The 'modal theory’, fencing, and the death of Aubry
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On 29 June 1909, a jury of six scholars decreed that Pierre Aubry (1874–1910), in his book Trouvères et Troubadours, had stolen the 'modal' interpretation of medieval monophony from the young doctor Jean-Baptiste Beck (1881–1943). Aubry was to make amends for his plagiarism in two ways: first, by destroying copies of the book's first edition and issuing an emended one; second, by publishing the trial's verdict in twenty scholarly journals at his own cost. An only slightly emended Trouvères et Troubadours did appear the following year (1910), but Aubry failed to publish the jury's verdict in a single journal. A little over a year after the trial, in August of 1910, he died of a fencing wound. The following year, Beck emigrated to the United States.

The exact events surrounding Aubry's death, and the reasons for Beck's subsequent emigration, have remained a mystery to this day. As Alejandro Planchart has written, '[Aubry’s] death in a fencing accident in 1910 has been traditionally connected with the preparations he was making to challenge Beck to a duel'. ¹ This conjecture takes on the cloak of fact in accounts by Jacques Handschin,² Burkhard Kippenberg,³ Ian Bent and James McMahon.⁴ In his article in The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, Bent states: 'The lamentable outcome of [the trial] was Aubry’s death in 1910 while fencing with foils, apparently in preparation for a duel with Beck'.⁵ It is only a small step from this to the claim that Aubry died while duelling with Beck. This is in fact the rumour which still circulates among some scholars today. New evidence presented in this essay for the first time indicates however, not only that Beck was innocent of Aubry's death, but that Aubry probably wished to die.

¹ The Music of the Troubadours, ed. Peter Whigham (Santa Barbara, 1979), 3.
² 'Beck, Johann Bapiste (= Jean)', Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 1 (1949–51), col. 1480.
³ Der Rhythmus im Minnesang (Munich, 1962), 105.
⁴ The Music of Early Minnesang (Columbia, SC, 1990), 51.
The so-called ‘modal theory’ proposed the application of the six rhythmic modes of ‘Notre Dame’ polyphony to medieval monophonic song of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries notated with no such rhythm indicated by the neumes. The popularity of the theory owed much to the seminal work of Friedrich Ludwig (1872–1930) on the motet in the early part of the twentieth century, but it was Pierre Aubry who first experimented with ‘modal’ transcriptions of monophonic music. As early as his 1898 dissertation, Aubry had suggested the application of rhythmic modes to the songs of the trouvères. These ideas were further developed in a series of articles published between 1900 and 1904. In 1905, Aubry, while working in the manuscript room in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, met a young scholar who was working on his dissertation. Discovering their common interest in medieval monophony, the two began to share with each other the fruits of their research. Aubry lending his own facsimiles to his younger colleague. The young scholar’s name was Jean Baptiste Beck.

Seven years Aubry’s junior, Beck had been working on the application of rhythmic modes to medieval song since about 1904. As he later recalled, it was during his conversations with Aubry in the Bibliothèque Nationale that Beck revealed to him ‘the key to my modal method’. The following year, Aubry


7 Aubry, ‘Lettre ouverte à M. Maurice Emmanuel sur la rythmique musicale des trouvères’, Revue musicale, 10 (1910), 267; Chailley, 214.


published an article which, according to Beck, not only differed substantially from his previous interpretations, but also borrowed heavily from Beck’s own ‘modal method’ without giving him credit. He openly accused Aubry of plagiarism. None the less, the unrepentant Aubry published his Trouvères et Troubadours (Paris, 1909) two years later, where he expounded the ‘modal theory’ (pp. 175–209). Exasperated at Beck’s continued accusations, Aubry called for a jury of French scholars to decide who was the originator of the ‘modal’ interpretation, confident that the verdict would be in his favour. Instead, the six-man jury declared Aubry guilty of plagiarism.

In the year which elapsed between the trial and Aubry’s death, both scholars displayed their outrage with the trial’s outcome for different reasons. Since Aubry failed to publish the verdict, Beck decided to take matters into his own hands. In several reviews of Aubry’s books, he made public the trial and its sentence, referring to the forthcoming emended edition of Trouvères et Troubadours. In an open letter to the editors of the Annales du Midi, Beck responded to a review of the first, ‘plagiaristic’ edition of Trouvères et Troubadours: ‘I find myself forced to send you, in order to defend my rights . . ., this simple correction of . . . the review which involuntarily harmed me; I further reserve the right to resort to other means of coercing Mr Aubry, if journals persist in publishing reviews of an edition whose destruction was ordered by the trial’. He also published the trial’s proceedings, concluding triumphantly: ‘I hope that in future reports or critiques of works in which my modal interpretation is applied . . . the owner’s rights will not be sacrificed for those of a plagiarizer. As I have said before, “Suum cuique”!’

But if Beck was angry at the trial’s outcome, Aubry was infuriated. In a scathing open letter to one of the jury members in the Revue musicale, Aubry accused the jury of incompetence and claimed that he, not Beck, was the

15 According to Beck’s report of the trial (‘Zur Aufstellung’, 319), Aubry was responding to his accusations made ‘dans une conférence faite à Paris le 21 Mars 1909’; this was probably 19 March, however (Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres: Comptes Rendus: 1909, 222 and 321–5).
16 ‘J’avais de toutes mes forces appelé ce débat, dont l’issue, selon moi, ne devait pas un instant faire de doutes’ (Aubry, ‘Lettre ouverte’, 263).
18 ‘Je me vois forcé, pour la sauvegarde de mes droits, de vous adresser . . . cette simple mise au point de la notice, involontairement préjudiciable à mes intérêts, de M. Salverda de Grave, en me réservant de prendre l’opinion de mon conseil pour aviser à d’autres moyens de coercition envers M. Aubry, si la presse continuait à publier des comptes rendus de l’édition dont la sentence arbitrale avait ordonné la destruction’ (‘Correspondance’, Annales du Midi, 22 [1910], 115). According to Beck, it was several reviews of the plagiarized edition which finally drove him to make the trial public (‘Zur Aufstellung’, 317–18).
originator of the 'modal theory': 'As early as 1898 . . . I had formulated the fundamental, essential, and new principle of the role of modal formulas in trouvère melodies'. 21 He called Beck's theories 'nothing but an inconsistent bluff', and charged the jury with unjust procedures; his rights had been violated and the fruits of 'fifteen years of work and toil' were now ruined. 22 But behind Aubry's public show of fury, the profound despair produced by his humiliation had begun to fester. In a recent personal correspondence, 23 Jacques Chaillley has revealed that, according to Aubry's close friend Félix Raugel, Aubry experienced a nervous breakdown following the trial. According to Raugel, Aubry had brought on his own death. The fencing incident was nothing more than a suicide in disguise, 'un suicide déguisé'.

What were the exact circumstances of Aubry's death, and could they correspond to a 'suicide déguisé'? In Aubry's obituary printed in the Société Internationale de Musique, Jules Ecorcheville summarized the fatal event. This is an account which, to my knowledge, has received no attention since its publication in 1911:

Aubry was a consummate fencer. Since his high-school days at the collège Stanislas where he was the local fencing club champion, he had continued to practise this sport for his own health and enjoyment. During his vacation in Dieppe this summer, he had often met amateurs of this fearsome sport in serious tournaments. On the morning of 31 August, as he was happily leaving his hotel, chance would have it that he was apprehended by the Captain de Romilly. What happened next? Did our colleague behave recklessly, fencing without a breast-plate and wearing a worn jacket? Was there a fatal coincidence of two contrary movements, a 'faux pas'? No one will ever know, nor will anyone ever be able to explain the incident which surprised all those watching. The épée of Mr de Romilly entered, pointe d'arrêt [the protective tip] and all, into his adversary's body at the base of the lungs, and produced a tearing wound. As air began to enter through the wound, death by suffocation [quickly] followed. Taken back to his home, Aubry succumbed a few hours later to what doctors call traumatic emphysema. 24

But there is more to these events than Ecorcheville's ambiguous description

21 'Dès 1898, . . . j'avais . . . formulé le principe fondamental, essentiel et nouveau, du rôle des formules modales dans la constitution des mélodies de trouvères' (Aubry, 'Lettre ouverte', 268).
22 Ibid., 266 and 270.
23 Letter to this author dated 17 September 1995.
24 'Aubry avait la passion de l'escrime. Depuis le collège Stanislas où il était le champion de la salle d'armes, il n'avait cessé de cultiver l'épée, par goût et par hygiène. Pendant son séjour à Dieppe, cet été, il avait plusieurs fois rencontré, dans de sérieux tournois, des amateurs de ce sport redoutable. Le 31 août au matin il quittait joyeux son hôtel, et le hasard le mit aux prises avec le capitaine de Romilly. Que se passa-t-il? Y eut-il imprudence de la part de notre collègue qui tirait sans plastron, avec une veste usagée? Faut-il croire à une coincidence fatale de deux mouvements contraires, à un faux pas? Nul ne saura jamais, et ne pourra expliquer l'incident qui surprit tous les assistants. L'épée de M. de Romilly pénétra toute mouchetée dans le corps de son adversaire, à la base du poumon, produisant une blessure déchirante. L'entrée de l'air qui suivit cette perforation, entraîna la mort par étouffement. Ramené chez lui, Aubry succombait quelques heures plus tard à ce que les médecins nomment l'empysemé traumatique' (Jules Ecorcheville, 'Pierre Aubry: 1874-1910', Société Internationale de Musique, 1 [1911], 41).
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provides. A previously unnoticed newspaper account corroborates his report and provides several important details. On Friday, two days after Aubry's death, the local Dieppe newspaper, the *Vigie de Dieppe*, published a full description of the fatal match.\(^{25}\) This account clarifies four important points. First, Aubry was a regular visitor to Dieppe and its local fencing school: 'Mr Aubry, a young and rich landowner living in Paris . . . and a regular visitor to our beach, just died tragically. A very practised fencer, he often came to the School of Arms set up in Dieppe by Master Damotte . . .'.\(^{26}\) According to the report, the two men were fencing 'under the supervision of Master Damotte' ('sous la direction du maître Damotte') at about 11:00 o'clock in the morning. They were using épées, and not foils as Bent claims. Secondly, the article calls Mr de Romilly a 'well-known fencer' ('tireur bien connu'); Ecorcheville's title 'Captain' would suggest a man of military experience and rank, such as were often found in fencing circles.\(^{27}\) Thus both Aubry and Romilly were experienced fencers. Thirdly, the newspaper story offers the following vivid account:

[Aubry and Romilly] had finished two sets in which they had made three hits each. 'The belle [tie-breaker] [says one]? 'Absolutely [the other responds].' Everyone is ready. Mr Aubry makes an open attack; Mr de Romilly avoids his épée by making a stop-hit [or stop-thrust] as he draws legs and feet together [rassemblement].\(^{28}\) The stop-hit leads the épée below the armpit of his adversary, who cries out . . .\(^{29}\) Mr de Romilly's thrust had unfortunately penetrated one of the tears in the left sleeve (Mr Aubry was left-handed), thus leading, as mentioned, the épée below the armpit. 'I'm hit', cried out Mr Aubry, in pain. Mr Damotte and the other fencers present surrounded the wounded man who soon began spitting blood. When the vest was removed a little red wound could be seen below the armpit . . . [A doctor was fetched, the épée having punctured a lung; Aubry was brought to the hospital] . . . Towards noon, Mr Aubry, still in control of himself, returned to the Hôtel Métropole from whence he had come with his wife and mother-in-law. For a while there had been hope, for no haemorrhaging had occurred, only a little bleeding. But the épée, penetrating with its *pointe d'arrêt* [protective tip] (which had not been removed as rumour had it), had produced a wound in the lung which brought on traumatic emphysema. About an hour afterwards, the injured man

25 *Vigie de Dieppe* (Friday 2 September 1910) front page (no page number given), single column. I would like to thank Michel Laisné of the Bibliothèque municipale of Dieppe, for his kind help.

26 'Un habitué de notre plage, M. Aubry, jeune et riche propriétaire, demeurant à Paris, Avenue Wagram, vient de mourir tragiquement. Escrimeur très entraîné, il fréquentait la salle d'armes installée à Dieppe par le maître Damotte . . .' (Ibid.). The ‘maître Damotte’ was quite possibly Louis Damotte, a picture of whom is found in Henry de Goudourville, *Escrimeurs contemporains*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1900), II, 191. He was the founder of his own fencing school in Montrouge, a southern suburb of Paris. Described as a distinguished and cultivated man, Damotte attracted a restricted and genteel clientele at Montrouge.

27 De Goudourville, for example, lists several in his *Escrimeurs contemporains*, 145 and 295.

28 Romilly seems here to have thrust and lunged forward. As Félix Gravé explains, 'the lunge, usually following a thrust, is the action of doubling the distance already existing between the heels when on guard, and to score a hit on the opponent' (*Fencing Comprehensive* [London, 1934], 57).

29 This was probably an unintended destination for Romilly's hit, since the armpit is outside the normal target area (Gravé, *Fencing Compréhensive*, 53). Accidents in fencing schools were frequent enough: Adolphe Tavernier, in his *Amateurs et salles d'armes de Paris* (Paris, 1886), devoted an entire chapter to them (32 ff.).
began suffocating and fainted shortly thereafter. He soon breathed his last in the arms of his frantic young wife.\textsuperscript{30}

Finally, the \textit{Vigie's} account provides an important detail which would support the suggestion of a 'suicide déguisé'. A fencer's standard dress would have included a long-sleeved jacket, made of sturdy sail cloth and buttoned up on one side.\textsuperscript{31} The article points out that Aubry's jacket was already well worn (which Ecorcheville also mentioned) and, moreover, that he had refused to get a new one. It then relates the following incident: 'Master Damotte had commented on this [his worn jacket] on several occasions. One day he had even told him laughingly: "Perhaps you would like me to lend you two louis [i.e., in order to purchase a new one]?" To which Mr Aubry replied in the same joking manner: "You'll see, I'll surprise you one of these days"'.\textsuperscript{32} Aubry was thus willfully not taking precautions to protect himself.

Neither in the \textit{Vigie de Dieppe's} story nor in Ecorcheville's account is there any mention of Beck or the Paris trial. Yet the tragic fencing match in Dieppe had immediate and grave consequences for Jean-Baptiste Beck. Less than a year later, Beck hastily decided to emigrate to the United States; by the autumn of 1911 he was teaching French at the University of Illinois. His whereabouts in the months immediately following Aubry's death are unclear, although he probably spent some time in Paris conducting research.\textsuperscript{33} After he had learned of the tragedy, Beck continued to defend his position as originator of the 'modal theory'.\textsuperscript{34} From around January 1911, he taught French in Vienna. Four
months later, encouraged by such scholars as Joseph Bédier, and prompted by criticism from the likes of Johannes Wolf, Beck applied to the University of Illinois.

What conclusions may be drawn from this evidence? First of all, it is clear that the two scholars never duelled together. In fact, following the trial, Beck and Aubry apparently never met or corresponded again. Instead, each man became embittered for different reasons: Aubry because of his public humiliation, and Beck because of Aubry’s lack of compliance with the jury’s verdict.

Furthermore, there is no evidence to support the story that Aubry had challenged Beck to a duel. It is understandable that apocryphal explanations should arise in the wake of such controversial events. That Aubry had challenged Beck was the most widely held view; here was a story to save Aubry’s honour. The account handed down to Beck’s children was that Beck had ‘challenged Aubry to a duel’ and that ‘shortly before the duel . . . Aubry fell on his sword’. This lionizes Beck and makes Aubry out to be a coward. However, this version has been acknowledged by Beck’s own daughter as a “family myth” whose origin is unclear. It may none the less contain a kernel of truth, for it is possible that Aubry did indeed fall on a sword, in effect, though not his own.

Rather than settling the dispute between the two scholars, the Paris trial only resulted in personal tragedy and posthumous confusion. The originator of the ‘modal theory’ is still debated, with accounts varying among historians. But, more importantly, the trial had devastating personal consequences for both loser and winner. It tarnished Aubry’s scholarly reputation. Following his nervous breakdown, he may have wished for death, ‘recklessly fencing without a breast-plate and wearing a worn jacket’, in Ecorcheville’s words. In this sense, I would interpret the Dieppe fencing match as a ‘suicide déguisé’. As for Beck, his rise in European academia was seriously hampered. Although he was innocent of Aubry’s death, his insistence on being named the sole author of the ‘modal theory’
theory' rankled with such senior scholars as Wolf and Ludwig. Forced to turn down a chair at the Ecole des Hautes-Etudes in Paris, Beck emigrated to North America for a new start and remained there until his death over thirty years later.39

39 ‘Vous savez peut-être que l’Ecole des Hautes-Etudes de Paris m’avait offert la succession à la chaire de Gaston Paris, devenue vacante par la démission de M. Ant. Thomas. Si j’ai refusé cette très honorable situation, au dernier moment, en faveur de votre offre, c’est que celle-ci me paraît assez engageante pour que je vous donne la préférence’ (Beck writing to Dean E. B. Greene of the University of Illinois, 27 May 1911 [see n. 37]).