первым, первое же издание было выполнено в 1697 году; (2) тогда как трактат по аккомпанементу, известный по изданию 1707 года, впервые увидел свет в 1680 году, и последнее обстоятельство вовсе не является «мифом» музыкальных библиографов XIX века, как ранее было принято считать в науке.

**Ключевые слова:** Себастьян де Броссар, де Сен Ламбер, клавесин, аккомпанемент, французское музыкальное искусство барокко, трактаты о музыке французского барокко, французская музыка для клавесина, музыкальное источниковедение, музыкальная библиография, музыкальная лексикография

**Благодарности:** Авторы благодарят за помощь в получении копий исторических документов и материалов доктора М. Н. Карски (университет Париж 8), профессора Стефана Беши и архивариуса Р. Веттори (Болонская филармоническая академия), Д. Раветти, С. С. Тарга и С. Р. Марчи (Международный музей и музыкальная библиотека Болоньи).

**Для цитирования:** *Panov A., Rosanoff I. On Dating de Saint Lambert's Treatises on Harpsichord Playing // Научный вестник Московской консерватории. Том 14. Выпуск 1 (март 2023). С. 104–133. <https://doi.org/10.26176/mosconsv.2023.52.1.04>.*

Most of today's professional musicians, especially harpsichordists and organists, are familiar with the name of Saint Lambert (or, to be exact, Monsieur de Saint Lambert<sup>1</sup>) and have studied one of his treatises<sup>2</sup>:

1) "LES PRINCIPES DU CLAVECIN[.] Contenant une Explication exacte de tout ce qui concerne la Tablature & le Clavier. Avec des Remarques necessaires pour l'intelligence de plusieurs difficultées de la Musique. Le tout divisé par Chapitres selon l'ordre des matieres. Par Monsieur de SAINT LAMBERT. A PARIS, Chez CHRISTOPHE BALLARD, seul Imprimeur du Roy pour la Musique, ruë S. Jean de Beauvais, au Mont-Parnasse. M.DCCII. Avec Privilege de Sa Majesté." [in-4 obl., 68 p.].

2) "NOUVEAU TRAITÉ DE L'ACCOMPAGNEMENT DU CLAVECIN, DE L'ORGUE, ET DES AUTRES INSTRUMENTS. Par Monsieur DE SAINT LAMBERT. A PARIS, Chez CHRISTOPHE BALLARD, seul Imprimeur du Roy pour la Musique, ruë Saint Jean de Beauvais, au Mont-Parnasse. M.DCCVII. Avec Privilege du Roy." [in-8, 64 p.].

Saint Lambert, a harpsichord teacher, who quite possibly was also an accomplished thorough-bass performer, and certainly a learned scholar, at times is referred to with the Christian name Michel, which has been proven to be incorrect. Unfortunately, this usage has been continued by some recent publications as, for example, an article by Michele Cabrini [13, 31],<sup>3</sup> who curiously refers to J. S. Powell's translation of Saint Lambert's treatise when doing so. Powell clearly states: "indeed, even his first name and dates remain a mystery," and that "there exists no evidence proving Michel to be his first name" [50, 10–11].

Scholars of the last fifty years have directed considerable efforts to uncovering who this mysterious musician was and to the publication date of his treatises, but the historical facts remain ambiguous, with much contradictory information still circulating, beginning in the late eighteenth century up to the present day. While those issues are of great interest, our article centers on a detailed study of the historiographic evidence of Saint Lambert's written work. His treatises are of major importance to our understanding of the traditions and practices in harpsichord performance and accompaniment of the end of the seventeenth to the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, many of which are applicable to the wider field of musical performance. The treatise on harpsichord performance was the first ever published in France, and can give us insight into the pedagogic, aesthetic, and musicological ideas reigning at the

<sup>1</sup> Since there does not exist any biographic evidence concerning the name of this French musician, we shall write it the way it was engraved on the title pages of his treatises, namely: *de Saint Lambert*, i.e. without the commonly used hyphenated version "Saint-Lambert", which appeared later. As a rare exception it is found in the translation of de Saint Lambert's treatise on accompaniment by John S. Powell, who adequately writes "de Saint Lambert" [49].

<sup>2</sup> In the following, bibliographic evidence of early documents related to the treatises and texts is given as precisely as possible. We will show below that subtle details can be of great importance.

<sup>3</sup> Earlier Powell also mentions: "Yet Saint Lambert's spurious first name still appears on the modern title-page of the reprint of the *Nouveau traité de l'accompagnement* (Geneve: Minkoff, 1974), as in the *National Union Catalogue*" [50, XVII].

time, along with related principles (e.g., tempo, articulation, ornamentation, rhythm, etc.) that pertained to musical performance and the early eighteenth century. A full comparative re-evaluation, however, will only be possible once the early treatise on harpsichord of 1697 will be found.

Thus, while the question of the first name seems largely solved, the question of the publication dates of the two treatises remain to be answered. For editions of the treatise on accompaniment we variously find the dates 1680, 1690, and 1707 listed, and the years 1697 and 1702 are given for the treatise on harpsichord playing. It is widely understood that this question has been successfully and convincingly dealt with, and the most decisive arguments, those forwarded by Frank Arnold in the *Appendix to Chapter I* (“III. SAINT-LAMBERT’S MYTHICAL TRAITÉ OF 1680”), seem to prove it. Concerning the treatise on accompaniment, Arnold stated in DATE:

“Saint-Lambert’s preface to the *Nouveau Traité &c.* (Paris, Ballard, 1707), of which the *Bibliothèque nationale* at Paris possesses two copies, contains the following reference to his earlier work, *Les principes du clavecin* (Paris, Ballard, 1702): “Ayant donné cy devant au public un ouvrage sous le titre des principes du clavecin, dans lequel je ne parle que de ce qui regarde les pièces, j’ai cru que le titre ne seroit point assez rempli, *si je n’ajoutois un traité de l’accompagnement*”<sup>4</sup> (the italics are added [by Arnold]). These latter words are not consistent with the assumption that Saint-Lambert had already (in 1680, or at any other time) published a *Traité de l’accompagnement*, an assumption which, in the first instance, rests solely on the authority of Fétis” [4, vol. 2, 900].

And about Saint Lambert’s *Principes*, Arnold says that “the date assigned by the latter [i.e. Fétis] to the *Principes du clavecin* is 1697 [is] a palpable error, for the fact that the above-mentioned edition of 1702 was preceded by no earlier one is irrefragably established by Saint-Lambert’s own statement in the preface, to the effect that ‘l’auteur corrigera sur les avis reçus ... si on *en fait une seconde édition*’ (italics added [by Arnold]).” In Saint Lambert’s treatise, the full sentence reads: “I would be extremely happy to defer to their [his readers] wisdom and to correct my work [the *Principes*] on the basis of their opinions if a second edition should be made.”<sup>5</sup> Arnold deduces from these arguments that “it will, then, be seen from the above that the *Traité* of 1680 is a myth, pure and simple, and that, in the *Principes* (1702) and the *Nouveau Traité* (1707), we have two closely related works.” [4, vol. 2, 901]. In 1978, Arnold’s argument was furthered by James Frederick Burchill [11, 19], and in 1984, Rebecca Harris-Warrick concluded that “the dates 1702 and 1707 should finally be recognized as the genuine publication dates of the two works” [28, IX]. In 1991 John S. Powell, basing his conclusion on the same material from Saint Lambert, argued that the claim of an earlier publication in 1697 of Saint Lambert’s *Principes* “is clearly disproven by the 1702 Preface to *Les Principes du clavecin*, where Saint Lambert offers to correct

<sup>4</sup> The translation reads: “Having previously given the Public a Work entitled *Principles of the Harpsichord* in which I discuss only that which concerns Pieces [i.e., solo harpsichord compositions], I have felt that the title would not be adequate unless I were to add a *Treatise on Accompaniment*” (tr. by Powell [49, 2]; the text in square brackets belongs to Powell).

<sup>5</sup> Quoted from: [27, 4], inserts in square brackets are ours.

any errors in *Les Principes* ‘should a second edition be made’ and that the 1702 and 1707 publications are both first editions.” We will return to these statements and examine the arguments supporting them.

There would be no need to concentrate our attention on the enigmatic personage of Saint Lambert and the publication date of his treatises were it not that the name “de Saint Lambert” can be found in Sébastien de Brossard’s 1701 *Dictionnaire des Termes* under the heading “Quatrième classe auteurs, qui ont écrit en François” (Fourth class [set] of authors, who wrote in French)<sup>6</sup> [10, 352, col. 2]. It should be noted that Brossard claimed that he only included authors in his *Dictionnaire* whose works he had personally “seen, read, & examined (j’ay vûs, lûs & examinez moy-même)” [10, 346].<sup>7</sup> Thus, this testimony invalidates all other available facts, and suggests that Brossard, the author of the first complete French music dictionary, had indeed “seen, read, and examined” one or probably both treatises by Saint Lambert before 1701. The years 1702 and 1707, widely recognized as “genuine publication dates of the two works,” are thus in fact not the first, especially of Saint Lambert’s *Principes*. Brossard was an outstanding bibliographer and scholar and would likely only mention Saint Lambert in his *Dictionnaire* if he was not well acquainted with his work and if it had not been published, just as was the case with sixty-two other French authors, including M. L’Afflard, T. Arbeau, B. de Bacilly, C. Blockland de Montfort, L. Bourgeois, É. Loulié, Ch. Masson, C.-F. Menestrier, M. Mersenne, and G.-G. Nivers.

The fact that we have this source available to us now led us to attempt a comprehensive and chronologically organized study of all known as well as many less known sources to trace Saint Lambert’s treatises to publication dated before 1702, or at least some information that could support arguments for an earlier publication. We also sought to point up the many instances where the bibliographic data given or the treatment of sources in contemporary scholarly publication proves erroneous.

We will address here the titles of de Saint Lambert’s treatises, the year of publication (if given in the original source), the layout size of the edition, the number of pages, the place of publication, the publishing house, as well as other publication characteristics. Before turning to these characteristics, however, it should be noted that in RISM [55, 747], the author of both treatises is listed as “Saint-Lambert (Michel de)” (our underlining), though no first name is found in any of the original sources of his time, and the hyphen in the last name is arbitrarily added. The title of the treatise on accompaniment reads: “Nouveau traité de l’accompagnement du clavecin, de l’orgue, et des autres instruments. Par Monsieur de Saint-Lambert. Paris, Christophe Ballard, 1707. In-8 obl., 64 p.” According to RISM, the Amsterdam edition was published in “[c1710] In-8” by Estienne Roger and contains 134 pages.

Four parameters should be noted for the 1707 edition: (1) the title begins with the word “Nouveau”; (2) the print layout is “In-8 obl.”; (3) the place of publication is Paris; and (4), the work consists of 64 oblong pages. These specifications differ in the historical materials cited below.


For *Les Principes du Clavecin*, the bibliographic data listed in RISM is fully in accordance with the original titles given above, apart from the inclusion in RISM of the first

<sup>6</sup> See: [48, 417–30; 46, 28–44; 47, 201].

<sup>7</sup> De Brossard’s italics; our underlining.

name: “Excepting the name of the author “Michel” the bibliographic evidence is fully in accordance with the original titles given above.”

The earliest known testimony we have on Saint Lambert is preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris under the indices “F-Pn, fonds française, n. a. 6355” [42], and is part of a collection of manuscript notes and *extraits* left by the musician and theorist Etienne Loulié (1654–1702).<sup>8</sup> The collection includes rare and important evidence, namely a page (page 124) from Saint Lambert’s *Principes* on which Loulié noted in the upper part: “Extrait du Livre de M<sup>r</sup>. de S<sup>t</sup>. Lambert.” Unfortunately, no date is given by Loulié and bibliographers in the Bibliothèque nationale are not able to provide any definite information on this point. Harris-Warrick briefly touches upon this note in the introduction to her translation of Saint Lambert’s treatise, coming to the conclusion that Loulié “excerpted” from the *Principes* [28, X]. A closer examination of the manuscript shows however that in some places, Loulié did indeed make excerpts, whereas in others he gave the material his own rendering and even added his thesis-like formulations (see comparative text analysis in Figure 1). He also made changes in the original in certain places. Finally, we suggest that he might have used another edition of Saint Lambert’s work, as contents of his “excerpts” differ in some places from the accepted edition of 1702.



**Figure 1.** E. Loulié: excerpt from de Saint Lambert’s *Principes du Clavecin*:

“By staff one understands the five parallel lines [fit] in such a manner on which the notes are placed and named [?] as a tone [sic?]. When this staff is repeated six times on one page, the paper which contains them is called six-staff paper...”. (*Bibliothèque nationale de France* under the library number F-Pn, fonds française, n. a. 6355, p. 124)

<sup>8</sup> The *Catalogue des Livres de Musique, et autres qui vendent chez Christophe Ballard* of 1704 [15] gives the whole text of the title of the *Principes*. It has some minor divergences: 1) the first article “Les” is omitted, 2) “de Clavecin” replaces “du Clavecin”, and 3) “difficultéez” replaces “difficultées”, and no date is given. In the catalogue of D. J. Galloys [6, no paging, where under no. 2628 (the numbers of items in this part “In-quarto” are mixed up)] we read: “Les Principes du Clavessin, par M. de S. Lambert. Paris, 1702”.

On appelle Portée les cinq lignes parallèles qui forment les degrés des Notes, ce que nous avons nommé au commencement l'Echelle de la Musique. Lorsque ces cinq lignes sont répétées six fois dans une page, le papier qui les contient se nomme Papier à six portées.


Figure 2. De Saint Lambert: *Les Principes du Clavecin* [58, 28]:

"By staff is meant the five parallel lines which frame the pitches of the notes and which we called the *L'Echelle* of music at the beginning of this book [ch. I, p. 9]. When these five lines are repeated six times on one page, the paper which contains them is called six-staff paper" [27, 49].

The comparison of the excerpts given in Figures 1 and 2 shows that the texts are different. The most important difference (while preserving the general meaning) is the introduction of the concept of "*l'Echelle de la Musique*" in Saint Lambert's treatise of 1702. This suggests two options: Loulié made an abridged version of Saint Lambert's text, or that the version he used differed from the edition of 1702. Since on each page Loulié specified the material as "Extraits de Livre de M<sup>r</sup>. de S<sup>t</sup>. Lambert," we can assume that he copied the text word by word from a different edition.

Another example is found in the part where Loulié copied from the chapter on ornament. Writing on the performance of trills, for example, Saint Lambert refers to Jean-Henry d'Anglebert's table "Marques des Agréments" in the first book of *Pièces de clavecin* [3]. The ornament listed by both Saint Lambert and d'Anglebert as "Cadence" is titled in Loulié's manuscript copy "Tremblement, Cadence". This means that Loulié did not use Saint Lambert's treatise of 1702, in which, when considering d'Anglebert's ornaments, the entry "Cadence" appears. It might suggest that Loulié had another source. It should be noted that in his own explanations of performing the trill, Saint Lambert uses the term *Tremblement*. In the source from which Loulié copied the example, on the contrary, a double name was proposed: "Tremblement[,] Cadence" (see Figure 3: "Manière d'exprimer ces divers Tremblemens").

(a) Loulié, MS, s.a.,<sup>9</sup> copy from the original



(b) J.-H. d'Anglebert (1689) [3]



(c) De Saint Lambert (1702) [58, 47]



Figure 3. É. Loulié: excerpt from de Saint Lambert's *Principes du Clavecin*, with similar examples of d'Anglebert and Saint Lambert proper.

<sup>9</sup> *Bibliothèque nationale de France* under the library number F-Pn, fonds française, n. a. 6355, p. 125.

There are more instances where Loulié's text differs from the original and they should be explored more widely. But our main purpose here is to show that even a brief examination can give rise to the question whether Loulié, who died 16 July 1702, could actually work with Saint Lambert's treatise just published in 1702, or whether he had an earlier version available. He clearly found it instructive to include references to d'Anglebert's table.

The other question is if Loulié, in the year of his death, even had access to a copy of the 1702 edition of Saint Lambert's treatise, could it be possible that he actually worked with the treatise and had made *ms* copies? Information on the exact month of the 1702 publication could not be determined at this point, and it remains largely hypothetical if mention in a source may have aroused Loulié's interest, leading him to obtain a copy, or at least pages from it. It is logical to assume that he used an earlier source. But if we add to this the fact that there is direct reference to de Saint Lambert in de Brossard's 1701 dictionary, we come closer to turning hypothesis into a statement.

The first review of both of Saint Lambert's treatises was published in 1708 [43, 1257–61]. Devoted to the “*Nouveau Traité de l'accompagnement du Clavecin & des autres Instrumens par Mr. de Saint Lambert*”, the review contains much valuable information. Three issues require our particular attention. Firstly, no publication date or print layout is indicated, while the publisher's data are given in full detail: “A Paris chez Christophle [sic] Ballarr [sic], seul Imprimeur du Roi pour la Musique, ruë Saint Jean de Beauvais, au Mont-Parnasse.” Since the review was published in July 1708, it is most likely that it refers to the 1707 edition. Secondly, the title deviates in some minor details from the title cited earlier. Of main interest, however, is a comment by the anonymous author who cites Saint Lambert's words and states that the author of this treatise had earlier published a work titled *Les principes du Clavecin*. This statement suggests, as Arnold also states, that the *Principles of Harpsichord Playing* was published before the *Nouveau Traité de l'accompagnement du Clavecin*. But is the work in question related to the “*Traité de l'Accompagnement du Clavecin*” (emphasis added) of 1680 mentioned by Johann Nikolaus Forkel [23, 352] and Johann Georg Sulzer [64, 360] in 1792, but not the *Nouveau Traité*? Thirdly, the review includes an abstract of the *Nouveau Traité de l'accompagnement du Clavecin & des autres Instrumens* [of 1707], while Forkel and Sulzer provide a different title: “*Traité de l'accompagnement du clavecin, de l'orgue, et des autres instruments*”. Moreover, Forkel and Sulzer include “*de l'orgue*” in the title. It seems unlikely that the German scholars would mistakenly omit the word “nouveau” or randomly add “*de l'orgue*” to the title. The most likely case is that they were discussing two different treatises. Could they have based their conclusions on someone else's works? Unfortunately, the question will remain open for now as some further documentation is still necessary.

In 1710 and 1718, Michel Charles le Céne and Etienne (Estienne) Roger included the titles of Saint Lambert's works in their *Catalogues des Livres imprimés à Amsterdam chez Etienne Roger*.<sup>10</sup> But these catalogues do not give precise bibliographic data on

<sup>10</sup> *Catalogue des Livres qui se trouvent à Amsterdam, chez Michel Charles le Cene* (without paging) [16] which was placed at the end of the romantic novel: Vergne M. de la Comtesse de la Fayette, *Histoire de Madame Henriette Première Femme de Philippe de France Duc D'Orleans*; Christiaan Huygens, *Nouveau traité de la pluralité des mondes* [32], and *Les Femmes Sçavantes ou Bibliothèque des Dames* [35].



the treatise on accompaniment which accord with the editions listed by Forkel, Sulzer, the official Amsterdam or the Paris editions; the titles also do not include the important word “nouveau.” Rather, the title is listed as “[Traitté] d’Accompagnement pour *bien* apprendre à bien accompagner du Clavecin, *quoi que la Basse continue ne soit point chiffrée*, par le Sr. St. Lambert, 8.” The words in italics indicate new additions to the officially accepted title, which now differs radically from that of the edition of 1707.

In yet another anonymous review, for the learned *Femmes* [35] the treatise on harpsichord playing has a title, which again differs from the one used for the publication by Roger (c1710?). It reads “[Principes] pour bien apprendre à jouer du Clavecin; par le Sr. St. Lambert, 8.” Compared with the original Paris and Amsterdam titles, which are identical apart from the place of publication (“Les principes du clavecin, contenant une explication exacte de tout ce qui concerne la tablature & le clavier...”, Paris), the title given in the 1718 catalogue is an abridged version of the title mentioned above, with new additions such as “bien apprendre à jouer” incorporated.

Harris-Warrick, referring to Francois Lesure’s *Bibliographie* [36, 49], shows that Roger mentions two works by Saint Lambert in his 1712 *Catalogue*: “Principes pour bien apprendre à jouer du clavecin par Mr. de Saint Lambert” and the “Traite d’accompagnement pour apprendre a bien acompagner du clavecin par Mr. de Saint Lambert” [28, VIII]. But she does not emphasize the divergences in the titles, which here also differ from the original titles. Several conclusions suggest that Roger and Michel Charles le Céne may have copied the title from an as yet unknown publication of the treatise on accompaniment. The main reason supporting this conclusion is the omission of the most important word — “nouveau” — may not be a random misprint: in all other instances when listing a work whose title begins with the word “nouveau,” it appears under the letter “N” (e.g., the treatise by Charles Masson<sup>11</sup> on p. 345). Saint Lambert’s treatise is listed under “T” (“Traitté d’Accompagnement pour bien apprendre à bien accompagner du Clavecin, quoi que la Basse continue ne soit point chiffrée, par le Sr. St. Lambert, 8”; the divergences from the 1707 Paris edition are underlined). A misunderstanding or misprint is thus doubtful.

The first study and reference in Germany to Saint Lambert’s works was by Johann Mattheson [41, 5, 17], who lists the title, with minor and insignificant editorial changes, as “Nouveau Traité de l’accompagnement du Clavecin, de l’Orgue & des autres Instrumens, par Msr. De St. Lambert, Paris 1707.” In his *Critica Musica* [39, 30], Mattheson refers to Saint Lambert’s work as “Traité del’accompagnement de St. Lambert,” omitting “nouveau,” but including in his text a quotation from Saint Lambert. His reference to “pag. 48” further allowed us to cross-check it with the original publication, which clarified that Mattheson had the 1707 Paris edition of the *Nouveau traité* at his disposal<sup>12</sup>. In the “Register,” Saint Lambert is referred to as “Lambert St. s. A. 30, 210,” suggesting that he had not paid careful attention to the context of the passage

<sup>11</sup> “Nouveau traité pour apprendre les règles de la Composition de la Musique &, à faire un chant sur des Paroles & c. par Mr. Masson, 8.”

<sup>12</sup> Harris-Warrick [28, X] does not provide exact bibliographic information concerning which of the editions (the Amsterdam or the Paris) were the ones that Mattheson worked with.

on page 210,<sup>13</sup> and attributing the treatise to the famous French singer Michel Lambert instead of the harpsichordist Saint Lambert. This is the first time that the two French musicians were confused [39, 210]. The same edition of Saint Lambert's treatise is referred to also in Mattheson's *Grosse General-Baß-Schule* [40, 127]. It should be noted, however, that nowhere did Mattheson apply the first name Michel to Saint Lambert.

Both treatises by Saint Lambert are mentioned in the "Catalogue of Other Books on Music Theory and Practice" at the end of the *Traité de L'Harmonie* by Jean-Philippe Rameau [53]. The first treatise is given with the short title "Principes pour le Clavecin, par Mr. de Saint-Lambert," followed directly with "Traité d'Accompagnement pour cet Instrument, & pour tous les autres." Unfortunately, no further bibliographic data is given.

The scholarly discussion really begins with Johann Gottfried Walther's *Musicalisches Lexicon* of 1732 and the materials included in the article "Lambert [*de Saint*]" [66, 352]. This article and its multitude mistakes attracted the attention of many scholars. Here we will focus on the use of the name "Michel" and the confusion of Saint Lambert with Michel Lambert. A summarized and convincing account is given by Harris-Warrick ([28, VIII–IX], also [29; 30, 800]) and Powell [50, X].

In her introduction to the English translation of the treatise, Harris-Warrick pays much attention to the detailed examination of the biographical information about Saint Lambert and the misinformation found in the works of German lexicographers. In the *New Grove Dictionary*, she writes that "the first name 'Michel,' frequently attributed to him, derives from the conflation of Saint Lambert with the singer and composer Michel Lambert, an error that goes at least as far back as Walther's *Musicalisches Lexicon* (1732)." Similarly, in the second edition of *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* she states: "The frequently ascribed first name Michel to him [i.e. to de Saint Lambert] cannot be found in any 18-century source, and perhaps may be explained by the fact that his name has often been confused with the name of the well-known singer and composer Michel Lambert (1610–1696); this confusion goes back at least as far as J. G. Walther's *Musicalisches Lexicon* (1732)" [30, 800]. Analogous explanations are also found in Powell's introduction to his edition of the treatise [50, X]. Thus, both identify Walther as the first lexicographer to confuse the two French musicians.

We believe these statements to be erroneous,<sup>14</sup> as Walther never mentions the name "Michel" in his article. Figure 4 gives an excerpt of his article.

<sup>13</sup> "...que diroient les Lambert, les Boesset, les le Camus, & les Battiste s'ils renebenoient au monde, ... (Was würden wohl Lambert, Boesset / le Camus und Battiste sagen / wenn...)" (German translation by Mattheson: [39, 210], "...what will the Lamberts, the Boessets, the le Camus, & the Battistes say if they return to the world, to see the François chant so changed so debased & defaced?" [our English translation]. It is definitely certain that in this passage "Lambert" is the French singer Michel Lambert.

<sup>14</sup> In the course of this study this list will be significantly expanded. Among many other authors we could name T. Schultz who insists with enough warrant that Walther was also the first to make this mistake. The materials to be examined above disprove his judgment [62, 7].

*Capaccio* in seinem Forastiero, Giornata 1. p. 7. rühmlich gedenket.  
 Lambert [ *de Sains* ] Maitre de la Musique de la Chambre du Roy, d. i. Königl. Großfürstlicher Cammer-Componist, hat Trio vor allerhand Instrumente gesetzt; auch Principes du Clavecin und an. 1707 wiederum einen Tractat de l' Accompagnement du Clavecin, de l' Orgue, & des autres Instruments zu Paris in 8vo herausgegeben, welche sämtlich zu Amsterdam nachgedruckt worden sind. Jener hält 28 Capitel in sich, folgenden Inhalts. c. 1. des Notes & des Clefs c. 2. du Clavier. c. 3. de la manière d' étudier les Pièces. c. 4. de la Valeur des Notes. c. 5. du Point. c. 6. de la Tenue. c. 7. de la Liaison. c. 8. des signes qui marquent la Mesure & le Mouvement. c. 9. des Parties. c. 10. des Pauses. c. 11. de la double Barre. c. 12. du Renvoy. c. 13. du Guidon & du Renvoy. c. 14. des Feintes en général. c. 15. du Diéze. c. 16. du Bémol. c. 17. du Béquarre. c. 18. des Pièces transposées. c. 19. de la position des Doigts. c. 20. des Agrémens en général. c. 21. du Tremblement. c. 22. de la Double Cadence. c. 23. du Pincé. c. 24. du Port de Voix. c. 25. du Coulé. c. 26. de l' Harpegé. c. 27. du Détaché. und c. 28. de l' Aspiration. Hierauf folgen noch einige Anmerkungen über einige Stellen dieses Tractats, welcher, sammt der Vorrede und dem Vorbericht, 9 Bogen stark ist. Der zweyte Tractat bestehet aus 9 Capiteln, davon das erste; von der Definition de l' Accompagnement. c. 2. des Intervalles. c. 3. de la Pratique de l' Accompagnement. c. 4. des Tons, des Modes, & de la Transposition. c. 5. du mouvement des Mains. c. 6. du Choix des Accords. c. 7. des Regles pour deviner les chiffres, quand les Basses-Continués ne sont pas chiffrées. c. 8. des Licences qu' on peut prendre en Accompagnant, und c. 9. du Goût de l' Accompagnement handelt, und ist mit dem vorigen von gleicher Stärke. Daß auch ein Lambert des Lully Schwieger-Vater gewesen, liest man in *Mosch-smii Crit. Mus. T. 1 p. 183.*

Figure 4. J. G. Walther, *Musicalisches Lexicon*, 1732 [66, 352]

Their mistaken interpretation derives from an incorrect reading of the last sentence: “That also [there was] a *Lambert* — Lully’s father-in-law, one may read in *Mattheson’s Crit[ica] Mus[ica]* Vol. I, p. 183 (Daß auch ein Lambert des Lully Schwieger-Vater gewesen, lieset man in *Matthesonii Crit. Mus. T. 1 p. 183*).” Walther does not state that the “Lambert [de Saint]” named at the beginning of the article is the same person mentioned later simply as “Lambert,” who had been “Lully’s father-in-law.” Everything in Walther’s sentence depends on the understanding of the words, “Daß auch ein Lambert,” which are used in the sense of “another” or “also.” Without these words, the sentence could *de facto* mean that “[de Saint] Lambert had also been Lully’s father-in-law.” Walther alludes to the authority of Mattheson, who writes:<sup>15</sup> “The rest he [Lully] left for his wife to take care of, who he especially esteemed. We read<sup>16</sup> that he had two sons, Louis de Lully and Jean Louis de Lully, who they had together. She [the named wife] was the daughter of the famous composer Lambert.”

In our reading, “ein *Lambert* des Lully Schwieger-Vater,” as Walther wrote, is not in fact Saint Lambert, but the widely-known singer and composer Michel Lambert, whose daughter Lully had married. Walther had not “evidently confused Saint Lambert with Michel Lambert (1610–96), composer, singer, singing teacher, and father-in-law of Jean-Baptiste Lully,” as Powell writes, or that there was an “error that goes at least as far back as Walther’s *Musicalisches Lexicon* (1732)” as affirmed by Harris-Warrick.<sup>17</sup>

Another frequent error is the ascribing to Walther the use of “noveau” as first word of the title in the treatise on accompaniment. There is no such word in Walther’s text. Walther, in fact, provides erroneous information, mentioned by both Harris-Warrick and Powell, which will turn up in the works of other authors, but that is the crediting Saint Lambert with the title “Maitre de Musique de la Chambre du Roy” and by ascribing to him a “Trio vor allerhand Instrumenten.” But information was scarce and very difficult to obtain in the period Walther was writing.

<sup>15</sup> Johann Mattheson, ‘Leben und Tod des weltberühmten JEAN BAPTISTE de LULLY’ [39, 178–84].

<sup>16</sup> Mattheson’s article (as he clarifies it in the first footnote on p. 178) is based on the information provided by Concertmeister Lingke, who, in his turn, gathered the facts from a book titled ‘*Lettres historiques sur tous les spectacles de Paris*’ (1718) [RISM: Boindin (Nicolas). *Lettres historiques sur tous les spectacles de Paris*. [Première-quatrième letter (p. 78)]. Paris, Pierre Prault, 1719. In-8, pp. 92–134–50–59. See detailed information about Lully in the *Seconde Lettre* (p. 76 onwards)].

<sup>17</sup> There is a curious passage in the MGG2 article on de Saint Lambert which should be commented: “Both Saint-Lambert’s works [i.e. of 1702 and 1707] were well known throughout the 18<sup>th</sup> century: ...they were quoted or plagiarized by numerous French and German music theorists (among the latter, S. de Brossard, E. Loulié, J.-Ph. Rameau, Joh. Mattheson, Joh. D. Heinichen und J. Adlung)” [30, 800]. Nothing that follows the mentioning of Loulié and de Brossard raises any questions. But for Loulié it is impossible for him to have “cited and plagiarized” from de Saint Lambert, because Loulié’s last work dates back to 1698, and de Saint Lambert’s first treatise, as it is claimed by Harris-Warrick, was published in 1702. If the date of de Saint Lambert’s publication had been 1697, then Loulié could apply to the treatise. Concerning de Brossard, it was shown above that his complete music dictionary was published for the first time in 1701 rather than in 1703 as it is currently believed! Once again, the same question arises: how could de Brossard cite in 1701 from de Saint Lambert, if the treatise of the latter was presented to the Paris musicians only a year later as Harris-Warrick confirms? Loulié is not mentioned in Harris-Warrick’s NGD2 article [29]. De Brossard could have “cited, or even plagiarized” from de Saint Lambert only under one condition, namely if his *Dictionnaire* was published after the publication of de Saint Lambert’s treatises. But according to our latest research (see above) the year of the first publication of de Brossard’s *Dictionnaire* was 1701. This means that de Saint Lambert’s treatises, or only one of them was released before 1701.

There is still another issue to look at. If we read Walther's article carefully and pay special attention to the mentioned size of the print format of the treatise, we will notice that both of treatises are listed as being "in-8." However, the Paris edition of Saint Lambert's *Principes* had been printed "in-4," and the work on accompaniment "in-8." In Amsterdam, the two treatises had also been published "in-8." Which editions are described by Walther? A lexicographer of his stature would never confuse "in-4" with "in-8." Thus, we can presume that Walther was referring to the Amsterdam editions, a premise that seems to be supported by Walther's explanation of the French term "Portée" (p. 488) by referring to an explanation on page 66 of Saint Lambert's *Principes*, to be found on page 66 of the Amsterdam edition, while in the Paris 1702 edition this material is on p. 28!

Among the many eminent authors cited in his compendious *Elementa Musica*, Quirinus van Blankenburg refers several times also to the treatise on accompaniment by Saint Lambert, with special attention paid to Saint Lambert's debatable idea of a simplification of the main principles of notation and different clefs used at his time. In the footnote to Saint Lambert's explanation of the "Bemol" sign, Blankenburg turns to page 3 of the *Traité de l'Accompagnement* [7, 32]. This reference most likely is to page 3 of the Amsterdam edition; in the 1707 Paris edition, this topic is discussed on page 2. (Blankenburg does not use the word "nouveau" in the title of Saint Lambert's work; however, it is definitely used in title of the Amsterdam version.)

When discussing the problem of transposing (p. 74), on the contrary, Blankenburg indicates that he refers to the new treatise on basso-continuo ("in zyn niew tractaat van de Bas-Continuo"), with the footnote stating: "Parys 1707. Op de 55 en volgende bladzyden" [Paris 1707. From page 55]. It is strange that Blankenburg here refers to the Paris edition of 1707, to the *Nouveau traité de l'accompagnement*, where transposing is discussed on pages 27–28 and further, but not on page 55. We do find the discussion on page 55 of the Amsterdam edition. Was it negligence on the part of Blankenburg that he named one source, and in fact used another one? A cross-examination showed, however, that the title and the material cited by other authors match the original sources. Thus, we can suppose that the inaccuracies in reference to Saint Lambert's works may have to do with the fact that he had an unknown Paris edition of the treatise on accompaniment at his disposal, or, less likely, that he thought that the Amsterdam and the Paris editions were identical.

Let us consider some other sources. A few years later, in 1742, the treatise on accompaniment was included in the *Catalogue Général et alphabétique de Musique* [17, 53] published by Boivin's widow. Here the title is again listed without the word "nouveau," as simply, "Saint-Lambert. Principes & Traité d'Accompagnement, pour le Clavecin." And in Padre Martini's *Storia della Musica* (1757), both works by Saint Lambert have Amsterdam as the place of publication, without year [38, vol. 1, 458]. The treatise on accompaniment is listed as "Nouveau Traité de l'Accompagn. du Clavec. & de l'orgue."

Known for his exactness toward exactness, Jacob Adlung's fundamental work, *Anleitung zu der musikalischen Gelahrtheit*, provides no easy answer to the questions as to which editions he is referring to. For example, in his discussion of new music, Adlung [1, 212] refers to page 126 of *Les principes du Clavessin*, where Saint Lambert refers to the use of only three clef signs. This most certainly points to the Amsterdam edition, because the

Paris edition has only 68 pages. However, in the section “Von der italiänischen Tabulatur,” where Adlung touches on the problem of ornamentation, we find: “Mit Vorzatz hat die Manieren erklärt Lambert in principes du clavessin, Paris, in 8 [sic] in 28 Capiteln” [emphasis added] [1, 729–30]. But the Paris edition was published “in-4.” Adlung also makes mention of information supplied by Walther’s *Lexicon*. As for Saint Lambert’s treatise on accompaniment, here Adlung [1, 635] refers to the Paris edition of 1707. But Adlung does not name this treatise a “new” one. Just as in Walther’s *Lexicon*, the title given here is “Tractat de l’accompagnement du clavessin, de l’orgue, et des autres instruments, Paris 8.” Adlung also refers to Saint Lambert simply as “Lambert,” the first time that the harpsichordist Saint Lambert is mentioned that way, something that will cause further confusion later in the century.

The *Mercur de France* includes an anonymous account of Saint Lambert’s *Principes* with the date 1702, and here again, the interest is connected with the innovate idea of reducing the quantity of staff signs to three, a problem that occupied many musicians in the eighteenth century and later [45, 169–70].

The question of the number of key signs is mentioned also in the third volume of the *Essays* by Jean-Benjamin de la Borde of 1780, who used the 1702 Paris edition of the *Principes*. De la Borde [8, vol. 3, 642] names the *Traité d’accompagnement pour plusieurs instrumens* by Saint Lambert, not using “nouveau” but adding the word *plusieurs* to replace “du clavessin, de l’orgue, et des autres instruments”: “Lambert (de St.) fit en 1702 les *Principes du clavecin*, contenant une explication exacte de ce qui concerne la tablature & le clavier, & un *Traité d’accompagnement* pour plusieurs instrumens.”

In Diderot’s *Encyclopédie*, “M. de Saint-Lambert” is mentioned only in connection with the *Principes de clavecin*, when differences between “le port-de-voix simple,” “le port-de-voix-appuyé,” and “le demi-port-de voix” are discussed. No bibliographic information is given [2, vol. 26, 875].

In a chronological context, the “mainstream” opinion based on the information from Gerber’s *Lexicon* [25] must be reconsidered now. For more than 200 years, a fundamental misinterpretation of the article in this book has prevailed. Gerber’s article does not address “de Saint Lambert,” as commonly thought, but rather is devoted to “Lambert (Michel), the French singer, as the original clearly shows [25, 777].

The contemporary confusion is summed up in this quote from Harris-Warrick: “Other German lexicographers, for example Gerber and Schilling, clearly thought that Michel Lambert and Monsieur de Saint Lambert were one and the same person” [28, ix]. But in her footnote 6, she mentions the *Lexicon* by Gerber [“1790–92”] as well as the *Encyclopädie* by Gustav Schilling [61], and (contradicting herself) states that the entries are under the name “Lambert (Michel).” Gerber, and Schilling following him, wrote the article about the singer and “Maître de la Musique de la Chambre du Roy” Michel Lambert, rather than Saint Lambert.

Contrary to the prevailing opinion, there is not a single word connected with Saint Lambert the harpsichordist or his harpsichord treatises in the first edition of Gerber’s *Lexicon* (see Figure 5). Thus, neither Saint Lambert’s name nor any of his works are found in this article, or in the second part published in 1792.

Lambert (Michel) Kapellmeister des Königs von Frankreich zu Paris, geb. zu Bivonne, einer kleinen Stadt in Poitou, 1610; kam sehr jung nach Paris, und gewann daselbst durch seine angenehme Stimme, welche er auf eine geschickte Art mit der Laute und der Theorbe zu begleiten wußte, die Gunst des Cardinals von Richelieu. Diese trachte ihn bald die Königl. Kapellmeisterstelle zuwege, wobey er den französischen Gesang, der bis daher nichts anders, als eine Art von Plain-chant gewesen war, unendlich verbesserte. Hierdurch machte er sich zum Modelehrer der Hofdamen und der Herren vom guten Tone, so daß seine Singeschule, wegen der Menge der Schüler, mehr einer Akademie ähnlich war, deren Sitzungen er allemal damit beschloß, daß er in der Mitte dieses glänzenden und bezaubernden Zirkels, mehrere Chansons anstimmen ließ und selbige mit seinem Instrumente begleitete. Diese Versammlung folgte ihm sogar auf sein Landhaus, welches er zu Puteaux hatte. Er verheyrathete seine Tochter an den berühmten Lully, und starb zu Paris 1696.

Figure 5. E. L. Gerber. *Historisch-Biographisches Lexicon der Tonkünstler...*, erster Theil, 1790, p. 777

In 1792, when Gerber published the second part of his *Lexicon*, Johann Nikolaus Forkel first issued the *Allgemeine Litteratur der Musik* [23]. While the information on Saint Lambert found in Forkel's work provides a significant part of our understanding of Saint Lambert, there are some matters, which have not yet received due consideration. For example, it is often thought that the name "Michel" is not found in any eighteenth-century source. This does not correlate with the information given in Forkel's volume,<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> The first article is *Principes du Clavecin*, the second one is *Traité de l'accompagnement du Clavecin, de l'orgue, et des autres Instrumens*.

which lists an article clearly titled “*Lambert (Michel de Saint)*,” and with the same name printed in the “Register.” As far as we know, this is the first time when a first name is listed, but more importantly, Forkel dates the publication of the treatise on accompaniment to the year 1680. Forkel quite accurately gives the title of the 1707 edition, but adds at the end: “which edition in consecutive order is this one is not known; however, the first edition of this work came out in 1680 [in-]8”.

The title is not totally accurate as listed — “nouveau”<sup>19</sup> is missing — but it is widely assumed today that Forkel misinterpreted the title and erroneously used the date 1680. However, a question arises: from what source did Forkel obtain his information? No evidence has yet shed light on this situation. But it suggests that an important but as yet unavailable bibliographic source may have been published during that period. This source may have been published between 1758, the publication of Adlung’s volume, and 1792, when Forkel’s work appeared. Concerning Forkel’s addition of “de Saint” to Michel Lambert, we suggest the following hypothesis: Forkel used Gerber’s *Lexicon*, among other bio-bibliographic sources, including evidence from, for example, Walther’s *Lexicon* that there were two treatises published by Monsieur de Saint Lambert, and decided that Michel Lambert wrote the two treatises, and thus “Lambert (Michel)” became “Lambert (Michel de Saint).”

Neither can we answer the question where J. G. Sulzer [Kirnberger/Schulz] — in 1792, just as Forkel — found information for a 1680 publication date when he mentioned it in his *Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste*<sup>20</sup> (“*Traité de l’accompagnement du Clavecin, de l’Orgue, et des autres instrumens, p. Mich. de St. Lambert, Par[is]. 1680 und 1708 [sic]. 8*”). And where did he take the first name “Mich[el]” from? Certainly not from Forkel as both volumes came out in 1792. The “Index” to volume 4 of the *Allgemeine Theorie* also lists the name “Lambert, Mich. de St.”

Taken together, this information might give us a clue where the year 1680 may have first appeared. This as yet unknown source may have been found either by J. Ph. Kirnberger or by his pupil J. P. Schulz (or Schultz), or may have been included in one of their works. “1708” is most probably a misprint. Saint Lambert’s *Principes du Clavecin* is mentioned in the bibliography of the entry on “Instrumentalmusik” [64, vol. 2, 686], where it is titled “*Principes du Clavecin, p. Mr. Michel de St. Lambert, Par[is]. 1702.*”

Gerber, in the second edition of his *Lexicon* (volume 3, 1813, Sp. 163), refers the reader to his article written on Lambert in the first edition of 1790. In 1813, he only adds “de Saint,” resulting in “Lambert (Michel de Saint)” and continues “on whom sufficient information is given in the [first] Lex[icon].” Gerber then lists the treatises:

<sup>19</sup> Harris-Warrick overlooked this important fact and comes to the conclusion that “The German music lexicographers Forkel ... and Gerber (*Neues Historisch-Biographisches Lexikon der Tonkünstler* (Leipzig, 1812-14), vol. III, p. 163) both cite 1680 as the publication date of the *Nouveau traite, ...*”. In the original materials of the bibliographers the word “Nouveau” (as in Walther’s *Lexicon*) is not present.

<sup>20</sup> Johann Georg Sulzer, ‘Begleitung’, in *Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste... Erster Theil* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1792), volume 1, 360. The articles on music were in the most part written by J. Ph. Kirnberger and later also in cooperation with Kirnberger’s pupil J. A. P. Schulz, as Sulzer informs. In the first edition of Sulzer’s *Allgemeine Theorie* (1771, 1774) de Saint Lambert and his works are not mentioned.



- 1) *Traité de l'accompagnement du Clavecin, de l'orgue, et des autres Instruments*. Paris, 1680 und 1707. [in] 8. 9 Bogen stark [9 printing sheets thick].
- 2) *Principes du Clavecin*. Paris, 1702. 9 Bogen.
- 3) Trio's für verschiedene Instrumente.<sup>21</sup>

In the preface to volume I, Gerber mentions Walther and Forkel. We can assume, with many contemporary authors, that:

- Gerber confused the information given by Walther and Forkel who both wrote about the harpsichordist “Lambert [de Saint]” (Walther) and “*Lambert (Michel de Saint)*” (Forkel).
- Gerber's entry refers to the singer Michel Lambert and attributes the harpsichord treatises to him.
- The next error is the addition of “de Saint” to the name Michel Lambert.
- In 1813, Gerber first gives the titles of Saint Lambert's treatises as cited by Sulzer/Kirnberger/Schulz or Forkel, and dates the *Traité de l'accompagnement du Clavecin, de l'orgue, et des autres Instruments* to 1680 (none of the earlier scholars included “nouveau”).

These errors have been taken over and perpetuated in the works of other authors up to today.

Two entries in the *Encyclopædia Londinensis* published by John Wilkes, who compiled this volume with the assistance of “eminent scholars of the English, Scotch, and Irish Universities,” also needs to be mentioned. It includes separate entries on both musicians. The first is dedicated to “LAMBERT (Michael) [who] was the favorite singing-master and composer of songs in France... Lulli married the daughter of this musician, [and] who was born in 1610, and died in 1696.” The other is on “LAMBERT (Saint): “LAMBERT (Saint), published, in 1702, ‘Les Principes du Clavecin,’ or Instructions for the Harpsichord, containing a clear explanation of all that concerns the clavier, or keys, in their rotation [sic] on that instrument; and ‘A Treatise of Accompaniment,’ for many instruments” [68, vol. 12, 96].

In contemporary literature, it is universally accepted that F.-J. Fétis (1844) first distinguished between these two French musicians. As we can see here, this had been done thirty years earlier.

The evidence given in Gerber or Forkel has been copied into many other publications, as for example, in the *Dizionario* by Peter Lichtenthal (“Lambert (Michel De Saint), compositore di camera francese a Parigi: *Traité de l'accompagnement du Clavecin, de l'Orgue et des autres instrumens*. Paris, 1707, 9 fogli in 8. Contiene 9 capitoli. La prima edizione è del 1680), where Saint Lambert is called “Michel” and identified as a chamber composer in Paris, which suggests that Michel Lambert was meant. It should be noted that again “the first edition — as is stated — was published in 1680,” and Saint Lambert's *Principes* are dated to 1702 [37, 195].

C. F. Becker published his *Systematisch chronologische Darstellung der musikalischen Literatur* in 1836, with greater part of the information on Saint Lambert most likely taken from Forkel or Gerber and thus conflating the two. However, some details should be

<sup>21</sup> There is no data in RISM. The first erroneous attribution of these “Trio's für verschiedene Instrumente“, as pertaining to Saint Lambert, refers to Walther's Lexicon. (The “Trio's für verschiedene Instrumente” attributed to “Lambert [de Saint]” by Walther (here — also by Gerber) actually were (as we presume) composed by the singer Michel Lambert. It might refer to those “Airs à une, deux, trios et 4 parties av. la basse cont, compos. par Mons. Lambert, Paris, ... 1689”, Chr. Ballard.)

mentioned. We believe that he follows Gerber, calling Saint Lambert “Michel” and giving some biographic details for the singer [5, vol. 1, 369]. The *Principes du Clavecin* is dated 1702, but Becker also suggests that it “probably... was already a later edition [Wahrscheinlich ist dies schon eine spätere Ausgabe].” Becker mentions the Amsterdam edition, but without bibliographic details [5, vol. 2, 91]. The first publication of the treatise on accompaniment, as stated in the end of the article, is dated to 1680: “Lambert (Michel de Saint): *Traité de l'accompagnement du Clavecin, de l'Orgue et des autres instrumens*. Paris, 1707. 8. 9 Bogen. Enthält 9 Kapitel. Die erste Auflage soll zu Paris 1680, in 8. erschienen sein” [5, vol. 1, 410].

Some bibliographic details on the *Principes du Clavecin* can also be found in *La France-Littéraire...* [52, vol. 8, 347], which the print-layout is included: “Saint-Lambert. — *Principes du clavecin*. Paris, 1702, in-4.”

Among early lexicographic works, G. Schilling's *Encyclopädie* is among the most criticized today, even though he relied on the work of a group of outstanding musicologists: “M. Fink, Geh. Kriegs Rath Kretschmar, Professor Dr. Marx, G. Nauenburg, Ludwig Rellstab, Ritter v. Seyfried, Schnyder v. Wartensee, Prof. Weber, Baron v. Winzingerode,” and so forth. The entry in Schilling's *Encyclopädie* is devoted to “Lambert Michel,” the singer.<sup>22</sup> But the information adds some specifics, namely that the treatise on accompaniment “was published in 1680 in a very solid issue,” and that “it had disappeared so quickly that already in 1690 a second, and in 1707 a third edition had to be published.” The title given for the work simply reads “*Traité de l'accompagnement du Clavecin, de l'Orgue et des autres Instruments*.”

Fétis is the most-cited source on Saint Lambert, if only because he first demonstrated in 1844 how little is known about this musician. The entry is given as “SAINT-LAMBERT (N. DE), professeur de clavecin à Paris” [21, vol. 8, 16–17]. In the second edition of 1864, Fétis lists “SAINT-LAMBERT (Michel DE).” Otherwise, both entries are identical [22, vol. 7, 371–72].<sup>23</sup> Fétis was criticized for including as bibliographic data: “*Traité de l'accompagnement du clavecin, de l'orgue et de quelques autres instruments*; Paris, Ballard, 1680, in-4<sup>o</sup> oblong. Une deuxième édition a paru à Paris, chez Ballard, en 1707, in-4 oblong”, and “*Principes du clavecin*; Paris, Ballard, 1697, in-4 obl., une deuxième édition a été publiée par le même imprimeur, en 1702, in-4<sup>o</sup> obl. [and added in the 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1864: Une réimpression de cette édition a été faite à Amsterdam, chez Roger (sans date), un volume grand in-4<sup>o</sup> de cent quarante-deux pages, avec deux planches de musique].” The dates 1680, 1690, and 1697 have been debunked as wrong, but little attention has been paid to the print-layout, which he wrongly gives as “in-4” for the Amsterdam edition.<sup>24</sup> However, one edition “in-4 obl.” does exist and was published in Paris by Juste Adrien

<sup>22</sup> This error one can meet in other bio-bibliographic sources, for example, in the 12-volume *Lexicon* compiled by H. Mendel: Hermann Mendel, *Musikalisches Conversations-Lexikon* [44, vol. 6, 232–33]. Here in the article dedicated to “Lambert Michel” — the French musician is said to be an “angesehener französischer Virtuose auf Laute und Theorbe, Gesanglehrer und Vocalcomponist” — it is written that M. Lambert published also the “*Traité de l'accompagnement du clavecin, de l'orgue et des autres instrumens*” (Paris, 1680 and 1707) and “*Principes du clavecin* (1702)”. Attention should be paid not only to the 1680 year of publication, but also to the fact that the treatise on accompaniment is not called “Nouveau”.

<sup>23</sup> In 1864 Fétis only added the text of the title of the *Principes* at the end of the article and some information on its Amsterdam edition.

<sup>24</sup> The *St. Petersburg State Conservatory Academic Library* has an original Amsterdam edition that contains the above mentioned 142 pages, and is not in the print-layout in-4, but in-8. There are no music examples, as Fétis writes too. Instead, there is a *Table* of contents on the page following p. 142!

Lenoir de Lafage (or La Fague, or Lafage; 1805–1862). A *Catalogue* published in 1862 of 2,300 publications issued by his printing house includes the following entry: “1441. Saint-Lambert (De). Nouveau Traité de l’accompagnement du clavecin, de l’orgue et des autres instruments. Paris, 1707, in-4 obl., dem.-rel., bas” [20, 118].

Saint Lambert’s treatise on accompaniment, with the date 1680, is mentioned by the Belgian scholar E. Vander Straeten [63, 61, 70] in his discussions of the system of notation and of innovations in quarter-tone intervals. Citing from the monograph by Blankenburg, Vander Straeten refers to Saint Lambert’s works three times,<sup>25</sup> each time using a slightly different title for the treatise on accompaniment:

- p. 61/footnote: *Traité de l’accompagnement du clavecin et de l’orgue*, par de Saint-Lambert,
- p. 70: de Saint-Lambert, *Nouveau Traité de l’accompagnement du clavecin et de l’orgue*,
- p. 70/footnote: “(1) Amsterdam, Roger, sans date. C’est probablement une contrefaçon de l’édition de Paris, de 1680,” suggesting that Vander Straeten used the Amsterdam edition, which he thinks may have been a pirated [“contrefaçon”] edition of the Paris 1680 publication.

Vander Straeten cites Saint Lambert without giving a page number in the source: “\*On trouve assez souvent en Italie des Clavessins compez par quarts de Tons pour accompagner les voix; sur ces sortes de Clavessins les plus petits intervalles sons d’un quart de Ton” (One often meets in Italy Clavessins with quarter-tones to accompany the voice; on such kind of Clavessins the smallest intervals are one quarter of a Tone.)

This footnote can be found on page 2 of the Amsterdam edition. The Paris edition of 1707 has no such note.

There are several reasons that could account for this divergency. First, it could have been added by Roger, for example, to explain Saint Lambert’s statement that “the smallest of all the intervals is called a semitone: it is the interval found between two pitches very close to one another, as between mi & fa — which are so close that there is no other pitch between them.”<sup>26</sup> The note may actually have been part of a 1680 Paris edition and then transferred to the Amsterdam publication. Third, there are few differences between the Amsterdam and the Paris editions. The footnote explains a topic of great importance in the 1689s, when the issue of temperament was widely discussed and literature on this topic was abundant (e.g. Prætorius [51, 65–66] and Blankenburg). By 1707, a note on the issue would have been out of date, but in 1680 it was still very relevant.

Ernest David and Mathis Lussy’s monograph on the *History of Notation* [18] quotes Saint Lambert’s work in several places, using the titles *Les principes du clavecin, par Monsieur de Saint-Lambert*. Paris, 1697, and *Traité de l’accompagnement du clavecin, de l’orgue*

<sup>25</sup> In the process of preparing his book Vander Straeten reasoned on this subject a year earlier in the article *Musiciens Néerlandais*. *Quirin van Blankenburg* in the weekly publication *Le Guide Musical* (12<sup>me</sup> Année, 31 Mai 1866, N° 22). In the text of this article, Straeten refers to de Saint Lambert’s treatise as “*Traité de l’accompagnement du clavecin et de l’orgue*, par de Saint-Lambert.”, but further in the next issue of this Weekly paper (12<sup>me</sup> Année, 21 et 28 Juni 1866, N<sup>os</sup> 25 et 26) Vander Straeten names the Amsterdam publication of this treatise as “*Nouveau Traité de l’accompagnement du clavecin et de l’orgue*” and adds in the footnote the same comment as in his book later: “(1) Amsterdam, Roger, sans date. C’est probablement une contrefaçon de l’édition de Paris, de 1680.”

<sup>26</sup> Cited from Powell’s translation, 6.


*et de quelques autres instruments*, Paris, 1680. An excerpt of the “Index” on page 211 is given in Figure 6, including the rare layout of “in-4° obl.”:

SAINT-LAMBERT. *Traité de l'accompagnement du clavecin, de l'orgue et de quelques autres instruments*, in-4° obl. Paris, 1680. — P. 139.  
 — *Les principes du clavecin*, 1 vol. in-4°. Paris, 1697. — P. 121, 154, 155.

Figure 6. E. David and M. Lussy, *Histoire de la notation musicale...* 1882, p. 211

David and Lussy quote extensively from Saint Lambert's texts and thus allow a comparison. The first is from page 121 of the *Histoire de la notation* where a long passage from *Les principes du clavecin, par Monsieur de Saint-Lambert*,<sup>27</sup> Paris, 1697 is cited:

« Quand le degré qui doit être dominé d'un dièse se trouve deux fois dans l'espace de cinq lignes, on met des dièses l'un sur l'autre. Exemple :



« Mais quand le degré qui doit être dominé d'un dièse ne se trouve qu'une fois dans l'espace de cinq lignes, on ne met qu'un dièse auprès de la clef. On place le dièse et le bémol devant la note, ou au-dessus ou au-dessous, mais jamais derrière, et plus généralement devant. »

Figure 7. E. David and M. Lussy, *Histoire de la notation musicale...* 1882, p. 121

The texts pertain to the next ones in de Saint Lambert's work [58, 38]:

Quand par la position de la Clef, le degré qui doit être dominé d'un Dièse, se trouve deux fois dans l'espace des cinq lignes ; comme par exemple, s'il y a deux degrés

Mais quand le degré qui doit être dominé par un Dièse, ne se trouve qu'une fois dans l'espace des cinq lignes, on ne met qu'un Dièse auprès de la clef. Voyez l'Exemple précédent.

Figure 8. De Saint Lambert, *Les Principes du Clavecin*, Paris, 1702, p. 38

<sup>27</sup> In most cases, when de Saint Lambert is mentioned, the quotations in the *Histoire de la notation* are from his *Les Principes*, because namely in this treatise “Saint-Lambert, claviniste” devotes much space to the problem of notation.

In the quote below both texts are given with the excerpts from the now available edition of Saint Lambert’s treatise in italics:

“Quand *par la position de la Clef*, le degré qui doit être dominé d’un dièse se trouve deux fois dans l’espace de cinq lignes; *comme par exemple, s’il y a deux degrez de Fa, deux degrez d’Ut, ou deux degrez de Sol*, on met des dièses l’un sur l’autre *de ces deux degrez*, ... Exemple: ...” ... “Mais quand le degré qui doit être dominé *par* d’un dièse ne se trouve qu’une fois dans l’espace des cinq lignes, on ne met qu’un dièse auprès de la clef. *Voyez l’Exemple précédent* [The following cannot be found as cited by David and Lussy:] On place le dièse et le bémol devant la note, ou au-dessus ou au-dessous, mais jamais derrière, et plus généralement devant.”

This arguably could be an example of editorial abridgements not shown by ellipsis, or a free quote of the original text. We suggest that David and Lussy cited from Saint Lambert’s treatise of 1697, which was re-edited in 1702.

A section from page 125 of the *Histoire de la notation* corresponds to a passage on page 14 of the Paris edition and to 35 of the Amsterdam:

“Il faut faire remarquer *deux choses* au lecteur, dit Saint-Lambert (*loc. cit.*), que les notes [in the Paris and Amsterdam editions it is written: *La première, que dans toutes les Pièces, les Notes*] sont séparées, avec de petites barres, par petites portions égales qu’on appelle mesures; Ce n’est pas à dire pour cela que chaque mesure d’une pièce contienne un nombre égal de notes, mais c’est à dire, que les notes d’une mesure, prises toutes ensemble, sont égales en valeur aux notes d’une autre mesure prises aussi *toutes* ensemble, comme un écu est égal à deux pièces de 3o sols [*de trente sols*] ou à quatre pièces de 15 sols [*de quinze sols: on sépare ainsi les Notes pour marquer les divisions qui sont naturellement dans le chant ...* ]”. [In Saint Lambert’s text a long section on the comparison of rhetoric in music and in speech follows, which is omitted by David and Lussy. What continues can be found on page 15 of the Paris edition and page 37 of Amsterdam:] “Or, le signe qu’on met au commencement d’une pièce marque ces trois choses *à la fois*: combien il doit y avoir de notes dans chaque mesure, a combien de temps elle doit se battre, à quel mouvement, c’est-à-dire quelle vitesse ou quelle gravité il faut donner à la pièce.”

David and Lussy may have made some editorial corrections. However, this argument does not hold up when we examine texts from page 155, as seen in the table below.

David and Lussy, <i>Histoire de la notation</i> , p. 155	Monsieur de Saint Lambert: Paris edition 1702, p. 65; Amsterdam edition — pp. 138–39
“Ces mesures sont si rares, que je n’ai point vu d’air composé sur aucune d’elles, excepté pour la 12/8, une gigue de Monsieur d’Englebert, et le bel air: <i>Ad un cuore</i> , dans l’ <i>Europe galante</i> .”	“...ces Mesures sont si rares, dans nôtre Musique, que je n’ay point encore vû d’Airs composez sur aucune d’elles; excepté seulement trois qui sont à douze pour huit; sçavoir, deux Gîgues de M <sup>r</sup> . d’Anglebert, & ce bel Air Italien de l’ <i>Europe Galante</i> , <i>Ad un cuore</i> .”

In the following example, the two texts are combined with divergences from Saint Lambert's text in our square brackets:

“Ces mesures sont si rares, dit-il, [dans nôtre Musique], que je n'ai point [encore] vu [vû] d'air composé sur aucune d'elles, excepté [seulement trois] pour la 12/8 [qui sont à douze pour huit], une gigue [sçavoir, deux Giges] de Monsieur d'Englebert [Mr. d'Anglebert], et [&] le [ce] bel air [Italien: *Ad un cuore*], dans l'*Europe galante* [in full: ce bel Air Italien de l'Europe Galante, *Ad un cuore*]”.

Spellings of the names varied of course but omissions are rare in David and Lussy. For example, Rousseau's explanation from the dictionary [57]<sup>28</sup> of the term “BÉMOL ou B MOL” is cited correctly by David and Lussy [18, 122], with omission points placed where the text is cut off. The only changes are orthographic editing.

The case is very different in quotes from Saint Lambert's treatises, and suggests that authors of the *Histoire de la notation* used the earlier edition of 1697.

There is one more notable passage cited by David and Lussy, a short quote related to tempo indications. The author's quote: “avec sentiment, gravement, légèrement, fort vite.” The context of this passage, on page 156, suggested the places in the 1702 Paris (p. 25) and Amsterdam (p. 58) editions. Saint Lambert wrote the terms, comparing with the *Histoire de la notation*, in a different order and the words “avec sentiment” are omitted: “LENTEMENT, GRAVEMENT, LEGEREMENT, GAYEMENT, VÎTE, FORT VÎTE, & semnables...” (see also the copy from the Amsterdam edition given lower).

quelqu'un de ces

**MOTS, LENTEMENT, GRAVEMENT, LEGEREMENT,  
GAYEMENT, VÎTE, FORT VÎTE, & semblables, pour  
suppléer par-là à l'impuissance du Signe, à exprimer  
leur intention. Cet-**

Figure 9. De Saint Lambert, *Les Principes du Clavecin*, Amsterdam, no date, p. 58

David and Lussy provided such texts exclusively because they had access to the 1697 version. If we return to Brossard, it becomes clear that he too must have had access to an earlier version, which we have not found yet.

Some information can be gathered also from the *Catalogue Bibliographique*, compiled by the librarian of the Paris Conservatoire National, Jean-Baptiste Weckerlin. Though there is no special entry on Saint Lambert's treatises, and he is mentioned only in connection with Fr. Couperin, a critical comment on the size of the print layout as stated by Fétis for the Amsterdam edition of *Principes* can be found: “L'édition d'Amsterdam, sans date, petit in-8 et non grand in-4º comme dit Fétis [the Amsterdam edition without date, is in small 8, and not in-4º as Fétis tells]” [67, 452, fn. 1].

Weckerlin does not mention the treatise on accompaniment in the *Catalogue Bibliographique*, which might suggest that the Conservatoire National at that time did

<sup>28</sup> David and Lussy used the edition of 1863.

not own works. But it also suggests that Weckerlin borrowed his information from another source, or had just seen the treatise.

As to Weckerlin's comparison of the *Principes* and Couperin's *L'Art de toucher le clavecin*: according to Weckerlin, Couperin did not know "les *Principes du clavecin par monsieur de Saint-Lambert*, parus en 1697" [67, 452].

In Bologna, the scholar, composer and bibliographer Gaetano Gaspari [24, vol. 1, 253, 340] compiled a catalogue "della Biblioteca del Liceo Musicale di Bologna" at around the same time of Weckerlin's compilation. Gaspari is the first scholar to give information about an Italian translations (in manuscript form) of Saint Lambert's treatises.<sup>29</sup>

First, Gaspari dates the Paris edition to 1680:

- (1)<sup>30</sup> "Saint-Lambert (de) n. Trattato dell' accompagnamento, dell' organo e di qualsivoglia altro stromento. Parigi, Ballard, 1680 – in 4° oblungo."

Arnold states that "an Italian translation manuscript of Chapters V–IX [is] preserved in the library of the Liceo Musicale at Bologna." Arnold further notes that the titles of the five extant chapters "correspond exactly (as Professor Francesco Vatielli, the courteous librarian of the Liceo Musicale, has kindly informed the writer) with those of the same chapters of the *Nouveau traité*."<sup>31</sup> Neither Arnold nor Vatielli mention Gaspari's *Catalogo*. However, this information corresponds to the next entry in Gaspari:

- (2) "È un brano di traduzione italiana in un manoscritto in foglio di carte 20 del trattato in francese di questo autore. Comincia a mezzo del capitolo 4 cotal versione [And a part of this treatise is translated on 20 manuscript pages from French, written by the same author. Beginning with a small part/version of the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter]."

Gaspari also gives the title of the Amsterdam edition:

- (3) "Nouveau traite de l'accompagnement du Clavecin, de l'Orgue, et des autres instruments par Monsieur De Saint-Lambert. – A Amsterdam, aux depens De Estienne Roger. – in 8°, senz' anno, di pag. 134. (Colla versione italiana manoscritta [with an Italian translation added to make one book])."

This is followed by a short commentary on the bibliographic entry:

- (4) "La prima edizione è di Parigi, Ballard, 1680, in 4° oblungo. Del 1707 lo stesso tipografo ne fece una ristampa pure in-4° oblungo. Questa sarà senza dubbio una terza edizione che non vedendosi citat del Fétis convien credere che gli fosse ignota."<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Some details from the *Catalogue of the Liceo Musicale* are cited and commented by Fr. Th. Arnold [4, vol. 1, 173]. Harris-Warrick only mentions the Bologna Italian manuscripts [28, X], but omits the publication date "1680", given by Gaspari.

<sup>30</sup> Here and further our special enumeration is given.

<sup>31</sup> To be exact, the Italian translation also includes a part of the 4<sup>th</sup> Chapter.


<sup>32</sup> According to this comment concerning Fétis and the one following below, the authors of this paper came to the conclusion that Gaspari had at his disposal the first edition of Fétis's *Biographie universelle* (volume VII, 1844, 371), where the Amsterdam editions were not mentioned. In the second edition of Fétis's *Biographie universelle*, the information on the Amsterdam edition of the *Nouveau Traité* is present.

(The first edition was printed in Paris, by Ballard, 1680, in-4° oblong. The 1707 type is nothing else but a pure restamping of it in-4° by the same printer. It [the Amsterdam edition] is without doubt a third edition, which since not cited by Fétis [in Fétis's first edition of 1844], convinces us that it was unknown to him.)

Neither Arnold nor Harris-Warrick mention that the treatise on accompaniment was said by Gaspari to have been “published for the first time in Paris in 1680”, and that the print lay-out was “in-4 oblong.” Libraries generally list print size with “in-8.”<sup>33</sup>

Gaspari cites the title according to the one published in Amsterdam, but more important is his comment on the edition: “Lichtenthal confuses this author with Michele Lambert; but Fétis noted that Saint Lambert was another person. This opus saw light for the first time in Paris in 1697 [printed by] Ballard in 4° oblong, and was reprinted by the same typographer in the same size in 1702. This third edition [i.e. the Amsterdam one] is not mentioned by Fétis.”

The handwritten title listed under call number No. MS. E39 Cod.9 reads “Traité de l'accompagnement du clavecin, de l'orgue et de quelques autres instrumens” [our underlining]. The title as given in the Italian manuscript can be found in David and Lussy, Gaspari, Arnold and in earlier works by Forkel, Sulzer, Gerber & c.; the addition of “quelques” was used only by Fétis in 1844.



**Figure 10.** De Saint Lambert, Italian translation of *Traité de l'accompagnement du clavecin* (Bologna, *Biblioteca del Liceo Musicale di Bologna*, library No. MS. E39 Cod.9, title page)

The next important source for our investigation is the *Quellen-Lexikon*, published by Robert Eitner, where the entry is headed “Saint-Lambert, Michel de” [19, vol. 8, 387]. Eitner gives credit to the research by Fétis, stating that “Gerber and his followers confused [de Saint Lambert] with the Paris royal Kapellmeister Michael Lambert.” The keyboard treatises are listed by Eitner as: “Traité de l'accompagnement du clavecin, de l'orgue, et de quelques autres instrumens. Paris, 1680 Ballard. qu4°.”

Eitner points out that he takes his information from Fétis. He then gives the title in Italian: “Trattato dell'accomp., dell'organo... Parisi 1680 Ballard. qu4°. [Bologna im Ms.]” Next follows the title of the Paris edition: “Nouveau traité de l'accompagnement du clavecin, de l'orgue

<sup>33</sup> One may come out with a deluding suggestion that the print-out-size “in-8° oblong” might have been confused with “in-4°”.



et des autres instruments. Paris 1707. Ballard. qu4<sup>o</sup> [B. B. Paris Nat. Stadtb. Besançon.” Interesting is the size, “qu4<sup>o</sup>”, and that the treatise was held at “Paris Nat. Stadtb. Besançon.” Next is the Amsterdam edition: “Amst[er]dam Roger. 8<sup>o</sup>. 134 S. [in] Glasgow. [and] br[itish] Mus[eu]m] Bologna nebst einer italien. Uebersetz[ung] im Ms. [...]” Eitner continues: “The Cat[alogue]<sup>34</sup> says (I. 253) that this “Nouveau traité is just a 2<sup>nd</sup>] edition of the above named work [Der. Kat. sagt (I 253), dass dieser Nouveau traité nur eine 2. Ausg. des obigen Werkes sei” (i.e. the Nouveau traité de l’accompagnement... Paris 1707 ...).”

1697 is given for the *Principes du clavecin* also by A. Beyschlag. He writes that Rousseau [1687] recommended ornamentation in performance, however that “in 1697 Saint-Lambert formulated his own opinion that the subtraction of appoggiaturas from the succeeding main note might be more appropriate in the singing style, but in keyboard pieces it is much better to choose anticipation” [9, 71–72]. In a footnote on page 72, Beyschlag confirms his point of view citing a passage from Saint Lambert on the “Port de Voix.” Our comparison of the quoted text with the 1702 original as well as the Amsterdam edition showed only minor editorial and spelling deviations, which can be explained by the use of a more modern French. (For example, “voix” in the original is written with a small letter, but Beyschlag writes it with a capital letter; we find “siot” instead of “doit”; Beyschlag writes “et” instead of the sign “&” and so forth.)

Analogous bibliographic evidence can be found in Riemann’s *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte* where he writes: “Michel de Saint Lambert, Clavecinist. Schrieb eine Generalbaßschule 1680 und eine Klavierschule (Principes de clavecin 1697) [Michel de Saint Lambert, the harpsichordist, wrote a thorough-bass school in 1680 and a harpsichord school (Principes de clavecin 1697)]” [56, 509]. Other examples are the *Encyclopédie* by A. Lavignac [34] where chapter V, “La Musique Française de Lulli a Gluck (1687–1789)” was written by L. de la Laurencie, who later became the founder and president of the Société Française de Musicologie [33]. References to Saint Lambert’s works are found in Laurencie’s monograph on the history of the violin in France: “Saint-Lambert, *Les Principes du clavecin* (1702), *Nouveau Traité de l’accompagnement au clavecin* (1707)” [33, 36]. But the *Encyclopédie* article gives another date for the *Principes*. Laurencie states that the *Principes de clavecin* of 1697 was “the first méthode for this instrument published in France, and that the maîtres must judge [the abilities of] the pupils” [33, 1501]. Unfortunately, nothing is included which would explain the change of date.

I. Herrmann-Bengen does not question the date 1697 in her work on tempo indications. She not only quotes from Saint Lambert, but gives the shelf number for the 1697 treatise: “nach dem Original in Paris, Bibl. Nat. Vm 851” [31, 95, fn 40]. Herrmann-Bengen’s research is based on Margarete Reimann’s work [54, 46], who provides the above mentioned reference in her footnote 102. What is important here is that Saint Lambert’s *Les principes* were published in 1697, and that this edition was kept in the *Bibliothèque National de France* in Paris under number “Vm. 851.” Reimann studied it there some time before 1940 but did not cite from it. She only indicated that the tempo of the “Menuet de Clavecin,” according to Saint Lambert, differs from the “Menuet à danser.” Herrmann-Bengen

<sup>34</sup> But it is worth noting that Eitner bears in mind not only Gasparis’ *Catalogo*, but also (cf. his *Verzeichniss der benutzten Quellen*, in Bd. 10, 461) another Bologna publication: “Catalogo della collezione d’autografi lasciata alla R. Accademico Masseangelo Masseangeli. E catalogo della collezione di ritratti in fotografia 1. Bologna Regia Tipogr... 1881[–96].”

cites Saint Lambert's passage on the menuet in her book in full [31, 154]: "C'est ainsi que se battent encore les Menuets à danser, quoy que la Mesure en soit de trois Noires, parce qu'on les jouent (sic) *fort gayement*. Je dis les Menuets à danser; car il y a des Menuets de Clavecin qui ne se jouent pas ordinairement si *vite*." (It is in this way that all minuets for dancing are beaten, even though the measure is made up of three quarter notes, since they are played very quickly. I say minuets for dancing because there are harpsichord minuets which are not ordinarily played as fast as this).<sup>35</sup>

During the period 1965–2012, the questions surrounding Saint Lambert's name and the publication dates of his treatises kept cropping up at times in works on the French harpsichord tradition and harpsichord performance during the period 1650–1750. But the most radical change in opinion came with the publication of Arnold's monograph. Contemporary authors often referred and appealed to his fundamental work, and then to the work of scholars who followed and expanded his research: Burchill, Harris-Warrick, Powell, and Schweitzer.

Arnold writes that, based on the "valuable details of confirmatory evidence collected by M. Tessier", "Saint-Lambert's preface to the *Nouveau Traité &c.* (Paris, Ballard, 1707), ... contains the reference to his earlier work, *Les principes du clavecin* (Paris, Ballard, 1702)." This fact comes from Saint Lambert himself, and leads Arnold to the conclusion that Saint-Lambert could not have published a treatise on accompaniment before publishing his *Principes du clavecin* of 1702. A statement from Saint Lambert's own "Conclusion"<sup>36</sup> is still more convincing: "I could add here a Recapitulation like the same I included at the end of the *Principles of the Harpsichord*, but that does not seem very necessary."<sup>37</sup> However, neither Arnold nor other contemporary authors paid attention to the text on the of title pages of the treatises which may suggest the possibility of two treatise on accompaniment: one with the title *Traité de l'accompagnement du clavecin, de l'orgue, et des autres instruments* [of 1680] and the other *Nouveau Traité de l'accompagnement du Clavecin & des autres Instrumens* [of 1707].

There still remains the question of the publication date of Saint Lambert's *Les principes du clavecin*. The generally accepted date is 1702 (Paris). In her arguments that the earliest publication was indeed 1702, Harris-Warrick draws on the 1703 *Dictionnaire* by Brossard, reasoning: "In his *Dictionnaire de musique* of 1703, Sébastien de Brossard lists 'le Sr de Saint Lambert' among the 'Auteurs qui ont écrit en François ... que j'ay vus, lus, et examinez moy-même" [28, X]. The same line of reasons is adhered to by Powell: "Saint Lambert's theoretical works were well known and widely quoted by eighteenth-century theorists. Upon publication of *Les Principes du clavecin*, Brossard in his *Dictionnaire de musique* (Paris, 1703) mentioned Saint Lambert among the "Auteurs qui ont écrit en françois... que j'ay vus, lus, et examinez moy-même" [28, IX].

<sup>35</sup> Tr. by Harris-Warrick, 38; while the words in square brackets belong to the author of the article.

<sup>36</sup> P. 64; Amsterdam edition: p. 134.

<sup>37</sup> "Je pourrais ajo ter ici une Recapitulation semblable à celle que j'ai mise à la fin des Principes du Clavecin, mais cela ne me paroît pas trop nécessaire." Tr. by Powell, 115. However, there is a slight chance that the 1680 edition of de Saint Lambert's *Traité* or some absolutely indisputable information of its publication might still be found.

All of these arguments are refuted by the fact that Brossard already lists Saint Lambert in his 1701 *Dictionnaire des Termes*, suggesting that *Les Principes du clavecin* were published earlier, i.e. in 1697, a conclusion which concurs with many sources examined above, especially with David and Lussy, and Hermann-Bengen.

Thus, we can claim with some confidence that Saint Lambert's *Les Principes du clavecin* was published first in 1697 in Paris, and the *Nouveau traité de l'accompagnement* in 1707, again in Paris. The question of a 1680 edition of the *Traité de l'accompagnement* remains unanswered.

### References

1. Adlung, Jacob. 1758. *Anleitung zu der musikalischen Gelahrtheit theils vor alle Gelehrte, so das Band aller Wissenschaften einsehen; theils vor die Liebhaber der edlen Tonkunst überhaupt; theils und sonderlich vor die, so das Clavier vorzüglich lieben; theils vor die Orgel= und Instrumentmacher*. Erfurt: J. D. Jungnicol.
2. D'Alembert, Jean Le Rond, and Denis Diderot. 1780. *Encyclopedie, ou Dictionnaire Raisonné des Sciences, des Arts et des Métiers*, vol. 26. Berne, Lausanne: Societes Typographiques.
3. D'Anglebert, Jean-Henry. [1689]. *Pièces de Clavecin ... Livre premier*. Paris: L'Auteur.
4. Arnold, Frank Thomas. 1965. *The Art of Accompaniment from a Thorough-Bass as Practiced in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Centuries*, in 2 vols. New York: Dover.
5. Becker, Carl Ferdinand. 1836–1839. *Systematisch-chronologische Darstellung der musikalischen Literatur von der frühesten bis auf die neueste Zeit*. Leipzig: Robert Friese.
6. *Bibliotheca D. Joannis Galloys... Seu Catalogus Librorum*. 1710. Paris: Laurentio Seneuze.
7. Blankenburg, Quirinus van. 1739. *Elementa Musica of Niew Licht*. Gravenhage: Laurens Berkoske.
8. Borde, Jean-Benjamin de La. 1780. *Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne*, vol. 3. Paris: Ph.-D. Pierres, Eugene Onfroy.
9. Beyschlag, Adolf. 1908. *Die Ornamentik der Musik*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
10. Brossard, Sébastien de (l'Abbé). 1701. *Dictionnaire des termes grecs, latins et italiens, dont on se sert fréquemment dans toutes sortes de Musique, & particulièrement dans l'Italienne*. Paris: Jean-Baptiste-Christophe Ballard.
11. Burchill, James Frederick. 1979. "Saint-Lambert's 'Nouveau Traité de l'accompagnement: a translation with commentary.'" Ph. D. diss., University of Rochester.
12. *Catalogue des livres de musique & autres, qui se vendent à Paris chez Christophe Ballard*. 1697. Paris: Ballard.
13. Cabrini, Michele. 2012. "The Composer's Eye: Focalizing Judith in the Cantatas by Jacquet de la Guerre and Brossard." *Eighteenth-Century Music* 9, no. 1: 9–45. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1478570611000315>.
14. *Catalogue des livres de musique, et autres qui se vendent chez Christophe Ballard*. 1699. Paris: Ballard.
15. *Catalogue des Livres de Musique, et autres qui vendent chez Christophe Ballard*. 1704. Paris: Ballard.
16. "Catalogue des Livres qui se trouvent à Amsterdam, chez Michel Charles le Cene." 1710. In Vergne M. de la Comtesse de la Fayette. *Histoire de Madame Henriette Premiere*

- Femme de Philippe de France Duc D'Orleans*, no paging. Amsterdam: Michel Charles Le Cene.
17. *Catalogue Général et alphabétique de Musique, imprimée ou gravée en France*. 1742. Paris: Boivin ... et Christophe-Jean-François Ballard, Fils.
  18. David, Ernest, and Mathis Lussy. 1882. *Histoire de la notation musicale depuis ses origines*. Paris: Heugel et fils.
  19. Eitner, Robert. 1900–1904. *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Quellen-Lexikon der Musiker und Musikgelehrten <...>*, in 10 vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Haertel.
  20. Fague, Juste-Adrien-Lenoir de La. 1862. *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque Musicale de feu M. J. Adr. De LA FAGE, ancien maître de Chapelle*. Paris: L. Potier.
  21. Fétis, François-Joseph. 1844. *Biographie universelle*, vol. 8. Bruxelles: Meline, Cans et Compagnie.
  22. Fétis, François-Joseph. 1867. *Biographie universelle*, vol. 7. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Paris: Didot freres, Fils et C<sup>o</sup>.
  23. Forkel, Johann Nicolaus. 1792. *Allgemeine Litteratur der Musik. Zweyter Theil*. Leipzig: Schwickert.
  24. Gaspari, Gaetano, and Ugo Sesini. 1890. *Catalogo della Biblioteca del Liceo Musicale di Bologna*, vol. 1. [Bologna]: Libreria Romagnoli dall'Acqua.
  25. Gerber, Ernst Ludwig. *Historisch-Biographisches Lexicon der Tonkünstler...*, erster Theil. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1790.
  26. Guillo, Laurent. 2004–2005. “La bibliothèque de musique des Ballard d’après l’inventaire de 1750 et les notes de Sébastien de Brossard.” *Revue de Musicologie* 90, no. 2: 283–345, and 91, no. 1: 195–232.
  27. Harris-Warrick, Rebecca, trans. and ed. 1984. *Principles of the Harpsichord by Monsieur de Saint Lambert* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  28. Harris-Warrick, Rebecca. 1984. “Translator’s Introduction.” In *Principles of the Harpsichord by Monsieur de Saint Lambert*, trans. and ed. by Rebecca Harris-Warrick, VII–XIX. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  29. Harris-Warrick, Rebecca. 2001. “Saint-Lambert.” In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Second Edition*, in 29 vols., ed. by Stanley Sadie and John Tyrrell, vol. 22: 103–4. London: Macmillan; New York: Oxford University Press USA.
  30. Harris-Warrick, Rebecca. 2005. “Saint-Lambert.” In *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik begründet von Friedrich Blume. Zweite, neubearbeitete Ausgabe herausgegeben von Ludwig Finscher. Personenteil*, vol. 14, 800. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
  31. Herrmann-Bengen, Irmgard. 1959. *Tempobezeichnungen: Ursprung, Wandel im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Tutzing: Schneider.
  32. Huygens, Christiaan. 1718. *Nouveau traité de la pluralité des mondes*. Amsterdam: Etienne Roger.
  33. Laurencie, Lionel de La. 1922. *L'école française de violon de Lully à Viotti: études d'histoire et d'esthétique*, vol. I. Paris: Librairie Delagrave.
  34. Lavignac, Alexandre Jean Albert. 1931. *Encyclopédie de la musique et Dictionnaire du Conservatoire ... Première partie. Histoire de la musique*. Paris: Librairie Delagrave.
  35. *Les Femmes Sçavantes ou Bibliothéque des Dames Qui traite des Sciences qui conviennent aux Dames, de la conduite de leurs Etudes, des Livres qu'elles peuvent lire, Et L'Histoire de celles qui ont excellé dans les Sciences. Par Monsieur N. C.* 1718. Amsterdam: Michel Charles Le Cene.

36. Lesure, François. 1969. *Bibliographie des éditions musicales publiées par Estienne Roger et Michel-Charles Le Cène, Amsterdam, 1696-1743*. Paris: Heugel.
37. Lichtenthal, Peter. 1826. *Dizionario e bibliografia della musica*, 2<sup>nd</sup> part. Milano: Antonio Fontana.
38. Martini, Giovanni Battista. 1757. *Storia Della Musica*, in 3 vols. Bologna: Lelio dalla Volpe.
39. Mattheson, Johann. 1722. *Critica Musica... Erstes Stück*. Hamburg: Autor.
40. Mattheson, Johann. *Grosse General-Bass-Schule*. 1731. Hamburg: Kissner.
41. Mattheson, Johann. *Exemplarische Organisten-Probe*. 1719. Hamburg: Schiller und Kissner.
42. *Mélanges sur la musique; règles de composition; notes et extraits; par Étienne LOULIÉ*. n.d. <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b525178077>.
43. *Mémoires pour L'Histoire Des Sciences & des beaux Arts. Recüeilles par l'Ordre de Son Altesse Serenissime Monseigneur Prince Souverain de Dombes. Janvier 1708*. 1708. Paris: Etienne Ganeau.
44. Mendel, Hermann. 1876. *Musikalisches Conversations-Lexikon*, vol. 6. Berlin: Robert Oppenheim.
45. *Mercure de France*. 1767. December.
46. Panov, Alexei, and Ivan Rosanoff. 2012. "De Saint Lambert and de Brossard: Unknown and Known." *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Arts* 2, no. 1: 28–44.
47. Panov, Alexei, and Ivan Rosanoff. 2018. "Some thoughts on the conventional alteration of rhythm." *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Arts* 8, no. 2: 195–213. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu15.2018.203>.
48. Panov, Alexei, and Ivan Rosanoff. 2015. "Sébastien de Brossard's *Dictionnaire* of 1701: A comparative analysis of the complete copy." *Early Music* 43, no. 3: 417–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/em/cav044>.
49. Powell, John S., trans. 1991. *A New Treatise on Accompaniment with the Harpsichord, the Organ, and with Other Instruments. By Monsieur de Saint Lambert*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
50. Powell, John S. 1991. "Introduction." In *A New Treatise on Accompaniment with the Harpsichord, the Organ, and with Other Instruments. By Monsieur de Saint Lambert*, trans. and ed. by John S. Powell, VII–XVII. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
51. Prætorius, Michael. *SYNTAGMATIS MuSICI ... TOMuS SECuNDuS De ORGANOGRAPHIA*. Wolfenbüttel: E. Holwein, 1619.
52. Querard, Joseph Marie. 1836. *La France Littéraire*, vol. 8. Paris: Didot freres.
53. Rameau, Jean-Philippe. 1722. *Traité de L'Harmonie*. Paris: Ballard.
54. Reimann, Margarete. 1940. *Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte der französischen Klaviersuite*. Regensburg: G. Bosse.
55. *Répertoire International des Sources Musicales*, vols. VI<sup>1</sup>, VI<sup>2</sup>: *Écrits Imprimés Concernant la Musique*. 1971. München: G. Henle.
56. Riemann, Hugo. 1912. *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte ... Zweiter Band zweiter Teil*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
57. Rousseau, Jean Jacques. 1768. *Dictionnaire de Musique*. Paris: Duchesne.
58. De Saint Lambert. 1702. *Les Principes du Clavecin*. Paris: Ballard.
59. De Saint Lambert. 1707. *Nouveau traité de l'accompagnement*. Paris: Ballard.
60. De Saint Lambert. c1710. *Les Principes du Clavecin*. Amsterdam: Roger.

61. Schilling, Gustav. 1835–1841. *Encyclopädie der gesamten musikalischen Wissenschaften*. Stuttgart: Köhler.
62. Schultz, Timothy. 2001. *Performing French Classical Music: Sources and Applications*. Hillsdale: Pendragon Press.
63. Straeten, Edmond Vander. 1867. *La musique aux pays-bas avant le XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, vol. 1. Bruxelles: C. Muquardt.
64. Sulzer, Johann Georg. 1792. “Begleitung.” In *Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste... Erster Theil ... Neue vermehrte zweyte Auflage*. Leipzig: Weidmann.
65. Sulzer, Johann Georg. 1792. *Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste ... Zweyter Theil ... Neue vermehrte zweyte Auflage*. Leipzig: Weidmann.
66. Walther, Johann Gottfried. 1732. *Musicalisches Lexicon oder Musicalische Bibliothec <...>*. Leipzig: Wolfgang Deer.
67. Weckerlin, Jean-Baptiste. 1885. *Bibliothèque du Conservatoire National de Musique et de Déclamation. Catalogue Bibliographique*. Paris: Didot.
68. Wilkes, John. 1814. *Encyclopædia Londinensis*, vol. 12. London: J. Adlard.

Received: February 23, 2023

Accepted: March 7, 2023

#### Authors' Information:

**Alexei A. Panov** — Doctor Habil. (Art Studies), Full Professor at the Department of Organ, Harpsichord and Carillon, Faculty of Arts, Saint Petersburg State University

**Ivan V. Rosanoff** — Doctor Habil. (Art Studies), Full Professor at the Department of Organ, Harpsichord and Carillon, Faculty of Arts, Saint Petersburg State University; Full Professor at the Department of Organ and Harpsichord, Rimsky-Korsakov Saint Petersburg State Conservatory

Получено: 23 февраля 2023 года

Принято к публикации: 7 марта 2023 года

#### Об авторах:

**Алексей Анатольевич Панов** — доктор искусствоведения, профессор Кафедры органа, клавирина и карильона, Факультет искусств Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета

**Иван Васильевич Розанов** — доктор искусствоведения, профессор Кафедры органа, клавирина и карильона, Факультет искусств Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета; профессор Кафедры органа и клавирина Санкт-Петербургской государственной консерватории имени Н. А. Римского-Корсакова