

CHOREOLOGICA

Who Said Elephants Can't Dance

Grete Wiesenthal

Social Dance in Georgian Bath

Quarrelling Brothers

La princesse de Darmstadt

Prague Conference 2016

Volume 8 No. 1

Winter 2016/Spring 2017

ISSN 1746-5737



**European
Association
of Dance
Historians**



CHOREOLOGICA

Volume 8 Number 1 Winter 2016/Spring 2017



European
Association
of Dance
Historians

Volume 8 Number 1 Winter 2016/Spring 2017

ISSN 1746-5737

European Association of Dance Historians

9 St Margarets Avenue,

Torquay,

TQ1 4LW

eadhcommittee@gmail.com

© **European Association of Dance Historians 2017**

Editorial Board

Editor: **Geoffrey Whitlock**

Editorial Board: **Ricardo Barros, Madeleine Inglehearn, Geoffrey Whitlock**

Production Editor: **Elizabeth Morrell**

Published on behalf of the EADH by **Dance Books Ltd.**,

Southwold House,

Isington Road,

Binsted,

Hampshire GU34 4PH

www.dancebooks.co.uk

Printed by Lightning Source

Quarrelling Brothers: The establishment of the Académie Royale de Danse and changes in dance teaching

RICARDO BARROS WITH NICOLETTE MOONEN



Nicholas Bonnard, *Le maître à danser*, 1682.

In March 1661 King Louis XIV of France announced the foundation of the Académie Royale de Danse. The decree, one of his first after Louis effectively rose to power, has been regarded by modern eyes as a beacon symbolising the King's passion for dancing and, most importantly, for the further enhancement of the dance profession and teaching.

Its founding document – the *Lettres Patentes*,¹ verified by the Parliament in March 1662 and only published the following year – outlines a twofold purpose: to prevent ‘abuses capable of ruining this art beyond repair, caused by those ignorant or unskilled who show it in public’,² and to ‘re-establish the art to its former perfection and to develop it whenever possible’.³ Rather succinct, with only twenty-two pages, the document sets out twelve statutes and, as we shall note, implicitly pledges the standardisation of teaching methods and rising standards in dance profession (including performance and choreography).

The *modus operandi* of the Académie consisted of nominating, at first, thirteen so-called ‘experts’, or ‘Ancient Dancing Masters’,⁴ who would meet once a month in order to ‘discuss the status of dance, advise and deliberate on methods to improve it, and correct abuses and faults that have, or might henceforth, be introduced’.⁵ Quite importantly, it established that the thirteen masters should run the Académie ‘according to the set of [twelve] statutes’⁶ attached to the *Lettres Patentes*.

However, what were such ‘abuses’ that compromised the integrity of the Art? What was the status quo, political or social, which set the scene for such shuffling to happen? Did the new institution fit its purpose? In order to answer that, we need to observe the political controversy that rose from its creation – a bitter quarrel that lasted over three decades and which brought centre stage another powerful character: the Confrairie [sic] de St Julien.

In reality, the Académie Royale de Danse wasn’t the first institution created in France with the purpose of regulating artistic production and teaching. Established in 1331, the Confrairie de St Julien was a guild (or ‘Maîtrise’) formed with the purpose of regulating Dancing Masters and instrumentalists. These included ‘high’ musicians (i.e. violin family and viols) and ‘low’ musicians (i.e. minstrels, bagpipers, hurdy-gurdy, pipe & tabor players). Interestingly, another Royal Decree of 1658 (just three years before the foundation of the Académie) established the revised statutes of the Confrairie which ruled, amongst many other things, that:

The Masters, either in Paris or any other town of the Kingdom, shall keep any apprentice for a period of four years. [...] Nobody from the Kingdom

1 *Letres patentes du Roy pour l'establissement de l'Académie Royale de Danse en la ville de Paris* (Paris, 1663) <<http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k76291j>> (last accessed 28 April 2016).

2 *Letres patentes*, pp.4-5.

3 *Letres patentes*, p.6.

4 *Letres patentes*, I, p.13.

5 *Letres patentes*, II, p.13.

6 *Letres patentes*, pp.8-9.

or from abroad can open schools, particularly teach dances or how to play instruments, congregate in ensembles either at day or night – be it in public or private assemblies – or for this matter engage in any exercise of this science without having received the title of Master, or having it agreed by the ‘King of the violins’ [a title given to the chairman] or any of his lieutenants.⁷

Furthermore, any candidates who wished to join the Confrairie should (in addition to being submitted to the four-year long apprenticeship) pay sixty *livres* to the ‘King of Violins’, and ten *livres* for each single Master. Every Master should in turn pay the Confrairie thirty *sous* per year for their licence, and to pay the ‘King of Violins’ an extra fee for each of their pupils.⁸ One can quickly appreciate the substantial amount of money being exchanged for the licenses to join the Confrairie, considering that there were between four and five thousand Dancing Masters associated to the guild in the early 1660s.⁹

One of the main controversies surrounding the establishment of the Académie was the self-proclaimed ‘independence’ of Dance from the Confrairie’s statutes, as that Art would thenceforth be overseen by the new, rivalling Royal Academy:

We wish that the Art of Dancing to be forever more exempt from any regulations of guilds [*Lettres de Maîtrises*] [...], and if any such regulations rose, they are to be considered revoked, null and with no effect [...], and [the culprits] be subject to a fine of 1500 *livres*, plus damages and interest, payable to the Académie.¹⁰

In fact, the Académie stood in direct opposition against the old Confrairie in many other issues, as can be noted in the Académie’s *Lettres Patentes* and statutes. For instance:

- **Article III** dictates that every Saturday, two chosen Ancient Masters would meet and receive other Dancing Masters ‘or others’ (complete novices,

7 *Statuts et Reglemens des Maîtres de Danses et Joueurs d’instrument, tant hauts que bas, pour toutes les villes du royaume, registrés en Parlement le vingt-deuxième Août 1659.* Statues I and VI (Paris, D’Houry et Fils, 1753), contained in Micheline Cumant, *Musicien et Professeur de Musique au XVIIIème siècle*, Wisconsin, Books on Demand, 2013, pp.12-14.

8 According to Francis Turner in ‘Money exchange rates in 1632’ <<http://1632.org/1632Slush/1632money.rtf>> (last accessed 28 Dec 2014), 1 French *livre* = 1 guilder of the time = £24 in today’s money. Thus, approximate conversions are: 60 *livres* = £1440; 10 *livres* = £240; 30 *sous* = 1.5 *livres* = £36. For an indication of monetary value based on estimate of rates of pay, please visit <<http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~unclefred/MONETARY.htm>> (last accessed 28 Dec 2014).

9 Guillaume Dumanoir, *Le Mariage de la Musique avec la Danse*, Paris, 1664, Arnaldo Forni facs. edn., Bologna, 1985, p.47.

10 *Letres patentes*, p.10, also repeated on article X of Statutes, p.20.

perhaps?) who wished to teach dancing. Their task was 'to instruct these candidates on the way of dancing', and show them both old and new dances that had or would be created by the thirteen Ancient Masters. That way 'those wishing to teach would be capable of showing and avoiding the abuses and bad habits that could be contracted'.¹¹

- **Article VI** dictates that those wishing to apply for a membership should submit to the training with the 'Ancients', at a cost of 150 *livres* chargeable to the sons of existing Masters, or 300 *livres* from anybody else.¹²
- **Article VII** says that all those wishing to embark in the dance profession should register with the Académie, at the risk of never being allowed to join it if found otherwise.¹³
- **Article VIII** dictates that any choreography (old or new) should be approved by the Académie before being shown or taught.¹⁴

As one would expect this caused uproar, because violinists – who until then were entitled to teach violin and dancing under the Confrairie's regulations – were no longer permitted to 'hold classes' unless they, too, submitted to a costly re-training process to become associates of the new institution.

At that time, the 'King of the Violin' (the leader of the Confrairie) was Guillaume Dumanoir (1615-1697), a violinist, leader of the famous Vingt-quatre violons du Roy since 1655 – in fact, the one who really had daily contact with the orchestra, while its director Jean Baptiste Lully (particularly from 1661 onwards when the later assumed the post of *surintendant de musique*) only directed the Vingt-quatre on special occasions.

Not surprisingly, the main opposer to the establishment of the Académie was Dumanoir, the one receiving substantial regular payments in the capacity of 'King of the violins'. Soon after its foundation was announced, Dumanoir filed a court case against the Académie. His case was simply dismissed by the Parliament, and a harsh punishment was put in place against those not associated with the Académie who attempted to teach dancing – this included destroying their instruments and imprisonment.¹⁵

Having stirred the bees' nest, Dumanoir's arguments caused the problem to escalate, with an irate response from the Academicians entitled *Academic*

11 *Letres patentes*, III, pp.14-15.

12 *Letres patentes*, VI, pp.17-18. According to Francis Turner (footnote 8), 150 *livres* = £3,600; 300 *livres* = £7,200.

13 *Letres patentes*, VII, p.18.

14 *Letres patentes*, VIII, p.18-19.

15 *Letres patentes*, under 'Arrest du Parlement de Paris, qui démet les Maistres Violons, de l'opposition par eux formée à l'enregistrement des Lettres d'établissement de l'Academie de Danse', p.28.

*discourse, to prove that dancing, in its most noble form, does not need musical instruments, and that it is absolutely independent from the violin.*¹⁶ This discourse, published together with the original *Lettres Patentes* in 1663, provocatively rebuts Dumanoir's offensives stating, in the opening paragraph, that:

It is difficult to imagine that Dance and the instruments – which have lived agreeably together for many centuries – could become confused in our [century], where both have reached their perfection. It was believed that their association was formed based on that of the harmony and movement of heavens, and that it should last forever. Also, Dance protests that it has never contributed to their disagreement, and that it has always been ready to follow [Music's] movements, provided these [movements] would equally be willing to adjust to those of Dance, and preserve this equality that made and sustains their association. But since the Violin – swollen with pride for having been introduced in the chambers of the greatest King, and for finding itself being favourably heard in all the entertainments – has wished to grant itself a superiority unheard of [...], Dance has believed it necessary to stand opposed to such a novelty, and to announce its independence from Music: to which it has well succeeded, for the King in his Providence has decided it was fair to establish a Royal Academy of Dance, where nothing of Music neither of instruments enter; just to prove that although Dance and the Violin have met thousands of times for the entertainments, they have not melted one into the other, and that there is no reason why to merge them.¹⁷

It seems that the thirteen academicians must have weighed Dumanoir's repute and considerable influence in the musical scene of the time, having decided to step up their offensive a notch to a quasi-personal level – not so much disparaging 'Music', but aiming at the Violin, and more directly at Dumanoir's person. The Academicians' tirades intensify, with a number of affirmations that are at times contradictory, if not bordering the nonsensical:

- They state that Dance is 'a body capable of subsisting without music'.¹⁸
- They vaguely attempt to appease matters, stating that Dance shall not 'speak in detrimental terms to Music, to which it shall always hold in high esteem; it will only endeavour to show its independence from the Violin, which has

16 *Lettres patentes*, under '*Discours Academique, pour prouver que la Danse dans sa plus noble partie n'a pas besoin des instruments de Musique, et qu'elle est en tout absolument indépendante du Violon*', pp.33-48.

17 *Lettres patentes*, pp.33-35.

18 *Lettres patentes*, p.36.

- attempted to subject her'.¹⁹ Note here the clear distinction between 'Music' and 'Violin', in a subtle innuendo that violinists are not real musicians.
- They argue that music only pleases the ears, while Dance 'truly unveils the secret emotions of the Soul',²⁰ once again suggesting that Music is nothing but insipid and incapable of stirring emotions.
 - They claim that Music is 'absolutely useless to those learning to dance', who wouldn't be able to follow the rhythm of music without first having learned the steps – the violin solely 'animates the dancers',²¹ and the implication is that the violins cannot offer anything of value in the teaching of dancing, as if their liaison was so superficial to be singularly based on rhythmical counterpoint, if not on the shallowest form of 'counting'.
 - They question the credibility of the violins as they allegedly rise themselves to the status of 'kings' (alluding to Dumanoir's title at the Confrairie) and 'Dancing masters' for all they do is to play sounds – while Dance, 'through studied movements, devised steps, well-ordered figures, and thousands of eloquent movements, [...] endeavours to make the silence speak before the eyes of the spectators [and,] without resorting to the voice, make clear the nature, condition, state and passion of those characters it represents',²² once again implying that Music is sterile and does not succeed in conveying such Passions.
 - They claim that the Violin doesn't leave any lasting impressions on the body or in the spirit, for it only briefly 'flatters the ears' before its sounds disappear – while 'Dance imprints a sense of propriety (decency) and disentanglement on the body of those who practise it, and in the souls of those who watch it.'²³

It is clear that a major rupture from the previous teaching tradition was on the verge of being adopted. Possibly risen from genuine good intentions at first, the bitterness of the ever escalating arguments – a real battle of wills – must have taken the better of the 'Ancients' who stepped up their offensive with this Discourse, to the point of completely banishing music from dance classes. This brutal response in turn provoked an even harsher open counter-attack by the Confrairie, personified by Dumanoir.

Published in 1664, *Le Mariage de la Musique avec la Danse*²⁴ was Dumanoir's

19 *Letres patentes*, pp.36-37.

20 *Letres patentes*, pp.38-39.

21 *Letres patentes*, pp.42-43.

22 *Letres patentes*, pp.44-45.

23 *Letres patentes*, pp.45-46.

24 Guillaume Dumanoir, *Le Mariage de la Musique avec la Danse*, Paris, 1664, Arnaldo Forni facs. edn., Bologna, 1985.

published response to the Academicians' aggressive Discourse. It lists the inconsistencies and contradictions of the Academicians' rhetoric, in an attempt to expose their flaws, undermine their influence, diminish their reputation and revoke their powers. Throughout the book, Dumanoir writes under the role of 'Music' itself and refers to Academicians as 'reckless, pretentious, presumptuous, blind, proud children, evil spirits, rebels, great prophets, delicate gents'²⁵ amongst other derogatory terms – any hint of propriety and composure was long gone, for the controversy had reached new 'lows' and the debate was thence very much indeed in personal terms. Dumanoir argues that the Académie was the product of the thirteen Ancients' ambitions, and not of the King's will, and counter-argues:

- To the statement that dancers shall be free from the Confrairie's ruling: 'These audacious blinds [the thirteen Ancients] have, most of them, played the violin or other instrument for their whole lives, and know deep in their soul that Dance without music shall be nothing but disorder.'²⁶
- He points the contradiction that, if the governing body would be composed by 'thirteen Ancient Masters', these would obviously need to be 'Masters' (associated to the Maîtrise), in order to join the Académie; so if all links to the Confrairie and Lettres de Maîtrise to be considered void under the *Lettres Patentes*' regulations, this would also null their own 'Dancing Master' titles and, as such, the Académie would not be able to exist in the first place.²⁷
- Dumanoir questions if Ancients have considered the implications of changing the fortune of all Dancing Masters and depriving them of a legitimate 'Maîtrise'.²⁸
- To the statements that 'Music shall not be allowed in the Académie' and to the suggestion that the link between Music and Dance is shallowly based on rhythm, Dumanoir states that just like in painting and sculpture there needs to be a material or a canvas in order for the work to be created: 'it's not necessary to just have the wish to dance, and to have created in your soul all steps and figures, and even having good feet and legs to perform such task – above all, you need a medium for this exercise, in the form of harmony, the melody, the rules and bars, the movement and cadence of music [...], otherwise it would be impossible either to teach or to learn any dance, which would be like a body without a soul'.²⁹

25 Dumanoir, *Le Mariage*, p.58.

26 Dumanoir, *Le Mariage*, p.4.

27 Dumanoir, *Le Mariage*, pp.13-14.

28 Dumanoir, *Le Mariage*, p.5.

29 Dumanoir, *Le Mariage*, pp.10-12.

- He argues that most of the thirteen 'Ancients' are in fact very young, and there are many older and more experienced 'Ancients' who could more aptly do their job.³⁰
- He points Academicians' basic faults when, for instance, choreographing *Menuets* that are set to scores of *Sarabandes* or even *Chaconnes*, 'just because the time signature is the same', and similarly that they have adapted the *Pas de Bourrée* to fit the *Gavotte*, even though these are very different musical forms.³¹
- Dumanoir challenges the statement of the Académie's concern with 'preventing abuses', pointing out that the exclusive group of thirteen Ancients themselves are committing an abuse in taking on the task of the inspecting and overlooking all of the choreographic production, either old or new, according to the Académie's own Statute VIII,³² not to mention overlooking all the training of candidates, monopolising the process and, more worryingly, moulding and inculcating their own style and approach in the candidates.
- He affirms that nothing but pure jealousy and vanity rule the Academicians' spirits, as they 'incessantly question the incontestable, and wish to separate the two art forms, which are effectively one single body'.³³

Personal attacks aside, Dumanoir's well-argued counter-case highlights significant inconsistencies in the governing body of the proposed Académie Royale de Danse. Perhaps Dumanoir's social status (given his post as leader of the Vingt-quatre) and closeness to Lully might have lent considerable weight and credibility to his counter-arguments, as it fuelled an ongoing dispute on whether monopoly should be granted to the Académie, and consequently to the thirteen 'Ancients'.

Dumanoir might have been genuinely concerned with the status quo of relations between music and dancing, and how it was about to take a deep plunge. But one cannot fail to consider that the underlying reason for his rage might have been the triple financial impact it had on himself, on violinists in general and on the Confrairie. Dancing masters who defected to the Académie no longer paid their license (a hefty sum, as previously stated) to the Confrairie or to Dumanoir, meaning loss of income to the ageing guild and to himself. Violinists would not be able to teach dance in France (unless they defected to the Académie), meaning personal loss of income; but even those considering to defect would incur the costly expenses of membership, submit to the lengthy

30 Dumanoir, *Le Mariage*, pp.25-26.

31 Dumanoir, *Le Mariage*, p.32.

32 Dumanoir, *Le Mariage*, pp.28-29.

33 Dumanoir, *Le Mariage*, p.59.

and patronising re-training process, resulting in very bruised egos. It is very likely that such impositions may have been a contributing factor in compelling dancing masters to seek employment further afield in Europe, at that specific time.

In defence of the Académie, one could argue that the ageing Confrairie might have lost its hold on the 'quality control' when allowing members to join. After all, the Confrairie enlisted all sorts of musicians, from court violinists to *jongleurs* and street buskers. Perhaps the main aim of the new Académie was not to blatantly dissociate dance from music, but rather to distance itself from the amateurish stigma of the Confrairie.

Amidst the controversy, one could wrongly assume that the Confrairie would have had its final blow in 1669, when the Académie Royale de Musique was created. But the main purpose of the latter was rather different from those of its Dance counterpart. Although to a certain extent it regulated musical artistic production, it wasn't concerned at all with the training of music masters, as its main objective was to develop Opera in France – hence its dual connotation of enlisting composers as members, but also having its head-quarters doubled as the main Parisian Opera house (also known as Académie Royale de Musique). Thus, its establishment did not impose any further threat to the ailing and bruised Confrairie.

Whatever the real motives for both parties were, Dumanoir's intervention and persistence eventually paid off, as according to Philippe le Moal (*inspecteur de la création artistique au ministère de la Culture et de la Communication*), the quarrel finally died down in 1695 with a solemn judgement substantially granting the same rights to both parties.³⁴ Despite this, the Académie's power and influence grew stronger. Having not managed to secure full control over the training of Dancing Masters, at least it made sure to use a firm hand when exerting control over creative output. One of the most renowned cases of the Académie's intervention in this matter was the heavy criticism they published in the *Mercure de France* in September 1732 on Pierre Rameau's own system of notation, which had been published in the three editions of his *Abbrégé* [sic] *de la Nouvelle Methode* (c.1725, c.1728 and c.1732).³⁵ The newly developed system was greatly derived from the Beauchamps-Feuillet system, but seemed to be met with raised eyebrows by the well-established and powerful top league

34 Philippe de Moal, *Création de l'Académie royale de danse* <<http://www.archivesdefrance.culture.gouv.fr/action-culturelle/celebrations-nationales/recueil-2011/beaux-arts-musique-et-cinema/creation-de-l-academie-royale-de-danse>> (last accessed 28 April 2016).

35 Pierre Rameau, *Abbrégé de la nouvelle methode, dans l'Art d'ecrire ou de tracer toute sortes de danses de ville* (Paris, c. 1725) <<https://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=musdi&fileName=141/musdi141.db&recNum=0>> (last accessed 28 April 2016).

of the Academy's 'elders'. According to Meredith Ellis Little and Carol Marsh, this was originally instigated by the Parisian dancing master Hardoüin.³⁶ The newspaper article reported that Rameau's system had 'totally destroyed' the previous Beauchamps-Feuillet system, and the criticism led to Rameau agreeing not to republish his work.

On the other hand, the frail Confrairie continued to be battered by rebelling members. The stigma associated with the Confrairie became much more obvious when a group of keyboard players (organists and harpsichordists) rebelled against the forced membership, and published a manifesto in 1695 advocating the reasons why they should not be seen as part of the guild (and, quite conveniently, not having to pay their taxes to them either). The quarrel went on until 1750, when Parliament dismissed the counter-claims pressed by Guignon, by that time Dumanoir's successor as the 'King of Violins'. Guignon renounced his position in 1773, not long before the Confrairie ceased to exist in 1789.

It seems that a varying level of ability amongst instrumentalists and dancing masters in the Confrairie – which caused the separation between 'minstrels' (*bas musiciens*) and violinists (*haut musiciens*) – might have been the cause for the rupture. Dancers no longer might have wanted to be associated with the Confrairie and its stigma as an old institution, but instead be associated to the new, approved by Royal seal, Académie. However, a similar inconsistency in levels seemed to have been carried over to the new institution, as regardless of how rigid the training and monitoring of dancers and their activities were being carried out by the 'Ancient Academicians', there were always better choreographers than others. It is notable that there were choreographers wishing to explore further the intimate choreo-musical relation, as opposed to others devoted to 'functional' dancing represented by choreographies that could work reasonably well to virtually any given piece of music with same time signature and phrase length, illustrating the great chasm between choreographic styles, regardless of the training they received. It seems that the institutionalisation process of dancing – be it to a Royal institution or a guild – might have carried equivalent political kudos, but the results that really count were solely due to the artistic skill of those who were associated to either the Confrairie or the Académie.

After all, what are the factors that so intrinsically tie dance and music together? Apart from the obvious harmony, melody, phrasing, cadence and rhythm provided by the music, Dumanoir refers to what I personally believe to be the precise ligament which amalgamates them: the relationship between bowing and *mouvement*, the building block to achieve cohesive phrasing, technical prowess and, above all, an expressive performance. According to him,

36 Meredith Little and Carol Marsh, *La danse noble: An inventory of dances and sources*, Williamstown, Broude Brothers Ltd., 1992, p. 124.

'the violin is the most appropriate instrument to make one dance, for it marks better than any other, the *mouvements* and all cadences [rhythms]'.³⁷

Michel De Pure gives an equally important insight in his book *Idée des Spectacles Anciens et Nouveaux*:

The airs de Ballet should be played in a way that is not inconclusive, neither as languid as one could possibly play them. One should avoid ornamentations commonly employed by the voice, but give it an outspoken passion, a particular vivacity, while ensuring it always provides a lift [to the dancers]. Its [notes] should be rather shorter than longer, so that the dancer could prepare for the following rest, capriole or any other jump that he might perform in the following bar.³⁸

Having entered service to Louis XIV in 1652 as a dancer, already in 1653 Lully was appointed director of the reduced Petits Violons with which he experimented and elaborated the technique demanded for string instruments to play dance music. One can assume confidently that his work was based on the choreomusical relation of retakes-*mouvements*, for being a dancer and musician himself, he understood it like few. He enforced and expanded on the practice of adopting the 'Down-bow rule', already mentioned by Marin Mersenne in 1636.³⁹ Later in 1661 when he took control of the larger Vingt-quatre violons du Roy, he also imprinted his mark on that renowned ensemble, remarkably raising its status to one of the most famous in Europe. Apart from Mersenne's succinct text, the only other account of such practice survives in Georg Muffat's book *Florilegium Secundum*,⁴⁰ in which the author – a German visitor spending a sojourn in Paris – minutely writes down what he witnessed in Lully's orchestra in order to apply that technique back home.

The 'down-bow rule' consisted of making use of the naturally weightier sound of the down-bow stroke in every first beat of music bars, granting a natural and more controlled accent, in contrast to the weaker up-bow. Muffat emphasises how subtle such 'lift' was, and how the phrasing was not compromised by such a refined technique, writing:

The greatest skill of the Lullists lies in the fact that even with so many repeated down-bows, nothing unpleasant is heard, but rather that they wondrously combine a long line with practised dexterity, a variety of dance movements with the exact uniformity of the harmony, and lively playing

37 Dumanoir, *Le Mariage*, pp.60-61.

38 Michel De Pure, *Idée des spectacles anciens et nouveaux*, Paris, 1668; Minkoff facs. edn., Geneva, 1972, p.265.

39 Marin Mersenne, *Harmonie Universelle*, part II, book IV (Paris, 1636) <<http://imslp.org/wiki/Special:ImagefromIndex/77447>> (last accessed 9 May 2016), p.185.

40 Georg Muffat, *Florilegium Secundum*, Passau, 1698.

with an extraordinarily delicate beauty.⁴¹

Before explaining in detail how the bowing is to be negotiated in various musical passages – according to the practice of the Lullists – Muffat sets out a few general rules:

Rule 1: The first note of a measure which begins without a rest, whatever its value, should always be played down-bow. This is the most important and nearly indispensable general rule of the Lullists upon which the whole style depends.⁴²

Rule 3: Of the three notes which make up a whole measure in triple time, the first would be played down-bow, the second up-bow and the third down-bow, when played slowly, according to rule 1; this means one would play two down-bows in a row at the beginning of the following measure. If one plays faster, the second and third notes are often both played up-bow, the bow springing equally on each note.⁴³

This process creates a minute, very subtle gap – more like a ‘lift’ – in the phrase, allowing dancers to perceive the timing and intensity of such a retake in order to precisely place their next step, at the same time judging the necessary energy to be employed and character to be conveyed in any given passage, only by judiciously being aware of the musical phrasing. Likewise, musicians cross-feed from the phrasing communicated by the dancers, its intensity and character, and are able to judge if – in nexus with the harmonic, phrasal and rhythmical parameters of a given passage – they might continue the flow or present a new, contrasting *Passion* in their discourse. Rather than being constricted by rigid counting, this way both dancers and musicians achieve a wondrous elasticity and freedom in phrasing which can convey harmonious fusion (when both dance and music share the same ideas in a given passage) or highlight a contrapuntal dialogue (when eventually rhythmical – and phrasal – elements are not congruent and hence *retake-movement* relation becomes broken, making a feature of such incongruity).⁴⁴

Unfortunately, it seems that the heated political argument between Academicians and *Confrères* overlooked the necessity to maintain the integrity of the Art for its sake. Were it not for the spirit of those truly committed to the

41 David Wilson, *Georg Muffat on Performance Practice: The Texts from Florilegium Primum, Florilegium Secundum, and Auserlesene Instrumentalmusik: a New Translation with Commentary*, Indiana, Indiana University Press, 2001, p.41.

42 Wilson, *Georg Muffat on Performance Practice*, p.34.

43 Wilson, *Georg Muffat on Performance Practice*, p.35.

44 A detailed analysis on the choreomusical relation found in *retakes-mouvements* will be the subject of a forthcoming paper.

Arts – who continued to thrive, create and perform – perhaps such high art form might have fallen into oblivion sooner than it did, when eventually dancing and music were fatally separated in distinct sects.

Perhaps the best commentary on the absurd allegations and on the disproportionate nature of the quarrel, can be seen in Molière's prologue to *L'Amour Médecin*, set to music by Lully and premièreed in 1665, at the height of the dispute. Here, Music, Dance and Poetry set aside their differences and unite to praise 'the greatest king on Earth':

Quittons, quittons notre vaine querelle,
Ne nous disputons point nos talents tour à tour.
Et d'une gloire plus belle
Piquons nous en ce jour
Unissons nous tous trois d'une ardeur sans seconde,
Pour donner du plaisir au plus grand Roy du monde.

De ces travaux plus grand qu'on ne peut croire,
Il se vient delaisser quelque fois parmy nous,
Est-il de plus grande gloire
Est-il bonheur plus doux.
Unissons nous tous trois d'une ardeur sans seconde,
Pour donner du plaisir au plus grand Roy du monde.

Pour plaire au plus grand Roy de tous les rois du monde.⁴⁵

45 Jean-Baptiste Lully, *L'Amour Médecin*, Prologue (Paris 1665), M.s. Rés.F.523, Conservatoire de Musique, Bibliothèque <<http://imslp.org/wiki/Special:ImagefromIndex/01804>> (last accessed 9 May 2016), pp.4-9..

CHOREOLOGICA

The refereed journal of the European Association of Dance Historians aims to provide a forum for historical and theoretical explorations of dance histories and practices. Articles for submission are welcomed. These may include analyses of individual works or investigations, whether they be monographic, contextual or interdisciplinary. Submissions may address topics ranging from the past dance practices to contemporary themes. The editorial board particularly welcomes essays rethinking current approaches and theoretical understanding of dance practice, history or crossovers into other disciplines.

For guidelines on submission please see the publications section on:
www.eadh.com

Submissions should be sent with any supporting images to:
eadhcommittee@gmail.com

Editorial Board Choreologica

European Association of Dance Historians
9 St Margarets Avenue
Torquay
TQ1 4LW
eadhcommittee@gmail.com

ISSN 1746-5737

