This is the first intellectual biography of the eighteenth-century French composer and theorist Jean-Philippe Rameau. Rameau is widely recognized as the founder of tonal harmonic theory. Through his principle of the fundamental bass, Rameau was able to explicate the structure of tonal music with unprecedented concision and clarity, earning himself in his day the popular accolade “Newton of Harmony.”

Ranging widely over the musical and intellectual thought of the eighteenth century, Thomas Christensen orients Rameau’s accomplishments in light of contemporaneous traditions of music theory as well as many scientific ideas current in the French Enlightenment. Rameau is revealed to be an unexpectedly syncretic and sophisticated thinker, betraying influences ranging from neoplatonic thought and Cartesian mechanistic metaphysics to Locke’s empirical psychology and Newtonian experimental science. Additional primary documents (many revealed here for the first time) help clarify Rameau’s fascinating and stormy relationship with the Encyclopedists: Diderot, Rousseau, and d’Alembert.
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FOREWORD BY IAN BENT

Theory and analysis are in one sense reciprocals: if analysis opens up a musical structure or style to inspection, inventorying its components, identifying its connective forces, providing a description adequate to some live experience, then theory generalizes from such data, predicting what the analyst will find in other cases within a given structural or stylistic orbit, devising systems by which other works – as yet unwritten – might be generated. Conversely, if theory intuits how musical systems operate, then analysis furnishes feedback to such imaginative intuitions, rendering them more insightful. In this sense, they are like two hemispheres that fit together to form a globe (or cerebrum!), functioning deductively as investigation and abstraction, inductively as hypothesis and verification, and in practice forming a chain of alternating activities.

Professionally, on the other hand, “theory” now denotes a whole subdiscipline of the general field of musicology. Analysis often appears to be a subordinate category within the larger activity of theory. After all, there is theory that does not require analysis. Theorists may engage in building systems or formulating strategies for use by composers; and these almost by definition have no use for analysis. Others may conduct experimental research into the sound-materials of music or the cognitive processes of the human mind, to which analysis may be wholly inappropriate. And on the other hand, historians habitually use analysis as a tool for understanding the classes of compositions – repertories, “outputs,” works, versions, sketches, and so forth – that they study. Professionally, then, our ideal image of twin hemispheres is replaced by an intersection: an area that exists in common between two subdisciplines. Seen from this viewpoint, analysis reciprocates in two directions: with certain kinds of theoretical inquiry, and with certain kinds of historical inquiry. In the former case, analysis has tended to be used in rather orthodox modes, in the latter in a more eclectic fashion; but that does not mean that analysis in the service of theory is necessarily more exact, more “scientific,” than analysis in the service of history.

The above epistemological excursion is by no means irrelevant to the present series. Cambridge Studies in Music Theory and Analysis is intended to present the work of theorists and of analysts. It has been designated to include “pure” theory – that is, theoretical formulation with a minimum of analytical exemplification; “pure” analysis – that is, practical analysis with a minimum of theoretical underpinning; and writings that fall at points along the spectrum between the two extremes. In these capacities, it aims to illuminate music, as work and as process.
xiv  Foreword

However, theory and analysis are not the exclusive preserves of the present day. As subjects in their own right, they are diachronic. The former is coeval with the very study of music itself, and extends far beyond the confines of Western culture; the latter, defined broadly, has several centuries of past practice. Moreover, they have been dynamic, not static, fields throughout their histories. Consequently, studying earlier music through the eyes of its own contemporary theory helps us to escape (when we need to, not that we should make a dogma out of it) from the preconceptions of our own age. Studying earlier analyses does this too, and, in a particularly sharply focused way; at the same time it gives us the opportunity to re-evaluate past analytical methods for present purposes, such as is happening currently, for example, with the long-despised methods of hermeneutic analysis of the late nineteenth century. The series thus includes editions and translations of major works of past theory, and also studies in the history of theory.

That Rameau is the most significant figure in the music theory of the modern (i.e. post-medieval) era is generally accepted today. His impact on musical thought since his time has been monumental. His ideas provided a battle ground over which theorists fought for a century and a half after his death. His insights into the nature of music, brilliant and sophisticated in their day, withstood the assaults of his opponents and retain their potency for us now. Every theorist and analyst of the twentieth century is influenced by his ideas, whether consciously or unconsciously, and is conditioned by his frame of reference.

Our view of Rameau's work is, however, a stereotype. His ideas have been purveyed in a succession of simplified forms, the first being those by d'Alembert in his Eléments de musique of 1752 and by Rousseau and d'Alembert in the first volumes of the Encyclopédie in 1751. Knowledge of his original writings is nowadays largely restricted to the first of his treatises, the Traité de l'harmonie of 1722. This is not surprising. For a start, the discourse of French eighteenth-century music theory is unreadable without highly specialized historical knowledge. Secondly, Rameau’s own use of vocabulary is inconsistent, his syntax notoriously unclear, and his capacity for organization low. Thirdly, while the treatises subsequent to the Traité introduced important new observations, they did so amidst a welter of revisions, modifications and recantations that failed to yield at the end of his life a definitive “theory” or even a stable formulation.

Thomas Christensen’s study is the first to present a picture of Rameau’s theoretical work in its totality, including materials discovered only in recent years. It provides for the first time a lucid chronological unfolding of Rameau’s ideas from before 1722 in notes now lost, through his treatises, letters, polemics and other writings, right to his death in 1764. It teases the meanings out of Rameau’s intractable language, and carries us effortlessly along his laborious quest for ultimate theoretical codification. In the course of this journey, it builds up a fascinating picture of Rameau the man, and portrays vividly his contemporary proponents and antagonists. It completely rethinks Rameau’s relationship to previous music theory, relates his
work skillfully to music practice, and — perhaps above all — succeeds in setting Rameau’s ideas and aspirations deep in the intellectual currents of his day, not only interpreting them as the product of a tension between Newtonian empiricism and Cartesian systematization, but also subtly showing how many different modes of thought and methodologies went to make up Rameau’s complex world of ideas.
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