

# **History, Authenticity and the Experimental**

**An Ethnography of the Historically Informed Performance Movement in Sydney,  
Australia 2016-2017**

**Harrison Werlemann-Godfrey**

2018

Department of Theatre and Performance Studies

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

The University of Sydney

A thesis submitted to fulfil requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy

### **Statement of Originality**

This is to certify that to the best of my knowledge, the content of this thesis is my own work. This thesis has not been submitted for any degree or other purposes.

Harrison Werlemann-Godfrey

## Abstract

This thesis concerns itself with the manner in which history is perceived, produced, marketed, and received through the medium of classical music performance. Specifically, it is concerned with a group of classically-trained musicians operating in Sydney, Australia who describe their practice as 'historical' or (at the very least) 'historically informed'. In this thesis, I introduce the reader to the world of Historically Informed Performance, or 'HIP' as it is acronymized by insiders. Specifically, this thesis sets out as an ethnography of HIP grounded in participant-observation. Drawing on phenomenological and semiotic theories of J. Lowell Lewis and Samuel Weber it seeks to answer the questions: 'what is the Historically Informed Performance 'movement' to insiders, and how do they police its boundaries? And what *sort of thing* is HIP to insiders?' Looking firstly to texts on and in HIP, this approach reveals a struggle between two seemingly irreconcilable insider discourses of HIP: on the one hand the historical 'Authenticist' position and on the other the 'non-dogmatic' or 'Experimentalist' position. However, this thesis argues that such discursive definitions, while important, do not accurately describe HIP, and in the best case, they must be *disseminated* into practice. As such, notions of Historicity, Authenticity and Experimentalism must be understood as *performed* on an embodied level in events; through interacting habituated and habituating bodies. In this sense, HIP is constructed out of much more than rigidly defined notions of historicity. It is borne as much of a specific and contingent intimacy, the enactment of historical, consensual social-roles and the complex discipline of instrumental practices.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank my supervisor Ian Maxwell for sharing his wealth of knowledge and providing such invaluable guidance. His enduring encouragement and tactful nudges in the right direction have made this project a real pleasure. I would also like to thank all those in the Department of Theatre and Performance Studies for providing such a welcoming and stimulating scholarly community. A big thank you to those members of the HIP community who made this project possible. Thank you to Neal, Danny, Anthony, Donovan, Serena and Kat for the seemingly endless and inspiring discussion. Finally, thanks to Mum for supporting me in so many ways, to Froukje for challenging me, and to Aleisha for putting up with me.

## Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Preface</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Overture</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Theoretical Framework</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Part 1: Text</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Chapter 1 - Didactic Texts and the Grounds of Authenticism:</b>	
<b>Repertoire, Instruments and Practices</b>	<b>26</b>
Repertoire of Historical Performance: Contested Turf	30
Instruments of HIP	39
HIP Practices	45
<b>Chapter 2 - Theorising HIP: The ‘Non-dogmatic’ Orthodoxy</b>	<b>57</b>
Musicology, Performance and HIP	62
Discourse of Dogmatic HIP	68
Non-Dogmatic HIP	71
The Non-Dogmatic Orthodoxy	79
A Note on Performance as Object	80
<b>Part 2: Act</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Chapter 3 - The Performance of Authenticity and the</b>	
<b>Construction of Community in HIP</b>	<b>83</b>
Concert: Mozart Reimagined	85
The Classical Music Concert Genre	93
Historicity	97
Experimental HIP	100
<b>Chapter 4 - Performing Historical Performance in Domestic Space</b>	<b>113</b>
A Conversation in Alistair’s Bedroom	116
Intimacy, Social Roles and Event	127
The Scholastic and the Scholar-Performer	133
The Neo-Authenticist Position	135
Practicing HIP: The Liberating Potential of the Conservative Stance	138
The Plurality of the Historical	140
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>151</b>

## Preface

I first became interested in the Historically Informed Performance—HIP—movement during my undergraduate music performance degree at the Sydney Conservatorium of Music in 2010. I gained entry to the Conservatorium on cello, bringing to my studies there my experience training as a cellist through what could be termed the typical classical musical pathways. I began playing at five or six years old and attended the Conservatorium High School. Upon entering the University, right next door, by the sheer luck of a roster system, I had been allocated a place in the Conservatorium’s Early Music Ensemble—or ‘EME’ as we would call it—in fulfilment of the requirements of the ‘Orchestral Studies’ unit of study.

On our first day, my fellow newcomers and myself were thrown into an entirely new world. The head of the Historical Performance department (or ‘Early Music department as it was called then)—let’s call him Nigel—summoned us to the Verbruggen Hall for our induction. We entered from the sound locks on stage left and took a seat on the wooden risers. Nigel explained to us what it was all about: that Historical Performance was, unsurprisingly, concerned with the *historical* performance of classical music. What was most striking, however, was his argument that ‘how we play classical music today is vastly different from the way it was played in the past.’ I was unfazed by the suggestion. It was not until he provided the evidence that something really began to click for me.

Nigel wheeled over a sound-tech trolley, fiddled with the dials and tangled cables, slipped in a CD and pressed play. Out of the speakers emanated the fuzzy-crackle of an old record player; then began the iconic piano line of Franz Schubert's *Ave Maria*. Whilst it was familiar, it was truly different: it almost sounded, dare I say it, *bad*. There was no reverberation on the piano; the quaver-line was rhythmically uneven, and it sounded muffled. I cracked a smirk and held it as I listened. Then the voice came in.

It sounded truly alien. The pitch of the voice was high, but the tone didn't match any vocal sound I had ever heard before. It was not a soprano: not brilliant enough in tone colour. It was not alto. Nor was it mezzo-soprano, tenor, baritone or bass. Not even a countertenor (I could tell from the unique quality of falsetto singing that characterised the voice type). The sound was at once round, piercing, muffled yet clear. The words were well articulated; I could hear all of the syllables. To be honest, it sounded like someone was taking the piss. In my mind I was stunned, and I held back my chuckles as I looked around at my slightly older peers, those returning to EME, and noted their unsurprised faces.

As the music went on, the singer slid around to hit notes, sped up the tempo and held it back again. He played around with the tone of his words at different times, sometimes 'internalising it,' muffling and softening it in volume and colour. Then he would 'open it up' particularly as he would rise to the heights of phrases. He even played around with his vibrato, often holding back from using it, but then adding it in at moments, and using different speeds of 'warble.' The effect was disorienting, but at the same time, captivating.

As it turned out, we were being played a turn of the century recording of Alessandro Moreschi, a vocalist widely accepted to have been the 'last castrato.' This was the evidence of Nigel's argument that we don't really play as they would have in 'the olden days'. Indeed, I reflected that were I to play like that in an exam, my examiners would most certainly have marked me down.

After this demonstration, we were all issued new instruments. I was handed a 'Baroque cello', which looked much like my old one save for some fairly important differences. The neck was fatter at its joint with the body of the instrument, the

fingerboard was almost perpendicular to the body, rather than sloped, and it had gut strings on it instead of steel strings. We were issued with music and we were, in a sense 'thrown into the deep end.'

Our first program was a production of Handel's 1724 opera *Tamerlano*. As the first few rehearsals, twice a week, began to pass by, I began to notice this funny crew of musicians had something going for them that I had not found in the what HIP insiders would term the 'mainstream' classical music department. Students and teachers would *talk to each other* in rehearsal, rather than students obediently receiving orders from a master conductor on a podium. The rehearsal director would explain things to us as if we were adults, providing us with time for detailed examination and rehearsal of the minutiae of new notions of phrasing and instrumental techniques. They would *justify* the things they would say, the musical decisions they would make, by reference to historical sources. Furthermore, they would explicitly call out what they saw as the 'authoritarian' dynamic between student and teacher imposed by the mainstream music world. Up until this time I had only heard about these historical performance ideas and dismissed them as 'pedantic' or dictatorial in their own way, particularly in regards to the manner one 'should' play music. That was to change.

I became more engrossed over the coming years. While I remained a modern cellist for some time, I opted to remain in the Early Music Ensemble for the rest of my degree. It seemed I had found my community. I had found a group of people who were undaunted by the 'status quo' of the modern conservatoire. They were bravely contesting notions of 'tradition', 'talent' and the romantic concept of the 'virtuoso' that saw as the mainstay of 'mainstream' performance. To me they appeared to be a safe haven where ideas trumped institutional politics. They were focussed on the music itself. I made strong friendships with others in the movement, and they remain until this day.

Finally, in 2013, I made a major decision: to take up an Honours degree at the Conservatorium *in* Historical Performance. This entailed a shifting of my major away from cello (or 'modern' cello to HIP) and into historical cello, and I took up lessons with a new teacher, who I will call Damien. I was required to give two major recitals and hand in a thesis. The topic of my thesis was the 'impact of recording on expressivity in classical



music performance.’ Within this I argued that recording technology interfered with classical musician’s expressivity and that Historically Informed Performance provided an alternative model through which to broaden the array of techniques available to classical musicians.

While something of my feelings regarding this bold thesis still remain to this day, what I discovered from this process was a fundamental lack of a vocabulary within musicology and music history that might be transposed to deal with the difficult issue of music performance. I found that there were a wide range of interdisciplinary efforts in fields such as psychology, neuroscience and music history to deal with performance, however, none were able to get at the unique individual and experiential aspect of music performance.

It was not until I found the department of Theatre and Performance Studies at the University of Sydney in my second undergraduate degree that a series of theoretical approaches began to emerge as useful tools for the exploration of the finer details of musical practice. This thesis might be read in such a way, as an attempt to pay tribute to the individuals of HIP and their unique and valuable practices.

## Overture

**Concert with the Conservatorium Early Music Ensemble: The Verbrugghen Hall 9.9.2016**

Beethoven Symphony No. 7, Movement 2: *Allegretto*

The Verbrugghen Hall was set up in the standard manner for an Early Music Ensemble concert. The golden-blond floorboards and risers of the platform-stage in the Conservatorium's largest concert hall were illuminated under down-lights; the audience was dimmed, lit only by the incidental ambient light of an overcast day streaming through the narrow stain-glass windows lining the grand heights of the hall. Across the stage, the orchestra was scattered, its members, in standard concerts blacks, having dribbled onstage, taking up their positions around a central point, the position of the conductor. They held with them their instruments, and seated themselves in front of their 'desk' position's stand.

Due to the lack of bassoonists interested or rostered in EME at the Con, I was playing the second bassoon part on cello, flipping back into the cello part—my main instrument—where possible. Henry was on the first part. I awaited the downbeat, the opening moment of the piece directed by the conductor to keep the orchestra together. I felt mild apprehension, recalling the difficulty of tuning the opening chord. My uncertainty derived from an awareness raised in rehearsal: I could either use the open string, which could be out of tune but would be bright in tone, sending the note out into the hall with a brilliant resonance, or I could finger the note in the fourth position, a risk too, given the

tuning of the string, and the fact that I was only just becoming reacquainted with the cello I was playing for this particular performance. I felt exposed.

Nigel stood and gestured an upbeat, his hands flinging upwards, hinging at the shoulder, arm slightly bent, strict but with a particular springiness. With intense focus on his face, his eyes shifting up out at us, the orchestra, and down into his score, his arm rose in a swift, steady and certain momentum, slowing as it reached its peak, suspended momentarily before falling and...

I tried to land my hand in sync with Nigel's gesture, but fell just behind the beat, as did the rest of the winds. It felt fumbled and jumbled, a mess of individual sounds, some high, some low, harsh and mellow, clustered and staggered. Perhaps it was only minor, but in the moment, the sensation seemed so clear. At least it was in tune, an acute concern in the context of this 'period' orchestra.

The opening chord passed. I broke back into the cello line, focusing on my bowing. I felt I was projecting more from where I was sitting, amongst the woodwinds, sensing a greater resonance in the space, well away from the other cellos. As a result, I became increasingly (self)conscious of my articulation, the temporal, rhythmic and tonal quality of the individual notes. My sound was too immediate, brilliant and scratchy in quality; I didn't want to stand out too much, preferring to blend into the warm rounded sounds of the group.

I shifted immediately towards the upper end of my bow, towards the tip, where I would find less of an immediate 'attack' to my notes, adjusting my right index finger, curving it further over the stick, rotating my entire right arm in tandem to 'grab' the string with the bow a little more. I drew the bow away from my torso with a little more length of bow-hair. The cello spoke back, resonating with the deeper guts of the G-string. I could feel the heavy resistance of the string under my bow like an oar pushing water. There was a pleasure in the sonorous texture. I felt and heard the vibrations activating the wood of the large sound box pressed against my body, travelling through my hands and outwards into the space. I enjoyed the little booms of each re-articulation of the note: a little explosion on each rhythmic repetition like a deep voice projecting through a hall. As we progressed through the phrase, I tried to give more to the notes relevant to the melody-

line, the moments I could sense were of harmonic action, perhaps a dissonance resolving or a series of marked dynamics, the moments I could just tell, along with the other cellos, were important.

At first it was the G-Sharp, the first 'leading' note in the bass line. I physically sank into the note, the weight of my arm descending into the string through my fingers into the bow. I pulled back immediately, sensing the sound was travelling too much, hearing again its brilliance. It was too much. I released the weight from my index finger, the tension in each part of my arm, the relaxation progressing towards my shoulder before finding a place of comfort.

Hearing the line drag amongst the rest of the orchestra, I attacked the following note with a renewed temporal vigour. We somehow found ourselves together, settled, steady.

I was used to the sound of this piece. I'd played it before in SBSYO—the youth orchestra, now dissolved, funded by Australia's state-owned multicultural radio and television broadcaster SBS (Special Broadcasting Service)—and have listened to Beethoven my whole life. I recalled completing a harmonic analysis on this piece at university or high school (it was also the theme of the 2010 historical drama *The King's Speech*). I can't help but silently to sing along. The tune rings out in my head, its stately and majestic, and its rhythm iconic, repetitive and steady. After all, King Colin Firth heroically overcame his speech impediment to this tune.

The famous line was about to come in. I was pre-empting it. I turned my attention, my ear and eyes towards Jane, my fellow cello, a peer two years below me at the Con. She was sitting across the orchestra, perhaps several metres away. I sang along, possibly partially out loud, wishing I was playing the cello part. The melody seemed to grab everyone's attention. The rest of the orchestra was playing the same repetitive pattern from the beginning. Things seemed to gel, the orchestra holding it together, every note placed together, like breathing. My attention seemed split; it was as though I was playing the cello line and my own bassoon part at the same time. Everything seemed to fit together so well. I guess we were comfortable enough with the parts that there was no

great labour, that we were able to send our attention around the orchestra whilst operating our own parts.

Finally, that moment in the piece that I was *really* waiting for... the same cello tune, played by the whole orchestra with the woodwind and brass blasting the opening rhythm at *fortissimo* and the middle strings playing the arpeggiated triplet pattern... it is the notoriously awesome moment.

I abruptly gave myself no volume limit... perhaps I was sufficiently drowned out. I gave it full bows, getting as much pull as I could out of the string: my right index finger rotated anticlockwise to dig into the string, drawing my bow out as far as I could on each note, full hair contact. There was a satisfaction and release in the hall. I was comfortable now; I could sit back on the beat now that the triplets were driving things. I felt my whole body want to bounce on each note of the bass line: a steady vertical dance through my bum, into the seat. I looked to Sandra, my friend on the bass, observing her arm descend into her lowest strings, somehow encouraging me to do the same, matching her movement, a swinging unison.

The section ended in its rather anticlimactic way, giving way to a soft, gentle clear wind chord.

The strings returned, joining the wind in an ascending upward passage. I was conscious of the HIP decision we had made in rehearsal: a slight *accelerando* to the top of the phrase lingering or holding at the top and a relaxation on the downward step figure at the end of the phrase. It was a risk, I became aware of experimental moments like this, everyone needs to 'get it' or really pay attention for it to work. But any mild concern I had dissipated as I found I was taken up in it. It worked. I felt the rush, an urgency of pace, ever increasing and falling forward, but resolving, catching itself just before toppling and tripping.

Coming offstage, I clocked Nigel in the sound lock. 'That was cool,' I said to his wide, tooth-revealing, grin.

## Introduction

This thesis is about history and the performance of classical music. It is not *a* history of classical music; rather, it concerns itself with the manner in which history is perceived, produced, marketed, and received through the medium of classical music performance. Specifically, it is concerned with a group of classically trained musicians operating in Sydney, Australia who describe their practice as ‘historical’ or (at the very least) ‘historically informed’. In this thesis, I will introduce the reader to the world of Historically Informed Performance, or ‘HIP’ as it is acronymized by insiders. These insiders are members of what I will provisionally call the HIP ‘subculture’, a term I am using purely as an analytical tool, invoking, for simplicity’s sake, a sense of the unity, evident from observations of what insiders would perhaps sooner describe as their ‘movement.’

In taking on this project, I proceed from two seemingly simple, but crucial and revealing questions: What is the Historically Informed Performance ‘movement’ to those insiders, and how do they police its boundaries? This question leads to the more complex question: what sort of thing is HIP to insiders?

Indeed, such questions have quietly stumped theorists who occupy a critical space within the world of historical performance, academia being an important arena in the life world of HIP as I shall demonstrate as this thesis progresses. I will argue that the difficulty

stems from two practical, conflicting concerns facing the HIP movement. First, there is the external face of the movement, its struggle for identification within the broader field of musical practice and consumption, including the music scene locally and a public market more broadly. This can be understood in terms of Bourdieu's concept of distinction (Bourdieu, 1984: 223). Framing this as a question, I ask: 'how does this scene distinguish itself from other forms of musical practice?'

Second, I point towards the internal struggle, within HIP, for legitimacy, between at least two factions, each of which seek both to secure their own position within HIP, and to reorient or reshape the field so as to legitimize practices and dispositions homologous, or of a piece with, those of the parties and individuals involved. Here I bring the discussion into the territory of Bourdieu's concept of capital, and the pursuit, within any given field of practice, of specific forms of capital which bestow upon agents within that field enhanced status and power. (Bourdieu, 1984: 5)

In the former case, which I will characterize as the 'external struggle for legitimation', I turn my attention to the (re)presentation of the HIP field in its relations with outside forces, in order to highlight the weight placed on the contested discourse of *authenticity* (to be outlined in what follows) as well as, in light of those struggles, a general, more pragmatic historicity both moulded though marketing in the service of commercial interests. In the case of the latter—the struggle for both existing specific species of capital and the power to be able to consecrate new forms of capital within the movement—I point to the appeal to historical 'authenticity' (importantly understood as a corollary with that of the external struggle) by a small but important group seeking to redefine the field against the view of existing gatekeepers who take a 'more flexible' and 'non-dogmatic' interpretative stance, thereby purporting to open up the possibilities of musical interpretation.

Such a reading of the scene, however, does not take into account the continuity of the movement. This is the next concern of this thesis. It asks, how does HIP find cohesion and unity in such a seemingly contested space?

In approaching these questions, this thesis sets out as an ethnography of the HIP movement, borne out of my own involvement as a participant-observer. Before I

elaborate any further on my observations, theoretical approach or analysis of the movement, it is important in the spirit of Bourdieuan reflexivity (see Wacquant 1994; Maxwell 2001) for me to disclose my personal investment in the field in question.

As implied in the thick description and prologue above, I identify myself as a HIP insider, and would hope to be acknowledged by others within the field as such. I have been involved with the field in various capacities over the last eight years as a student in an academic role and as a cellist, and have sought to build profile within its ranks (or what unspoken hierarchies may exist). In light of this, this project has presented me with a difficult problem of at once preserving my own disposition in rehearsals, performances, gatherings and conversations whilst at the same time seeking distance to attempt to construct the field in such a way as to avoid (to whatever extent possible) an overly distorted picture of the scene. Of course, in a strictly theoretical sense, such an endeavour is futile. As Bourdieu puts it,

there is no escaping the work of constructing the object, and the responsibility that this entails. There is no object that does not imply a viewpoint, even if it is an object produced with the intention of abolishing one's viewpoint (Bourdieu, 1988: 6).

In his study of the French academic world, Bourdieu expounds at length on the epistemological problems of the work of separation of the researcher's role as both insider and outsider.

In choosing to study the social world in which we are involved, we are obliged to confront, in dramatized form as it were, a certain number of fundamental epistemological problems, all related to the question of the difference between practical knowledge and scholarly knowledge, and particularly to the special difficulties involved first in *breaking* with inside experience and then in reconstituting the knowledge which has been obtained by means of this break. We are aware of the obstacles to scientific knowledge constituted as much by excessive proximity as by excessive remoteness, and we know how difficult it is to sustain that relation of a proximity broken and restored, not only on the object of our research, but also on ourselves as researchers, if we are to reconcile



everything we can know only as insiders, and everything we cannot or do not wish to know as long as we do remain insiders (Bourdieu, 1984: 1).

Indeed, Bourdieu also makes clear the tendency amongst researchers to ‘write themselves out’ of their work:

When faced with the challenge of studying a world to which we are linked by all sorts of specific investments, inextricably intellectual and ‘temporal,’ our first automatic thought is to escape; our concern to escape any suspicion of prejudice leads us to attempt to negate ourselves as ‘biased’ or ‘informed’ subjects automatically suspected of using weapons of science in the pursuit of personal interests, to abolish the self even as knowing subject, by resorting to the most impersonal and automatic procedures, those at least in this perspective (which is that of normal science), which are the least questionable (Bourdieu, 1988: 6).

In this study I will be making every effort to avoid falling into this mode of investigation. Instead of attempting to remove or ‘bracket out’ my own perspective, I intend to make an object of it without, I hope, descending into the error of the ‘diary disease’. I will be practicing what Bourdieu terms reflexivity, an ‘objectification of objectification itself.’ Further, by grounding this work in Geertzian thick description, my own position will be available for scrutiny (Geertz, 1983: 99; Geertz, 1972: 1). . In other words, I intend take heed of my own embodiment as intimately bound up in the project of observation. As philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce puts it:

There is but one state of mind from which you can ‘set out,’ namely, the very state of mind in which you actually find yourself at the time you do ‘set out’—a state in which you are laden with an immense mass of cognition already formed, of which you cannot divest yourself if you would (Peirce, 1974: 278).

### **Structure**

This thesis is divided into two main parts, one titled ‘text’ and the other ‘act.’ The insider HIP reader, or musicologist, might note the reference here to Richard Taruskin’s 1995 major work, *Text and Act*, the compilation of essays that contain his major criticism of the wide use of the term ‘authenticity’ in the HIP movement. This is a testament to the

centrality of his work in the movement, a centrality that will become clear as this thesis progresses. It also, however, provides an insight of a major theoretical thread that permeates this thesis, that of the relationship between discourse and action.

In Part One, I turn to a consideration of texts in and on Historically Informed Performance as ethnographic objects, to see what they reveal of the manner in which HIP is understood by insiders. Chapter One is concerned with what I describe as ‘didactic texts’; that is, texts which aim to direct and discipline action and, in turn, provide the grounds of an implicit ‘Authenticist’ interpretation of HIP. I argue this by looking to the manner in which the repertoire, instruments, and practices of HIP highlight the ‘external struggle for legitimation’ in the broader musical social field.

Chapter Two turns to a consideration of the theoretical texts of HIP: that is, to texts that aim to explain or theorise more *explicitly* what HIP is. Specifically, I demonstrate the limited amount of substantial literature that espouses the Authenticist interpretation of HIP. I argue this limited literature to be indicative of the construction of a straw man by a different and opposing camp of HIP: that which I call the ‘Non-dogmatist’ or Experimentalist *orthodoxy* of HIP. As an exemplar of this position, I draw attention to the work of Richard Taruskin, and to his famous deconstruction of the term ‘Authenticity. I argue that despite his efforts, the term endures in some form. The question remaining then is, what is HIP Authenticity if not the perceived ‘honest’ or ‘true’ or ‘real’ performance of history? Can experimentalist or non-dogmatic approaches to history be reconciled as authentic too? Part two of this thesis explores how HIP is performed by insiders, and in turn, how a ‘sense’ of Authenticity, as effect, is performed and received by insiders.

Part Two of this thesis marks a major shift in approach, away from text, and towards act; away from discourse and towards practice. This is predicated upon the assumption that the aforementioned texts of HIP must be understood as *disseminated* into performed discourse and action. As such, the two chapters in this section begin to understand HIP as performed in habituated, embodied action through events. Chapter Three analyses a performance of a HIP concert at the Sydney Conservatorium, drawing out the aspects of performance that contribute towards the emergence of a distinct HIP

authenticity. It points to the confluence of performed signifiatory systems of convention, historicity, and experimentalism, providing grounds for the reconciliation of seemingly irreconcilable discursive notions of authenticity and non-dogmatic experimentalism.

Finally, Chapter Four takes us into the domestic and quotidian world of HIP, taking as its object of analysis the performance of a conversation between an important insider in the HIP movement and myself. It is here where I am able to more specifically deal with the manner in which HIP discourse is disseminated in a context of heightened intimacy, strongly coded social-roles and habituated and habituating musical practice.

### **Theoretical Framework**

In this project, as has been suggested at above, I am drawing from a collection of different theorists from a range of different disciplines. I will be drawing theories from fields as diverse as Anthropology, Sociology, Philosophy, Musicology, Phenomenology, Semiotics, Deconstructionism, and, most importantly, Performance Studies. Such a spread of theoretical perspectives should not be conceived of as ‘cherry picking’ or ‘piecemeal.’ Instead, in the following pages I will present the two main theoretical frameworks that I am adopting for the analysis of the Historically Informed Performance movement as ordered within an already established Pragmatist mission. This is generally the broad pragmatist mission aiming at the practical generation of knowledge. More specifically, this mission is that outlined by J. Lowell Lewis in his book *The Anthropology of Cultural Performance* as a means of encouraging a platform of unity within the traditionally interdisciplinary field of Performance Studies. At the same time, I will be employing a complementary pragmatic framework derived from the work of philosopher Samuel Weber as a means of facilitating a more complex dealing with text both within and beyond the field of HIP. This is an issue of particular interest in the study of this cultural world where, as will become clear, texts hold a particularly important status as cultural objects. In terms of methodology, I will also utilise here the work of Gay McAuley and specifically her ‘semiotic schema’ as it provides a useful framework through which to engage with specific ‘material signifiers’ of performance.

Before proceeding it is important to note that the two main theorists outlined above on the surface present with some seemingly irreconcilable incongruities. On the

one hand Lewis goes to great lengths to distance himself from what he describes as ‘post-theory’ in general (postmodernism, post-colonialism, post-structuralism and the like) and specifically, the ‘deconstructionism’ of Derrida. On the other hand Weber presents us with a ‘deconstructionist’ approach to understanding interpretation. That said, however, Weber creatively subverts the traditional deconstructionist narrative of meaning making through his rereading of Derrida through a Peircian semiotic and phenomenological lens. As such, I believe Lewis and Weber share more in common than a superficial comparison may suggest. This common ground will become clear in what follows.

### **Lowell Lewis**

In *The Anthropology of Cultural Performance*, Lowell Lewis argues for what he calls a ‘coherent synthetic approach’ to performance theory (Lewis, 2013: 2), in and through which performance is understood as not simply a key cultural dynamic, but as the grounds for the construction of both group and personal identity. In particular, and as a critique of theories of performance which privilege ritual processes as the most primordial modes of performance—Richard Schechner and Victor Turner’s seminal work on ritual processes for example—upon and from which subsequent genres of cultural and aesthetic performance derive, Lewis asserts the foundational significance of ‘play’ to the development of selfhood in children, and, as a corollary of performativity, to the foundation of events.

In a chapter titled ‘Embodiment, Emplacement and Cultural Process’ Lewis sets out the argument that as fundamentally intertwined concepts, play and performativity are central to identity formation. Before beginning his explication of the nature of this relationship, he sets out a position, argued in his previous work, within the parameters of the existing, generally accepted phenomenological argument that, ‘Cartesian Dualism, also known as the mind body split, represents a cultural and historical misunderstanding of human being, at least a partial one’ (Lewis, 2013: 93). Where his previous work sought to understand the formation of personal identity, this chapter sets out to answer two related questions: first, In what sense could the phenomenological focus on experience relate to groups, rather than to separate persons only? And second, if shared experience exists, how does it occur and what are its manifestations?’

## Embodiment/Habit

Foundational to Lewis's model of embodied performance lies the premise that human beings 'always already' find themselves in 'situations.' For Lewis, following on from the work of Hans Joas, 'situation refers to both a location and a perceived contingency or 'stream of events' (Lewis, 2013: 93) from the perspective of social actors. In this sense, Lewis makes the argument that individual actors are never wholly autonomous; rather, they are 'semi autonomous' agents finding themselves navigating situations only ever 'partially of their own choosing and over which they have, at best, only partial control' (Lewis, 2013: 93-94). Lewis cites phenomenologist Edward Casey's concept of 'non-simple location' that involves 'multiple aspects of emplacement (dimensions, directions, horizons) as well as histories, memories, feelings, social constraints, imagination, and the like.' Lewis argues that humans and locations co-create each other, implying further, that this creates a 'locatability' of *events* that makes them a useful category of analysis.

Building on this idea of semi-autonomous agents, Lewis invokes a mediatory model of the manner in which humans navigate the relationship between mind and body, suggesting that 'humans live in fluid interaction—the intermediation—between embodied minds and intelligent bodies.' Citing Evan Thompson and Edmund Husserl, Lewis argues that this involves the movement of signification from a 'baseline' 'pre-reflexive self-awareness,' through to a subliminal consciousness, and finally into full consciousness. Lewis argues that this dynamic of signification exists in the realms of all human experience, including sensation, emotion and bodily habits. He clarifies this process through a framework proposed by the pragmatist philosopher and semiotician, C. S. Peirce. 'For Charles Peirce,' Lewis explains,

this process is a movement from *firstness* to *secondness*, as a sign emerges from its background condition and becomes salient due to its appearance as a contrast or disjunction in the perceptual field, calling one's attention to it. The sensation arrives fully fledged in in *thirdness* when it is identified and labelled ... I characterise such a development, in general, as the *micro-evolution of signification*, involving the propagation of effects: first from pre-reflexivity, through subliminal

sense to conscious awareness and then from vague feeling to linguistic concepts and ideas (Lewis, 2013: 94).

While this *micro-evolution of signification* explicates the process of perception of these agents, accounting for those ‘embodied minds,’ Lewis explains that the inverse process applies to the formation of bodily *habits*. Citing Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s concept of ‘motor intentionality,’ and Hubert Dreyfus’s equivalent concept of ‘absorbed skilful coping,’ Lewis explains that ‘humans consciously strive to acquire skills as embodied habits, and as skills become incorporated fully, the habits often recede from consciousness’ (Lewis, 2013: 95). It is this movement towards ingrained pre-conscious habit that Lewis is referring to in his notion of an ‘intelligent body.’

Lewis argues of these habits that there exists in agents the ability to communicate between, on one hand, ‘higher-order modes of thought and action’ and on the other, preconscious or unconscious habits. Lewis offers the example of an actor or an athlete (and I would add musician) faced with the necessity of altering their own behaviour through the use of more superficially, ‘higher level,’ habituated ‘cues’, to engage more deeply embodied habits.

The reliance on higher-level habits to influence more deeply embodied ones means that the latter, though not really under conscious control, may still be open to influence and thus to the possibility of change (Lewis, 2013: 96).

Invoking the developmental-biological terminology of ‘robustness and flexibility,’ Lewis transposes this dynamic into the cultural mode, arguing that deep-rooted embodied customs or traditional practices must be maintained at most times, but that they must develop ways of influencing these habits as a means of facing very real changing circumstances.

### **Intercorporeality as Intersubjectivity**

Lewis goes on to highlight the manner in which this process of embodiment occurs largely outside of our awareness. To explicate this point, he notes the manner in which the body only becomes ‘present’ to awareness at moments of dysfunction (for example, a sprained ankle or a bad reaction to spicy food).

More importantly, however, he points to the manner in which the process of embodiment recedes from the *functioning* body's awareness, notably, in the concept of 'sensory *nullpunkt*.' This is the notion that the innate human embodied sense of 'here' as the locus of 'self,' the notion of 'point of view,' is primarily born out of the experience of the 'null-point' of the visual sensory apparatus. Put another way, as the eye cannot see itself in the act of seeing, it follows that the unseen must be the locus of a subject 'I,' that perceives the world outwardly.

Lewis argues that in much of the literature from Husserl onwards, the assumption has been that the 'self,' what the phenomenologist Drew Leder calls the 'ecstatic' mode of experience, has been constructed by the 'conjunction of all the null points of [one's] sensorium.' However, Lewis makes an important point of differentiation between the different 'sensory modalities arguing that not all can be deemed 'ecstatic.' Drawing from Maurice Merleau-Ponty's notion of *flesh*, Lewis points to the idea of 'reversibility' in the sense of touch whereby one can 'touch oneself touching.' He argues that this creates a certain '*con-fusion*' between touching and being touched. The distinction Lewis is seeking to make here is between senses that construct a sense of distinct inside and outside, and those that 'allow inner and outer to comingle' (Lewis, 2013: 97). Herein lies the basis of Lewis's argument for the intercorporeal basis of the relationship between the formation of individual identity and group identity:

Some senses create a relatively clear distinction between subject and object (observer-observed), while others are capable of mediating that distinction by creating fields of sensation in which experience simply 'happens,' without clear agents or patients. Examples of the latter are the intense confusions of tactile sensation in lovemaking and the deep immersion in sound dynamics of musical ensembles... the concept of *intercorporeality* can be a useful tool in providing examples of intersubjective relations and in developing evidence for the existence, and perhaps the fundamental importance, of group experience (Lewis, 2013: 97).

Fleshing out this understanding of intercorporeality as closely linked to intersubjectivity, Lewis argues that common-sense western associations of 'self' with 'body' demonstrates the strength of individualism in our society and he contrasts this against other culture's

more 'dividual' conceptions of self: the *egocentric* versus the *sociocentric*. Mediating the two here, Lewis argues that humans navigate experientially between *isolability* and *intersubjectivity*, even at times able to operate with cognisance of both simultaneously. The self is multiple *and* singular, 'human selfhood and sociality are inextricably linked' (Lewis, 2013: 98).

One of the main ways that Lewis argues the personal and collective is navigated is through 'role play,' outlined firstly, following George Mead, as a concept in childhood development, but extended to adults as an important mode of intersubjectivity. Paraphrasing Joas, Lewis argues that 'roles precede organised social selves or subjects, and any self has available a variety of roles as models or templates for embodies social relationships' (Lewis, 2013: 97). Lewis stops short of adopting conceptions of self that imply that in place of an essential self, humans merely gather and perform their collection of accumulated roles. In this category of theories, which he labels 'postmodern views of selfhood,' Lewis places performative theories of 'social categories' citing specifically Butlerian gender performativity. Instead, Lewis argues that 'most humans at least at times have a sense of themselves apart from the roles they play... [and] as an adult, one plays roles aware (if only potentially) that they are consensual habits—social constructs—but one plays them in one's own unique way (Lewis, 2013: 99).

Lewis argues that this situation is scaled up in the case of special events. In stardom, unique abilities are celebrated, paradoxically, because of the performers ability to enact roles seamlessly 'without gaps or incongruences.' Performances in these cases emerge as intensifications of aspects of identity formation that are played out in everyday life. In the case of music, a performer is celebrated as somehow enhancing the processes of habit formation latent (in different forms) in the consciousness of their audience.

If role play depends on roles that are intersubjective signs ... then acting them out can be seen as a form of group experience (Lewis, 2013: 98).

Lewis brings this same argument back into Peircian terms, arguing that the roles being 'significate effects' 'require isolability and relatedness.' Pierce's *thirdness* is this relatedness as it is law, habit and cultural consensus, where *firstness* is uniqueness, providing the creative and pre-discursive. Mediating these two are signs in their



secondness, 'experienced in opposition or struggle' (Lewis, 2013: 100). Put simply, Lewis argues that:

One cannot have a purely individual experience; nor can there be a purely group experience. Group experiences must be instantiated, embodied in nodal selves, whereas personal experiences are always constituted upon semiotic, habitual ground that is consensual and intersubjective. If experience is always already both personal and cultural, it follows that selfhood is as well (Lewis, 2013: 100).

### **Intercorporeality**

Having argued his view on the use of intercorporeality as a tool for understanding intersubjectivity, Lewis goes about extrapolating the different domains of the former while at the same time beginning to develop a vocabulary for them. To begin with, he deals with the 'haptic' category of the human sensorium. Lewis argues touch to be the most basic and 'ramified' sense 'since it includes direct contact with skin (texture, heat, pressure, pain—all part of tactility) as well as the largely interoceptive feeling of proprioception'. (Lewis, 2013:107). He coins the terms *intertactility*—'the feelings intermediate between touching and being touched'—and *interhapticity*—'to include all the other ways people sense together in motion and at rest' (Lewis, 2013: 107).

For the Olfactory , Lewis argues for the terms *intergustation* for the tactile sense of the direct contact of tongue and palate upon the to-be tasted and *interolfaction* for taste itself. For the visual, Lewis restates his disdain at the aforementioned occularcentrism of the European tradition. Lewis, however coins 'intervisuality' as a term to describe successful attempts to create a shared visual sphere. Here he points towards dance, costume, museums and other events of visual patterning.

### **The Auditory**

As for the sonic, the realm that is arguably most important for the study of musical worlds, Lewis argues that it is a "particularly fertile field for intercorporeality: since acoustic waves directly link sources with receivers of sound by resonating through the medium of air between (*and* within) the two' (Lewis, 2013: 111). Here Lewis proposes the term *interauidition*—'the shared reception of sound'—and borrows from Steven Feld the

term *intervocality*: that is, ‘the co-production of sound, initially with vocal chords, but ultimately with any other instruments as well.’ Lewis explains that:

These processes may often come together, of course, since, when speaking, one hears one’s own voice, although not in the same way one hears the voices of others. This asymmetry ‘speaks’ to the intermediacy of voice as something shared (as well as individual) and corresponds to the quasi-locatability of hearing. For instance, soundwaves vibrate in many parts of a body, not just in the auditory canal. One cannot hear oneself hearing, but one can be lost in the indeterminacy and intermediacy of sound (Lewis, 2013: 111).

### **Event, Role-play and Habit in HIP**

In this thesis, I am adopting Lewis’s concepts of event, role-play, and habit, as tools for understanding how insiders perceive HIP. These ideas enable us to understand significance of shared bodily experience in the construction and salience of HIP discourse. Here I am referring to the mediation of this experience by intense intercorporeal engagement with sound, instruments and other musical bodies. It is, in a sense, a kind of embodied testimony, experienced immanently and somatically, which not only provides evidence to support the discursive claims of different HIP insiders, but it is also foundational to those claims. This will be of particular significance as I move into Part Two of this thesis and begin to demonstrate an understanding of HIP as being performed through events. However, it also underpins Part One, in which I look to texts of HIP, the efficacy of which as cultural objects is bound to their contingency as products of such an embodiment.

I will now turn to the next major theoretical frame that helps to understand the dynamic of struggle between vying discourses or interpretations of HIP.

### **Samuel Weber**

In an influential essay published in 1980, ‘Closure and Exclusion,’ Samuel Weber investigates the nature of interpretation. He takes as his point of departure a consideration of a passage from Jacques Derrida’s seminal essay ‘Structure, Sign and Play,’ in which Derrida lays out what he describes as ‘two interpretations of interpretation’. On

the one hand, Derrida claims, there is interpretation as the search for origin and truth; on the other, interpretation as the 'affirmation of [creative] play.' Weber offers his own translation of the passage, suggesting of these two positions that:

The one seeks to decipher, dreams of deciphering a truth or an origin that transcends play and the order of the sign, and for it the necessity of interpretation is lived as a kind of exile. The other, no longer oriented towards origin, affirms play and strives to pass beyond man and humanism, man being the name of that being which, throughout the history of metaphysics or of onto- theology . . . has dreamed of the plenitude of presence, of reassuring foundations, of origin and the end of play [*L'écriture et la différènce* (Paris: Seuil, 1967)(Derrida in Weber, 1980: 35).

Weber cites Derrida's contention that these two positions are fundamentally incompatible, citing another essay in which Derrida suggests that these positions 'are absolutely irreconcilable, even if we live them simultaneously and reconcile them in an obscure economy... they divide —se partage—the field of what is called, problematically, the human sciences' (Derrida in Weber, 1980: 35).

While noting that this distinction is a commonly understood one, Weber suggests that Derrida has been fundamentally misinterpreted (or rather has allowed himself to be misinterpreted): that the distinction between the two interpretations is only 'part of the story', and that the qualifications originally offered as constituting the distinction have been largely overlooked. Rather than simply providing a choice between two modes of interpretation — the nostalgic or the play affirming— Weber suggests that Derrida is instead proposing a 'reflection on the 'common ground' of the two absolutely irreconcilable modes of interpretation, and upon 'the deferring' of this irreducible difference.'

Weber continues to tease apart the passage above, seeking the nature of this common ground. From Derrida's text, he points to two clues. First, that 'the division of the field of human sciences' along the lines of these two interpretive positions involves a 'struggle.' For Weber, this is not a neutral operation: rather, 'it entails the staking of claims,

the effort to appropriate.’ In short, Weber mobilises the imagery here of interpretation as a practice of conflict, unfolding across a ground that is, in fact, a *battleground*.

Thinking through the implications of this idea, Weber argues that ‘if there is a temptation to take sides, to make a choice’ between the two positions, ‘it is because there are more ‘sides’ to the battle than first meets the eye.’ It would appear that there is a third position: ‘the interpretive gesture of Derrida’s text itself, setting the scene of a struggle it seems only to describe’ (Weber, 1980: 36). Weber make the point that this interpretive stance is veiled, as Derrida’s own writing appears to assert the positive worth of the ‘affirmative’ interpretive position at the expense of the ‘nostalgic yearning for origin.’

The second clue Weber looks to lies in the commonly understood association, which he highlights, between Derridean deconstruction and the work of Friedrich Nietzsche. As he indicates, Derrida makes an effort in the aforementioned essay to point to Nietzsche’s work as the inverse position to the ‘sad, negative, Rousseauistic face’ of interpretation. Indeed, resting on the weight of Nietzsche, Derrida suggests his interpretive stance to be analogous to his own, the ‘joyous affirmation of the play of the world and of the innocence of becoming.’ Here Weber presents us with the incongruity of this reading of Nietzsche and Nietzsche’s own words. He offers the following passage from the *Genealogy of Morals*:

Everything that exists, that has somehow come to be, is repeatedly reinterpreted in terms of new aims by a power superior to it, is repeatedly taken hold of [*neu in Beschlag genommen*], transformed and transposed to new ends; [...] all processes in the organic world entail overpowering and domination [*ein Überwältigen und Herr-Werden*], which in turn constitute new interpretation, manipulation, [*Zurechtmacheen*], in the course of which the previous ‘meaning’ and ‘purpose’ are necessarily obscured or entirely eradicated (Nietzsche in Weber, 1980: 36).

In the presentation of this passage, Weber’s key argument is laid bare. Rather than pointing to an understanding of interpretation that venerates the ‘affirmation of play’ and the ‘innocence of becoming,’ it would appear that Nietzsche’s position speaks more readily to the veiled third position Weber has wrested from Derrida’s text (of which the

former position remains but a part). Indeed, this is the reading that Weber suggests is implicit and missed in Derrida's work. It is that position which

interpret[s] interpretation as a struggle to overwhelm and to dislodge an already existing, dominant interpretation and thus to establish its own authority. Could anything be less innocent? (Weber, 1980: 36).

In elucidating this point—that is, illuminating an interpretation of interpretation as struggle—Weber presents Nietzsche's view in the context of Nietzsche's own attack on the Judeo-Christian and Platonic tradition. He points out that Nietzsche was very aware of the 'simulacrum of innocence,' in so far as these traditions did well to obscure their own nature as interpretations at all: they 'denied that there was any game whatsoever', claiming, in effect, that their practices involved a non-agonistic, disinterested, neutral, revelation of simple truths. The tradition, in Nietzsche's view, hiding behind notions of 'Truth, Being, Subject etc., ... succeeded in establishing its authority and driving all competitors from the field' (Weber, 1980: 36). However, as Weber argues, Nietzsche understood that those who 'played the game to the hilt,' the priests and philosophers who sought to align and further this interpretive position whilst denying the very possibility of the opposite, did so only at the expense of undermining the very foundations of the struggle itself. The tension that Weber points to in Nietzsche's work is that of the apparent condemnation of the player where perhaps, the game may be what is ultimately at fault.

Continuing to build an image of Nietzsche's understanding of interpretation (and thus the implicit position present in Derrida's work), Weber turns to his work *Homer's Contests* in which he 'interprets the practice of ostracism as a means by which the Greeks sought to safeguard the 'necessity of competition' against itself' (Weber, 1980: 37), He again quotes Nietzsche:

[The] original meaning of *ostrakismos*, as expressed by the Ephesians in banning Hermodor, was: 'No one should be allowed to be the best among us; if someone is, however, then let him be elsewhere and with others'...

Weber clarifies that Nietzsche means ‘No one should be permitted to excel as ‘the competition would fade and the eternal vital foundations of the Hellenic state would be in jeopardy’ (Nietzsche in Weber. 1980: 37).

The gesture of *exclusion* thus emerges as a necessary move designed to save the agonistic process from its own tendencies towards entropy’ (Weber, 1980: 37).

Having explicated what he sees as the dynamics of competing interpretations within a Nietzschean framework of ‘struggle,’ Weber throws into the mix the a troubling complication, that of the very real problem of the identification of contestants and arbiters. What if the institutional arbiters are also the contestants or interpreters? Who is to exclude the winners? Or is it the winners who will exclude?

In such a manner, Weber demonstrates that Nietzsche’s interpretation of interpretation stands as ‘something other than simple ‘joyous affirmation’’ as generally accepted readings of Derrida might suggest. Rather, his work understands interpretation as ‘power play.’

It is a game that belies any simple opposition, such as ‘active’ and ‘reactive.’ Interpretation, for Nietzsche, is —or begins as— re-interpretation, and its designs are never ‘innocent,’ if the word implies disinterested (Weber, 1980, 37).

Weber rounds off his discussion on Nietzsche by rearticulating the point that Derrida’s text does not explicitly state this position as such, however, it is deducible from the passage offered. In Weber’s terms it ‘practiced what it did not preach’ in so far as where he presents two opposing modes of interpretation, the nostalgic and the affirmative as irreconcilable, ‘he does not fail to add that *‘we live them simultaneously and reconcile them in an obscure economy.’* And on a final note, he throws the gantlet to the reader, acknowledging the opacity of the game to us as evincing our unavoidable involvement.

For the remainder of the essay, Weber seeks to ‘retrace the contours’ of the obscure economy in which the social sciences has divided itself.

I will use Weber’s work to stage the question of—indeed the dynamic of—HIP as a struggle. In simple terms, I will suggest that the interpretive game in which advocates for

HIP and their critics are engaged cannot simply be understood in terms of an argument about the merits of a case made for the accessing of an original truth of musical production on one hand, set against a counterargument that seeks to dispute any such aspiration on the other. Rather, I will interpret the field of HIP as a ‘battleground’ in which certain forms of mastery and empowerment, including the right to shape and to define a discipline, are at stake, are the stakes for which those involved are competing.

Indeed, one can see based on my opening remarks that the interpretations of the historical performance movement that I have put forward follow a similar pattern to that outlined here by Weber. On the one hand the ‘Authenticist’ approach is explicated and venerated as one that seeks to uncover *some kind* of historical truth or ‘origin’ in the interpretation of classical music. This is certainly the image presented on the commercial face of the field, as well as within by a small number of younger musicians. On the other hand a position of free interpretation is espoused, one that purports to being merely ‘inspired’ by history, leading some to describe themselves as merely ‘historically inspired performers.’

It is by taking these two approaches in tandem—Lewis’s concept of Event and Weber’s theory of interpretation—that it is possible to begin to uncover how HIP insiders perceive their movement and the manner in which such discourses surrounding historicity, authenticity and experimentalism play out on the level of embodied practice. It is in this manner that it is possible to reveal the ‘reconciliation’ of these seemingly contradictory delineating discourses or interpretations of HIP in what Weber describes as an ‘obscure economy.’ However, these theoretical approaches alone do not provide a thorough methodology to ‘get at’ the nuts and bolts of any given performance. Here I turn to the work of Gay McAuley.

### **Gay McAuley**

While the theories above provide a solid theoretical base through which to analyse the HIP movement, they do not necessarily provide an explicit, systematic methodology through which to piece together the signifiatory systems at play the movement. To remedy this analytical gap I will be mobilising a semiotic approach espoused by Gay McAuley, her ‘Semiotic Schema’ for analysis.

Gay McAuley's schema of analysis provides us with a useful means of drawing together the dispersed material signifiers observed in a performance, in order to formulate a coherent interpretation: a 'global statement' about how given performance might be understood to be meaningful. It should be noted here that there is a limitation to this approach in so far as it struggles to come to terms with the nature of signifiers less available to discourse (i.e. the feeling of the room). However, her notion of 'paradigm', as I will show, is still particularly useful. Indeed, I would extend McAuley's conception to account also for those aspects of embodied experience that I have already hinted at being serviced by Clifford Geertz's concept of 'sensibility.' (Geertz, 1983: 99).

### Schema

McAuley's schema consists of four parts. The first directs the analyst to document as much detail as possible about the performance experience: for example, space and stage structure, lighting, objects, décor, actors, costume music sound, blocking and so on. The second involves noting the narrative and segmentation of the work, looking to the manner in which the former and latter relate to each other. In part three McAuley suggest that one must 'look at the signs within each of the categories, and consider the system that seems to underpin the choices that have been made' and directs the analyst to 'begin to note the signs which seem to relate across categories to form clusters of special significance.' These clusters are what McAuley calls '*paradigms*' and they play out synchronically and/or diachronically through 'repetition, redundancy, contrast etc.' (McAuley,1998: 5)

Finally, in part four of the schema, McAuley provides space, based on the preceding work, for a 'global statement' or an attempt to explicate what the play is 'saying' or what it means to the analyst. She points to the possible mismatch between the presented narrative content of the work (its explicit intended message) and what the paradigms might reveal (McAuley, 1998: 5).

Here McAuley is pointing to the potential for miscommunication inherent in interpretation. McAuley does not delve much further into the question of the plurality of interpretation, however, in providing the hint towards such a conception, she rejects the conception of a neutral observer. I myself am not a neutral observer, and must restate my



investment in the field here. Not only do I have an investment in the field, but I am a lucid and practiced observer. The significance I draw from the performance, particularly through my trained ear and kinesthetic empathy towards musicians on stage, will certainly inform my interpretation. In other words, I am able to discern significances connotations and denotations, and to show how, cumulatively, relationally, the various specific details (the material signifiers) coalesce, come together, cohere, to produce a distinct performance genre, which I claim to embody HIP as practice.

McAuley's approach will become particularly pertinent as this thesis moves into performance analysis in the final two chapters. The following chapter, however, takes the first step towards elucidating the 'obscure economy' within which HIP is performed by examining texts of HIP that aim to direct and discipline practice with an eye towards drawing out their implicit interpretive gestures.

## **Part 1: Text**

## **Chapter 1 - Didactic Texts and the Grounds of Authenticism: Repertoire, Instruments and Practices**

*I want to do it properly, I want to get into the  
composer's head, see the music how they did.*

Alistair, 2016

In this chapter I will begin to reveal how HIP is understood by insiders by means of an exploration of a specific genre of academic literature salient within the HIP movement. This literature I will provisionally describe as 'didactic literature,' a label I use in order to distinguish this body of literature from that which takes the HIP movement's description or definition as its theoretical focus. The significance of this distinction will become clear as this chapter unfolds. I have made this move of categorization in the absence of an insider term, despite the seeming centrality of the genre of text within the life world of HIP. Indeed, it may well be this very centrality of texts—embodied in insider's close proximity to them—that informs such an absence. Specifically, I will here review those texts that are used to discipline practice: which aim to reveal to scholar-performers the historical techniques that are said to be the subject matter of HIP, provide instruction on

them, and offer a historical justification for them. These are the texts that inform the ‘historical approach’ to the performance of music.

This didactic literature does not have its effect in isolation from a broader theorization of the value of a historical approach, or of the capacity for the historical to be accurately realized in contemporary music performance. Here I must make a bold analytic distinction, perhaps to the dismay of some insiders (the authors whose work I utilize in this chapter included), who may very well seek justification for their actions, literary and practical, in those (often fleetingly introductory) theorizations. I intend, for now, to bracket out these theoretical tests, as best as possible—I will return to them in Chapter 2, below—and instead turn my focus solely towards what can be gleaned of the perceived scope and constitutive ideas of HIP from the referential quality of the didactic texts.

Another important distinction to make at this point is that between this secondary source material and the primary source material, taken by the as historical evidence for the advocacy of particular techniques or practices. Most specifically I refer here—though not exclusively, due to the broader range of forms of evidence including those visual such as etchings paintings and drawings—to composers’ ‘treatises’ on performance practice, which direct musicians to the intention of their authors (see, for example. Bach, 1949; L. Mozart, 1985; J. J Quantz, 2001). Unsurprisingly, such text are themselves emphatically didactic, and are used, in contemporary settings, in (at the very least) a similar way to those secondary sources that are the focus of this chapter. However, I am excluding them quite simply as they cannot be said to be products of HIP, at least within the frame of a study of HIP as a contemporary phenomenon. As texts in themselves, abstracted from their performed reception, they cannot tell us directly anything about HIP, though their use within this didactic literature goes some of the way to revealing the particular interpretive gestures I wish to illuminate in this chapter.

The texts which are the focus of this chapter often take on an almost encyclopaedic, tome-like form, presenting, particularly in those texts directing specific aspects of instrumental practice, a systematic cataloguing of techniques and evaluations of their relevance in application to particular repertoires and moments within those repertoires. Alternatively, they may take the form of a simple history of a given practice.

This will be of significance as I move to consider the manner in which such texts are taken up within HIP (perhaps acting as a limit in interpretation). More pressingly for the current project, however, this has implications for the ethnographer seeking to analyse text in isolation as a case study. How might the ethnographer justly present such a dense, wide and meticulous output for broader evaluation, given the scope of the material?

Here I return to the theoretical framework that binds this thesis, that of Weberian deconstruction. In this sense, I approach the texts in question as examples of gestures of interpretation that seek to displace other existing modes of interpretation. In this chapter I will posit and test the argument that these texts provide grounds, through their didactic mode of engagement with the reader and their deferral to historical sources for substantiation, for the emergence of a broader 'Authenticist' interpretation of HIP. I should make clear that I do not suggest in this argument that particular authors are rightly or wrongly 'Authenticist': in many cases the opposite may be true, or, more likely, their stance may be more nuanced. Furthermore, such moralistic deliberations are, more to the point, beyond the scope of this chapter and may do more to obfuscate the nature of the struggle over interpretation. I am quite simply making the observation that the interpretive mode of engagement with historical source material and audience within which these texts operate carries weight as an interpretive gesture that 'seeks origin' as justification. Put another way, I suggest that these texts offer a foundation for a particular discourse of practice of historical performance and, further, that they provide the other half of a dialectical relationship when perceived from the other perspective. As for the interpretation displaced, 'mainstream performance'—that is 'traditional' classical music performance—provides the 'other': that which is perceived and constructed as the misguided and arbitrary 'play-affirming' other, resting its justification in a '*false*' historical lineage of 'tradition.' To be plain, this other is a *resourced* other, by no means incapable of defending its own turf, although it is not my task here to do so.

This chapter will not provide a full survey of all the didactic literature (though a brief list of some works is provided); such a task would take a book in itself, as the output of the academic field is increasingly prolific given the centrality of research expected in the

work of the historical performer. Rather, this chapter proceeds through an analysis of passages from texts which I have identified as being paradigmatic for HIP.

In beginning to construct a sense of how insiders might perceive HIP (and particularly its formative parts and scope and the latent potential for Authenticist readings of the movement present in these texts) this chapter is divided into three interrelated sections. The first deals directly with the perception of the scope of repertoire of HIP. Specifically, it suggests that this proclaimed scope, far from being a benign delineation, through authoritative textual gestures of 'scholar-performers' and, in turn, of the academy, presents an affront to 'mainstream' classical music performance. Evidence for this lies in the discernible historical range of publications and their own (self-prescribed) bounds of appropriate repertoire. As will become clear, such an issue becomes complicated for HIP: underlying ideas about what is considered 'historical' begins to break down as HIP's musical scope moves, from its home territory of the 'Baroque', toward the twentieth century. As it does so, it brings with it a fertile convention of gentle antagonism towards 'mainstream' classical music performance.

The second section deals with the perception of historical musical instruments, revealing a more or less explicitly dictated idea about the use of 'period' instruments. Here I will note the strongly articulated insistence on the *difference* of these 'period' instruments to 'modern' instruments, an insistence through which these instruments find their historicity, and thus their place, as constituting feature of HIP, promoting a predisposition towards a discourse of authenticity.

The third section deals primarily with the way in which the broad range of musical practices that the texts claim to fall within the purview of HIP are understood. Within this I make a distinction between non-instrument specific and instrument specific practices or techniques. Of interest here is what is missed, assumed or left unspoken: the spectre, the unspoken trace, of a practice against which these practices both react, and rest upon. Indeed, as hinted above, it is not only what these texts can reveal to us, but also what they conceal that is of interest in understanding the manner in which HIP is conceived of by insiders.

First, then, I will to a consideration of texts that highlight the scope of repertoire of HIP ,and the manner in which that scope is determined.

### **Repertoire of Historical Performance: Contested Turf**

Historically Informed Performance's didactic texts reveal a great deal about how insiders perceive the scope of repertoire of the movement: what music is deemed to be within their jurisdiction, and how it understood. This is made clear in the literature through explicit and implicit authoritative gestures, made largely by scholar-performers, which stake claims to specific eras of music, effectively proclaiming them to be, through some opaque but present criteria, adequately 'historical.' The assertion of 'right' to such repertoire operates not simply as a benign mechanism of distinction, as perhaps the above issue may suggest, that is a claim to an un(re)discovered, unclaimed repertory (such terra-nullius arguments abound in corners of the movement), but is a claim to a turf already occupied by what insiders describe as 'mainstream' or 'modern' performance. The result is an antagonism, a tension felt strongly in the literature, and one which necessitates a more assertive mode of distinction on the part of historical performers, an alternative Authenticist narrative of practice.

This manifests itself in HIP scholar-performer's denial of the authority of what is considered the mainstay of mainstream performance: the score. This denial asserts that scores are unreliable or fallible documents when it comes to deciphering the 'correct' interpretation of music. Instead, Historical Performance, in the pursuit of what it construes as 'honesty' in performance, is oriented towards the use of historical data, treatises and methods. To illustrate this, I will follow three lines of investigation. First, I will turn to a very brief consideration of a broad range of titles as a means of gaining orientation of the scope of repertoire in question. I will demonstrate the challenge to mainstream performance by clarifying the conflict in jurisdiction. Gleaning from this a certain proclivity of HIP toward European text-based music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—roughly the 'Baroque' era—I will then turn to a consideration of this as the 'home-territory' of HIP. This specific historical emphasis points towards the movement's pragmatic reliance on available historical sources, as well as the nature of notation in historical scores.

Finally, I will consider a 'creep' of scope in HIP in the 1980s that saw the beginning of a new venture, continuing the march of the movement towards music of the nineteenth century, reinvigorating the longstanding antagonism to 'the mainstream', and challenging the existing HIP narrative.

In such a vein, I will proceed here with a consideration of a series of titles that appear on reading lists of HIP at the Conservatorium or appear, through reference to other works in the list, to build towards a canon. These texts reveal the scope of repertoire as indicated in the range of publications that I identify as 'didactic literature.'

### **The Repertoire of HIP**

Casting an eye over such an aforementioned reading-list the I find reference to books and articles in 'historical performance' or 'early music.' There are collections of titles promising works dedicated to particular historical eras and/or locations. Such titles include:

- *Interpretation of the Music of the XVII and XVIII Centuries, Revealed by Contemporary Evidence* (originally published in 1915) by Arnold Dolmetsch;
- *The Interpretation of Early Music* (1977) by Robert Donington;
- *A Performer's Guide to Baroque Music* (1975) by Robert Donington;
- *18<sup>th</sup> Century Continuo Playing – A Historical Guide to The Basics*, trans. (2002) by Jesper Bøje Christensen
- *Performing Baroque Music* (1992) by Mary Cyr;
- *Performance Practices of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (1993) by Frederick Neumann;
- *Rhythmic alteration in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century music: notes inégales and overdotting*. (1993) by Stephen E. Hefling;
- *Stolen Time: The history of Tempo Rubato* (1994) by Richard Hudson;
- *A Performer's Guide to Renaissance Music* (1994) by Jeffery T. Kite-Powell;
- *Classical and Romantic Performance Practice 1750-1900* (1999) by Clive Brown;
- *The Performance of Sixteenth Century Music: Learning from the Theorists* (2011) by Anne Smith; and



- *Playing the Cello 1780-1930* (2014) by George Kennaway
- *Music Performance Issues: 1600-1900* (2016) by Beverly Jerrold.

Such a list is by no means exhaustive, but on one level, given the temporal scope of publications, it hints at something of the sustained ever-burgeoning output of HIP. On another level, it points to the emergence of a distinct HIP canon. This is firstly evinced in the very presence of many of these texts on reading lists of reputable institutions, including the Sydney Conservatorium. However, it is also evident in the inter-referentiality of these texts. For example, whilst Arnold Dolmetsch's work does not appear on the presented reading lists, yet the pivotal nature of his work is celebrated in later HIP publications. Indeed, in light of this, much of the work written after Dolmetsch, for example, by Robert Donington, could be said to be indebted to his work. This inter-referentiality extends into more recent texts where I have relied on the regularity of a book or article's citations as indicative of the esteem by which it is held within HIP. The assumption here is the close relationship of academic institutions and HIP, a safe assumption given it is heavily argued throughout this thesis.

The titles reveal a broad scope of historical focus stretching from the Renaissance to the Romantic. The list omits authors concerning themselves with performance practices in pre-Renaissance music as well as those arguing in favour of a historical performance movement extending well into the twentieth century. For the purposes of this chapter, in the interest of space, I have somewhat arbitrarily left these peripheral cases to the side and will return to them in later chapters. On the question of such a scope of repertoire, I make two observations of this half-a-millennium or so scope of repertoire:

First, there is a clear overlap of jurisdiction between the 'mainstream' performance establishment and Historically Informed Performance movement. This needs no more evidence than the conscious juxtaposition of what is generally known in the (mainstream) classical music world as the 'Common Practice Era' — the Baroque, Classical, Romantic and Modern/Contemporary roughly eras spanning 1600-2018 — and the aforementioned list. The outcome of such an effort gives the impression of the HIP movement attempting to rival the turf of mainstream performance.

What I am interpreting as a struggle for dominance in this field needs to be understood in terms of the HIP aspiration towards self-containment and self-determination. In seeking to make a claim for the autonomy of the HIP project, advocates of HIP, rather than, as it were, agreeing to 'share' the matching of jurisdictions immediately moves from a question of simple, passive agreeable division and co-existence to one that automatically and outright excludes conceptions of shared musical material. Here lies, then, a gap between worlds, the discursive delineation on either side that emphasizes distinction. In the case of mainstream performance, this manifests as a narrative of conservatism and tradition, of establishment. For HIP, an alternative narrative is necessary and the assertion here is historiographical; that HIP is *truly historical*. The step towards 'Authenticism' from here is short, buoyed by a rejection of the score as sacrosanct in favour of illumination through the exploration of historical primary sources. Evidence of this rejection can be seen in the work of Arnold Dolmetsch who, as I will show shortly, predicated his historical disposition upon the inadequacy of notation. He states that:

In order to get a comprehensive view of the subject, we must analyse and compare all of the available documents (Dolmetsch, 1915: vi).

Furthermore, evidence of the endurance of this reactionary thread rests in the title of Barthold Kuijken's 2013 book *The Notation Is Not the Music: Reflections on Early Music Practice and Performance*.

The second observation to be made of the range of texts and repertoire of Historical Performance is that of the implicit assumptions resting latent in the tone of such titles. As examples I turn to Arnold Dolmetsch's *The Interpretation of the Music of the XVII and XVIII Centuries, Revealed by Contemporary Evidence*, arguably the first text of the genre in question, or perhaps his follower Robert Donington's *The Interpretation of Early Music*. As I see it, It is here that 'the historical' gains its weight. While the titles give a sense of range, at the same time they offer the promise of all-encompassing accounts of practices of the past, neatly collated, ready for consumption and ultimately, ready for honest and duteous reproduction on the part of agreeable musicians. In the case of the titles above this is evident in the use of the definite article, followed by the capitalized

word 'Interpretation.' It is in such didacticism, inherent in titles, regardless of whether or not content matches such a promise, that the trace of a contested space becomes apparent. It is a contest in which is a tone of didacticism in the very first instance, prior to any espoused philosophy of practice, presented to performers with the weight of 'History' and of Institution, academic and musical.

Indeed, it is upon this deferral to the authority of institutionalized history and its envisioned rationalistic, logical academic rigour that these titles rest. It is upon such a bed of 'substance' that HIP finds its distinction. The mainstream shares no equivalent: no body of interdisciplinary literature that generates such wide reaching and central justificatory discourse leaning on the unquestioned authority of a serious 'history.' I offer no defence of mainstream performance here, nor do I wish to imply that it is a powerless victim in such a struggle; I simply seek to disclose such a struggle.

Having explored here the manner in which scope is received in HIP through historical titles, I turn now to a deeper investigation of how HIP understands its repertoire, firstly by exploring its proclivity to the 'Baroque' as a feature of the movement's move away from score to historical text.

Looking to the works outlined above, it is clear that HIP has a particular penchant for music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; that is to say, there is an abundance of texts detailing historical techniques of the Baroque era. This repertoire can be understood as the 'home ground' of HIP. How might this be accounted for? Why the Baroque? What might this fact reveal about the perception of repertoire by insiders? One reason may be found in the availability of historical sources, along with the retrospective Historical Performance view on notation culminating in the generation of the 'early' narrative of HIP repertoire, that of HIP as a mission to rid the performance of pre-romantic music of inappropriate romantic style. This is evident in the work of HIP pioneer Arnold Dolmetsch, who offers, in the first place, an appraisal of the efficacy of notation to provide insight into performance within a progressivist historical narrative, and secondly, points to the abundance of historical source material in the form of 'instructive texts.'

Dolmetsch opens his seminal book by arguing that that in the earliest days of musical notation, much of the musical information that we take for granted in our modern

day scores was not present. In eleventh century manuscripts, for example only pitch was notated: rhythm, tempo, phrasing, and ornamentation were left out. The implication is that such musical features were 'taught orally.' Dolmetsch goes on to describe the subsequent evolution of notation, concluding that

For nine hundred years notation has progressed, and still it is far from perfect. We are not often conscious of this with regard to modern music, for what most of what we wish to play is already known to us from previous hearing; and when it is not, the style... is familiar enough to enable us to interpret the written text correctly without having to think much about it. But future generations will find difficulties and doubtful interpretations where all seems clear to us (Dolmetsch, 1915: v).

Here Dolmetsch enacts a severing of the modern from the historical, highlighting the problem of temporal distance from a musical sonic object (the composition or style) and the imperfect nature of the remaining physical score. For Dolmetsch, modern performers are unaware of the 'correct' manner in which music beyond the scope of our personal sound world should be performed, setting up a narrative of Baroque performance as a distinct 'lost tradition,' in which seventeenth and eighteenth century musical practices consist of a radically alien style. The implication here is that proceeding this repertoire begins the unbroken line of modern (or 'Romantic') music performance. Here I would characterise this as the struggle of interpretation playing out as the contention between the 'one size fits all,' affirmative and (in HIP's view) historically incorrect approach to the performance of Baroque music, and the HIP position, which construes historical research as the only means through which musical truth might be recovered. Dolmetsch continues:

If we go back [into the seventeenth century], the difficulties [of interpreting notation] become greater. We come to the time when what is now called 'Old Music' was merely old-fashioned. From that time to the revival which is now in progress, the attention of musicians was so completely withdrawn from this 'Old Music' that no tradition of it survived. The tradition now claimed by some [HIP] players only goes back to the early pioneers of the present revival, who knew much less about it than we do now. Reliable information is only to be found in

those books of instruction which the old musicians wrote about their own art. Happily there are many such, well filled with precepts, example, and philosophical considerations (Dolmetsch, 1915: vi).

From this it would appear that the Baroque rests itself in a particular historical niche. It is an era in which, retrospectively speaking, for modern musicians, notation is still, to some degree, legible, though perhaps with some difficulties. This accounts for the ‘common practice’ era beginning here too. It was an era during which, with the rise of amateur musicianship and demand for tutoring methods of music performance from the rising middle class, music was heavily textualised, yielding an abundance of texts. It is no surprise that Dolmetsch should be so happy. The historically informed performance insider is deeply affected by this abundance of textuality: HIP retrospectivity is bound to text.

On the other hand, the movement is not bound to baroque repertoire. This brings me to my next set of concerns: HIP’s contentious movement into the music of the Romantic period, complicating the aforementioned narrative.

Already, the reader will see an inconsistency in the suggestion of such a movement. If the home ground of HIP was the seventeenth and eighteenth century, bound by an assertion of this particular era as contingently and adequately accessible in historical terms, then the suggestion of a shift into the nineteenth century must necessarily entail a re-conceptualisation of the narrative of HIP.

Neal Peres da Costa, in his 2012 book *Off the Record: Performing Practices in Romantic Piano Playing*, sets out by offering an account of the collective attitude towards the movement’s shift into the romantic:

Rumour was that the period [the 1980s] instrument movement—as it was then called—would soon tackle Beethoven, Berlioz, and even Wagner. What would this sound like, we wondered? What could be so different between how we performed Romantic repertoire now and how it sounded at the first performance? (Peres da Costa, 2012: xxi-xxii).

Peres da Costa's gesture of shock and wonder and his questioning of the difference between Romantic Style and Modern Style is telling of the perception of the shift. How could 'Modern Style' if, as I have shown, it is so heavily influenced by its unbroken lineage to 'Romantic style', be conceived of as being somehow separate from the Romantic?

Indeed, this shift of narrative involved a harkening to a new, expansive, and progressive HIP history, external to the traditional progressivist narrative of music history against which the 'early' HIP narrative defined itself. This is a history that takes as its central locus the 'Baroque,' and from this point presents a two-way progression along a linear timeline; retrospectively towards the Medieval, and prospectively towards the present (seeming to stop abruptly, at least till now, at the turn of the twentieth century). It is a revisionist narrative, arguing for a radical historical approach to *all* music of the past. Conceivable as a 'radical conservatism,' this narrative rearticulates the Authenticist position towards a new repertoire, necessarily fuelling contention as it encroached upon historical orthodoxy.

This is the contention that some scholar-performers within the movement have been critical of, but all have acknowledged:

With this new branch of the Period movement dashing energetically off on a false trail, the Establishment, embodied in the symphony orchestra, meanwhile found itself once again in an embattled position, in barely the space of a generation. Up until the 1980s, the Romantic repertoire had been reserved turf, owned and controlled by Modern style, which had inherited it from Romantic style. No longer was it a matter of giving up Bach and Handel, or even Mozart. HIP was in the core of the Romantic stronghold: Beethoven, Schubert, and Brahms were being played in 'authentic style' (Haynes, 2004: 219).

Perhaps the most emboldened by the shift towards Romantic repertoire, and its most staunch defender, has been HIP theorist Clive Brown, whose work in HIP literature is broad and thorough. Noting the contested turf, in his 1999 book *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, Brown makes a clear gesture of moralistic and didactic exclusion, resting upon the weight of an anticipated and certain authority. In doing so, he places himself in line for ascension to the avant-garde:

By the time this book [*Classical and Romantic Performing Practice*] has become a classic tool of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century performing practice, it will be hard to believe that there were once musical professionals whose fear of the kind of knowledge it contains urged them to scorn the historical movement. It will be hard to explain that such ‘flat-earthers’ called an informed approach to music ‘flummery’, ‘exoticism’, or ‘learning to play out of tune’. What these faint-hearted folk were afraid of was a loss of artistic freedom, a withdrawal of that power which performers had more and more taken over during the early part of the twentieth century. And yet, of course, music has always been a shared activity between creator and performer. You don't lose power by knowing things.

Power-hungry performers have a free hand once a composer is dead—especially if he is 200 years dead. What the historical movement has tried to do is to give that composer back his share in the proceedings. ‘Tradition’ and mysterious illumination from teachers can easily assume the mighty shadow of truth. But sharing the stage with a composer and his age isn't really frightening or restricting at all. It is liberating and creatively inspiring (Brown, 1999: viii).

The narrative is argued for in the inverted form. Accusations of an arbitrary and ill-informed ‘Tradition’—framed as mere nostalgia—are thrown at the mainstream with scare-quotes casting doubt on the term. Where HIP had previously sought definition in its orientation towards origins, and been challenged on this front, now the argument is turned inside-out. HIP is rebranded as the revolutionary and progressive player, while the mainstream is portrayed as regressive and conservative. The irony here is not lost on those within HIP; such is the seeming contradictory nature of radical-authenticity.

Taking such a line of thinking to the extreme, Haynes goes on to predict boldly the ultimate triumph of HIP or ‘Early Music’ over mainstream performance, even in spite of his own diagnosed ‘irony,’ which might, in other circles, be deemed a flaw:

As time goes on, and the Movement asserts its right to perform all the music of the past, symphony orchestras and opera companies are gradually appearing in their real form as a glorious anachronism, an expensive and obsolete relic, maintaining the fiction of an unbroken performing tradition to Romantic times. The reality is, as

we have seen, that Modern style lacks the logic of history, and although it is now the mainstream performing style, there is a good chance that with time it will gradually recede, and become an endangered species in need of artificial help. Meanwhile, if we continue to love the Romantic repertoire, we may well find ourselves reviving the performing style that originally went with that music: Romantic style. The irony is that it will be the Period music movement (already at work on this project as we speak) that will reawaken Romanticist practices, and lift its former arch-enemy from its early and undeserved grave. Fantastic as it now sounds, I believe this is a reasonable prediction. 'Early music' will have come full circle, from a Movement devoted to finding an alternative to Romantic performing style to one that revives that very style (Haynes, 2007: 219).

Regardless of the interpretive gestures made within the HIP literature on repertoire, or the very repertoire that the movement seeks to approach, an idea about authenticity remains the unavoidable, ever-present absolute, inescapable as long as the movement seeks identification against mainstream music performance. This provides us with insight into the manner in which insiders understand the repertoire insofar as text informs such perceptions. Indeed, it not just here, however, that the grounds for Authenticist discourse manifests. I turn now to the musical instruments of Historically Informed Performance as another means through which a claim to authenticity is staked.

### **Instruments of HIP**

How the didactic literature of HIP deals with the question of musical instruments reveals something of the manner in which those within HIP perceive their movement, demonstrating clearly the logics through which claims to authenticity are made. The premise here rests on the observation that 'period instruments'—that is instruments deemed to be historically appropriate for the aforementioned repertoire—are to a greater or lesser extent mandated for use in the Historically Informed Performance world. Whatever the extent might be, however, the literature makes it clear that certain types of instruments are central to HIP. To be clear, this not to say that the literature explicitly dictates that historical instruments *must* be used to perform the repertoire outlined



above; rather in the labour of producing these historical texts, there is an assumption of the inherent, authentic, authenticating value of such instruments.

In this section I aim, therefore, to do two things. First, I will outline how this didactic process lends itself towards an Authenticist discursive disposition towards music performance through the consistent deferral to *difference*: specifically, 'original' instruments accrue their authenticity when systematically described in relation to, and against, modern instruments, as well as the reference to historical evidence. Second, I provide a sense of the range of instruments used in HIP so as to flesh out the reader's understanding of the material make-up of the field, the instrumental basis of practice.

Of course, not all of the didactic texts of HIP deal directly with the question of appropriate instruments: some seek only to inform practices. This can be read as a simple unspoken division of labour, in which the question of the instruments is left to the most interested specialists of those particular instruments and the performers themselves, testifying to the bias of theorists to think towards the *practice* of traditional musical performance, rather than expanding the scope of 'musical practice' to include, for example, the construction of musical instruments. It should also be acknowledged that there are contrasting views within the literature that suggest that the use of period instruments is of less concern than the implementation of historical practices: that so long as performers are concerned with playing correctly, the medium is less pertinent (Dolmetsch, 419). However, returning to the central theme of this section, I will return once again to a quote by Arnold Dolmetsch, who states:

the principal facts about technical capabilities, individual colours of tone and their combinations, and, above all, an account of the practical differences between the old instruments and their modern representatives, can be given in a concise form and may prove very useful (Dolmetsch, 1915: 419).

As the instrumental diversity of HIP is broad I will not attempt to provide a thorough overview of all of the instruments of HIP. Instead, I have opted to present two useful insider systems of categorisation that highlight the didacticism of the Authenticist vision. First, I will demonstrate the division between 'old' instruments and reconstructed instruments. By old instruments I am referring to instruments used that are *of the age of*

the music performed upon them. By 'reconstructed' I am referring to instruments that are not of the time, but reconstructed as they might have been built originally. (There are, of course, variations along a spectrum between these two extremes, with instruments that have been altered or repaired throughout history.)

The second distinction to make is between *rediscovered* instruments and instruments with an unbroken evolutionary provenance. Rediscovered instruments are those that are no longer in use in modern mainstream performance, but which HIP advocates have laboured to revive or to reconstruct; for example, the *viola da gamba*, *viola d'amore*, *violoncello piccolo*, *theorboe*, *Chalumeau*, the harpsichord, and clavichord. These instruments could be described as HIP-specific instruments. These are distinguished from instruments that have very close relatives in use today: violins, violas, cellos, basses, oboes, recorders and horns.

Throughout the didactic literature of HIP there are strong assumptions as to the value of 'period' instruments to the identity of HIP. The labour evident in both, on the one hand, the reconstruction of instruments, and on the other, the preservation of old instruments is indicative of the value placed on the instruments. Dolmetsch weighs in on this division with an indifferent tone with regard to the benefits of one over the other, while at the same time reinforcing this point that historical instruments are an integral part of HIP:

Concerning violins, the conditions are peculiar. Those who can afford it play upon instruments that were made two centuries ago. For the last hundred years violinmakers have continued to announce their discoveries of the great masters' secrets. As their instruments can be bought for a small sum, whilst a Guanerius or Stradivarius is worth a fortune, it would be idle to discuss whether the moderns rival the ancients or not (Dolmetsch, 1915: 453-454).

This, in my view, can be understood as a moment of the consecration or reinforcement of specific material resources, constituting them as a species of capital. Left unspoken is the diminution of the place of modern instruments in the interpretation of historical music and HIP in general. This becomes more palpable as Dolmetsch highlights the difference of modern instruments to these period instruments:

These old violins must be altered before they are considered fit for modern [mainstream] requirements. The original bass bar is replaced by one longer and stronger. The neck is lengthened, broadened and thrown more backward. The fingerboard is prolonged to reach extreme high notes. The bridge is raised and its curve increased so that the bow may press harder without fear of touching the next (Dolmetsch, 1915: 453-454).

Dolmetsch's reference to the alteration of old instruments to fit the current technical requirements does not appear to be laden with any particular value judgment. However, it is difficult, in the context of a book aiming to demonstrate an alternate way of playing music, for this not to be seen as building towards a case for an Authenticist interpretation of performance. Donington, who goes to great lengths to articulate these differences, develops this move towards the material construction of the instrument as the point of differentiation and thus of the constitution of value. As he explains of the 'Baroque' violin:

The neck of Baroque violins was often (not always) shorter than is fitted to them now. It was normally set at an angle nearer to the straight. This tends give less string pressure for a given pitch; hence a slightly freer, less massive tone. The tendency is increased where the bridge is low and the strings not very taut...The Bridge now fitted is steeper than the baroque average. This makes forceful passages easier to play without fouling a neighbouring string; chords harder to play without excessive pressure, resulting in harshness... The modern violin bow follows the design perfected by Tourte during the last quarter of the eighteenth century... the stick of the modern bow is curved, and pulled a little nearer to the straight as the hair is screwed tighter. As pressure is brought to bear, in playing, this is compensated by the curvature, and the desired balance of stiffness with resilience maintained. A good specimen of such a bow is an ideal implement for sustaining a rich and massive tone, while permitting a remarkable variety of articulation by smooth, staccato or spiccato bowings. The curve on most pre-Tourte bows, when they are screwed tight for use, is outwards, ranging from virtually straight (very frequent) to markedly curved (less frequent, especially in the baroque period). The length varies from very short to very long, a common length being an inch or two

shorter than the Tourte pattern, though bows a little longer than the Tourte are known...Gimping (covering gut cores with finely-wound wire) is known to have been in use by the later seventeenth-century, for the low strings of lutes, violins, *etc.*, which were previously of very thick uncovered gut (Decidedly unresponsive, especially on the smaller instruments). Covered lower string, but gut upper strings, favour the ideal colouring for baroque violin music (Donington, 1977: 531-533).

The attention to the construction of string instruments here, and the concern for the manner in which they might be performed in distinction to their modern counterparts, presents us with a sense of the significance of the historical to HIP. The same move is made with wind and brass instruments:

Superficially the most conspicuous change has been the evolution of key work. In detail, this has revolutionized their technique, but not basically; and it has no direct bearing on style. Its advantages are evident. It aids facility, and makes freely available remote tonalities, which were prohibitively difficult with keyless cross-fingering. Approximate intonation and even tone on different notes are made more reliable, though fine control always rests with the player. The weight of so much key work clamped to the tube has been thought to modify the sonority, but only slightly.

The real changes are the structural changes in length and bore, in the embouchure size on flutes, the size and flexibility of reeds on oboes, the breadth and depth of brass mouthpieces, *etc.* Since all these variables can be graded imperceptibly, there have generally been intermediate grades between early wind instruments and modern ones; but the final difference is in many cases too wide to be ignored (Donington, 1977: 548).

So far I have only focussed on instruments that could be said to be of an unbroken lineage with instruments that are still in use in modern orchestras today. The historicity bestowed upon these instruments is thus highlighted by comparative reference to their modern counterparts. In this sense it is easy to see how this might help build towards the potential for an Authenticist interpretation of HIP to be drawn. However, it is still

pertinent to provide example of cases of reconstructed instruments of lost lineage, and to demonstrate how historicity is discursively bestowed upon them.

Take the manner in which Donington compares the harpsichord and the modern day piano.

The starting-point for the harpsichord is its touch. Piano touch is in many ways quite different, and can make even a good harpsichord sound unsonorous [sic]. A bad harpsichord may be unavoidable unsonorous... The ideal approach is to feel the keys before depressing them. This is not peculiar to the harpsichord: pianists, especially those whose tradition descends along the great Czerny and Leschetizky line, recognize the same ideal. In practice, it cannot be done above a certain speed, but there is a certain feline smoothness which comes very near to it. The opposite to this is throwing the hands at the keys from a height, which sends the jacks up too violently for the quills to take a proper hold on the strings before plucking them. The result is a quite remarkably hard, metallic and jangling tone (Donington, 1977: 571).

There is a corollary with viols, the historical provenance of which Donington carefully distinguishes from that of the violins:

The viols are a family of bowed instruments collateral with the violin. The viol Family is the older, with medieval origin; the violins evolved, as a cross between the rebec and the lyra da braccio, only in the sixteenth century. But the viols became obsolete in course of the baroque period, except or the bass viol or gamba, which was not discarded until the nineteenth century (Donington, 1977: 527).

One might simply wish to ask of these instruments whether there is any capacity for HIP to conceive of these central 'tools of the trade' on their own terms. It is clear that an Authenticist interpretation of HIP lies latent in the manner in which these instruments struggle to cleave themselves away from comparison with the familiar modern counterparts. Of course, as I have already suggested however, the emphasis of HIP, in the didactic literature at least, rests less on the instruments and more on the practices, to which I now turn.

## **HIP Practices**

Performances practices presented in the didactic literature of HIP reveal something of the manner in which HIP is made sense of by insiders. In these texts, performers are informed about particular instrumental or general performance techniques, given historical context for them, and provide a description, based on primary sources, of the manner in which such techniques might be executed. The textual presentation of historicising labour—that is, the historical effort to uncover lost techniques or practices of the past—constitutes an explicit didacticism that provides fertile ground for an Authenticist conception of HIP.

The range of HIP practices (and historical practices more broadly) is exceedingly wide and continues to burgeon with new publications, reviews, and reappraisals of historical documents (Kim, 2012; Lindley, 2013; Peres da Costa, 2012). As such, an effort to reveal to the reader the broad range of historical practices would be very well beyond the scope of this thesis. Instead, I can only provide a sense of the range of techniques through a systematic evaluation of the various aspects of musical performance. At the same time, I will provide reference to other works that do attempt to cover more ground.

The specific aspects of practice to which I will refer here are pitch, articulation, temporal concerns (rhythm and tempo), and ornamentation. I will leave out an extensive consideration of instrument-specific techniques purely in the interest of space; however, I will make passing reference to a variety of these practices. Importantly, I will demonstrate the difficulty that historical formulations of practice have in establishing themselves ‘on their own terms,’ outside of reference to modern mainstream musical performance.

### **Pitch**

The term ‘pitch’ as associated with music has come to imply a number of things in common parlance. It can refer to the how ‘in tune’ a performer might be, or it may refer, in a loose sense, to the identity of a note within the western tonal system (A, A-sharp, B-flat, B, C etc.). In a strict sense, one more closely aligned to the term’s use in HIP, it refers to that quality of sound produced by the ‘frequency’ of vibrations per second. For the lay reader, this theoretical fact precedes the emergence of any system(ization) of tonality in

any cultural world. It is required for the emergence of any notion of playing 'in tune' and to identifying any given note as any 'thing' in particular.

In HIP it is actually all of these things (in some sense), but specifically, in the manner that I am using it, it is indicative of the agreed upon standard from which musicians might proceed with their practice and performance at any given moment. In other words, an insider might ask 'what pitch shall we play at?' The response might be a negotiation of, first, the mathematically-established frequency of what will become a4 (in mainstream performance  $a=440$  Hz) and, second, the 'temperament': that is, the distance between each of the intervals within the octave. Already it is evident that this can become a complexly mathematical process, one that is well beyond my own mathematical knowledge. However, in terms of HIP, it is also very strongly driven by a historical negotiation. That is, HIP's relationship with pitch is, again, bound to historical research, and primarily the most obvious fact born of such research: that how 'they' used pitch in the past is *different* to the way in which it is used in modern performance.

Mary Cyr, Colin Lawson, and Robin Stowell—the scholar-performers upon whose work I am drawing from here—advocate the use of alternative historical pitch and temperament. However, they are just some of many. Others include William Blood (1979), Bruce (1995), Owen Jorgensen (1977), to name a few. Although she was by no means the first to do so, Mary Cyr makes the point succinctly:

Before the twentieth century, pitch levels for music performance varied from place to place by as much as a third or more. Because practices were so variable, it is often impossible to document them precisely. Several Baroque and later theorists attempted to measure frequencies, but not until J.H. Scheibler's *Tonmesser* in 1834 were these attempts accurate enough to be reliable. The first declaration of a standard pitch was made in France in 1859, when a1[sic][a4] at 435 HZ (vibrations per second) was adopted by ministerial decree. The same standard was also adopted by several other countries, but international agreement was not reached until 1939, when  $a_1=440$  Hz became the new standard. Today, many symphony orchestras exceed this pitch, and some performers (especially singers) have expressed a desire to halt the upward trend by formal agreement (Cyr, 1992: 59).

Cyr goes on to categorise the different pitches relevant to different locations and times, citing Quantz's illumination of the differences between pitch in different cities and how they change over time.

At the present time the Venetian pitch is the highest; it is almost the same as our old choir pitch. The Roman pitch of about twenty years ago was low, and was equal to that of Paris. At present, however, the Parisian Pitch is beginning almost equal that of Venice (Quantz in Cyr, 1992: 64).

While this reveals a very present concern for and sensitivity to historical difference, again highlighting the dependency upon a historicity to create distinction against the mainstream, Lawson and Stowell provide a more dogmatic take on the use of particular pitches *within* HIP:

There can be no doubt that pitch has been unrealistically standardised in recent historical performance, with its almost exclusive focus upon  $a'=392$  Hz (French Baroque),  $a'=415$  Hz (general Baroque),  $a'=430$  Hz (Classical) and  $a'=435$  Hz or 440 Hz (Romantic) (Lawson and Stowell, 1999: 84-85).

Indeed, Lawson and Stowell claim this standardisation as the result of 'convenience', describing the use of these pitch levels as

...an over-simplified response to the evidence, even though the degree of acceptable compromise must clearly vary according to musical context (Lawson and Stowell, 1999: 85).

They call, in response, for a return to greater historical awareness. While Cyr is more forgiving, the same tone of pragmatism and historicity is present, as she proceeds to offer explicit instruction for the modern day historical performer. She highlights the negotiation of pitch in relation to the practical considerations of individual historical instruments, arguing that it must be taken into account that a historically accurate flute may 'play best at  $a_1, 402'$ , but that there would be a practical difficulty assembling a sympathetic ensemble of instruments with which to accompany it. She explains:



For this reason, many builders and players today have adopted a1, 415, as a useful compromise for most baroque music. In a concert, pitches and temperaments must be chosen carefully, since returning is often difficult and impractical. The music and the sonority should be the player's ultimate guide (Cyr, 1992: 65).

Here, it is clear that prior to any practical concerns there is an expectation of historical accuracy that, if not sufficiently taken into account, leaves the performer open to criticism of not being 'historical enough.' It is also, however, in the use of historical temperament that the manner in which the historical is venerated becomes evident. Further, it reveals the manner in which the Authenticist position implied as being pre-eminent in defining HIP.

Lawson and Stowell again explain that the commonly used temperament— that is the equal division of the twelve pitches within the octave—of mainstream performance is a relatively recent development in the history of musical performance:

Today's familiar equal temperament, where the octave is divided precisely into twelve semitones, found universal acceptance only in the middle of the nineteenth century. Thus the considerable complexities of different temperaments must be understood in outline by any historical performer and in detail by the keyboard specialist (Lawson and Stowell, 1999: 87).

Here is a clear example of the manner in which a particular set of practices is dictated within this genre of literature. It is not laid out as a question of choice, but rather, it is presented to the reader as something like a moral obligation on the part of musicians to attain this particular knowledge, and to make the 'correct' decision. Indeed, this knowledge is infinitely complex, as there are many different historical ways of dividing the octave and modern practicalities involved in implementing those methods. A similar process of 'compromise' is evident in the literature as well, and again, it can easily be read that the *historical* choice is interpreted as taking precedence over practicality, despite attempts to imply the opposite. This is evinced in the presentation of the following passage, which follows a page and a half of detailed discussion of appropriate temperament:

The temperament one chooses for a performance is of more than purely historical interest, for many period instruments—natural (valveless) trumpets and woodwinds for example—play more easily in non-equal temperaments. Others, including fretted instruments such as the lutes and viols, can play in equal temperament, but they can also adapt to other temperaments... as with pitch level, the overarching consideration for players and singers must be how the music sounds... and how well the instruments respond to it (Cyr, 1992: 66-67).

Even as the implication is that the 'historical' *might* be overruled by practical concerns, the practical, in this context is again historical, pertaining largely to the practicalities of historical instruments and in turn an abstract 'sound'.

### **Temporal Considerations**

Here I refer to the dictated use of the temporal in the didactic literature of HIP, for convenience's sake here conflating several aspects of temporality in music. Indeed, while there are many thousands of pages of descriptions of the finer details of the temporal characteristics expected within HIP performances, I will set out by describing only two sub-categories of musical temporality: those of tempo and rhythm. With regard to the former, I point to the manner in which the texts suggest that tempo might be chosen and altered in the appropriate places, and how that might relate to meter or tempo changes. In the case of the latter, the texts might refer to the already noted limitations of notational attempts to indicate the execution of rhythms: for example, the case of *notes inégales*, *over-dotting*, and more general *rhythmic alteration*. Again, the assumption is that the historical appropriateness is the sole ground upon which an artist should make performance decisions. In Cyr's explanation, it is the 'character of the music' that constitutes this appropriateness.

The three main types of rhythmic alteration that affect the expression and character of a piece are (1) *notes inégales*, (2) overdotting (sometimes also called double dotting), and finally (3) alignment of certain rhythmic figures with triplets. In many cases, the performer must weigh the possible interpretations and choose the one that best suits the character of the music (Cyr, 1992: 116).

Already here I interpret this as, veiled in the guise of individual artistic choice, the articulation of a didactic gesture. The performer *must* weigh the interpretive options, and chose the *one* that best suits the character of the music.

*Notes inégales* literally translates to ‘uneven notes.’ It implies that the two written equal length notes must be played unevenly, and more often than not the first note longer than the second. This is in contrast to what are called ‘dotted’ notes, where the duration of the long and short notes are notated and, importantly, *measured*. The use of *notes inégales* marks a striking divergence from the ‘score-centric’ interpretive stance of the mainstream, in which deviating from strict tempo and rhythmic markings is deemed ‘bad’ playing. There has been much debate surrounding the use of this traditionally French technique in music of other nationalities. Indeed, this intensity of debate may be read, in itself, as an indication of the struggle over different forms of capital, and the veneration of some artists as more ‘HIP’ than others.

Much ink has been spilt over the French convention... which is still the subject of debate, despite the excellent work of, in particular, David Fuller and Stephen Hefling (Lawson and Stowell, 1999: 66).

Here Lawson and Stowell set up a scene of internal HIP debate, guised as reverence for rigour. The full force of their prescriptive mode of interaction with the reader is laid bare as they continue to argue for the specific utilisation of the technique:

Although readers should be wary of applying this convention to pre-Classical music of all nationalities, as some scholars have advocated, there are good cases for its employment in some seventeenth- and early eighteenth century English music (e.g. by Purcell, Locke and others) and possibly even German and Italian music in a French style (Lawson and Stowell, 1999: 67).

The reader is presented with the clear assumption that precision in the application of historical performance conventions is essential. This echoes the work of Frederick Neumann, who devotes an entire chapter to investigating the international use of this French convention. In his formulation, Neumann gives very precise measurements for the execution of *notes inégales*.

*Inégale* lengthened the first note and shortened the second in a ratio that for all practical purposes ranged from a barely perceptible 7:5 to about 2:1, hardly ever going beyond this limit. Whenever the conditions were right, *inégale* was as good as mandatory unless the composer cancelled it by lacing dots or dashes above the notes or by using such words as *notes (or croches) égales*, *marque*, or *detache* (Neumann, 1993: 121).

The interested performer is presented with an historical account of a technique. However, in the articulation of that history the unreferenced and unqualified phrase ‘as good as mandatory’ is used. It is precisely this kind of assumed didacticism that provides the potential for an Authenticist interpretation of text and in turn HIP. There is not enough space here to continue an exploration of all of the other HIP techniques of temporal manipulation. However, this exploration of *notes inégales* provides an insight into the practice. That said, it is still worth noting the HIP movements complex engagement of tempo modification techniques beyond the scope of the baroque, even through into Romantic repertoire where a similar style of inequality between notes is used. I will now turn to a consideration of *articulation* in HIP.

### **Articulation**

Articulation in music might best be understood in analogy to spoken language. In this sense, it is useful to engage Neumann’s explication of articulation in teasing apart its aspects. For Neumann, there are four main aspects of musical articulation: ‘what is at stake is the way a tone is started, held, ended and linked to the one that follows.’ He explains:

The elements of linguistic articulation are almost literally applicable to music... the following four points are indeed the main aspects of musical articulation (1) how to start a tone, whether smoothly, like an unaspirated (as ‘aaa’), or sharply and percussively, as if with an explosive consonant (as ‘ta ta’), or in a way somewhere between the two extremes; (2) how to hold the tone... whether to keep the sound ever or let it grow or taper. (3) how to end the tone, whether by simply discontinuing it or by abruptly terminating it with an accent-like inflection or by letting it come to an end with a finely sculpted taper; (4) how to connect it with

the tone that follows, whether to link it smoothly and evenly without any interruption, or, at the other extreme, to separate it with a clear rest—or to connect it in any intermediate manner (Neumann, 1993: 187).

While this provides the reader with a sense of what the term ‘articulation’ might entail, it also provides a highly detailed framework for musicians to explore the different aspects of sound production on any given instrument or voice. In the case of HIP, it sets the stage for a very fine and particular engagement with historical accounts of articulation. It also provides the HIP performer with the capacity to evaluate the limits of a particular historical instrument. For example, Neumann goes on to explain that ‘the (Baroque) organ can sustain tone, but is incapable of accentuation and dynamic nuance’ (Neumann, 1993: 187). Similarly, the correlating assessment of other instruments could be made: for example, the harpsichord, a plucked keyboard instrument, whereby the beginning of the note is near immediate, the sustain very short and the end tapering way.

Of the music itself, Donington points out that articulation in Baroque music, to take one example, is often marked either with ‘words of articulation,’ such as *staccato*, *legato*, *marcato* and *cantabile*, or with ‘signs of articulation,’ as in slurs, stroke marks, vertical dashes, wedges and dots (Donington, 1977: 173-175). Cyr gives a clear example of the manner in which articulation might be dictated towards via evidence from historical treatises. Quoting Georg Muffat in his treatise *Florilegium secundum* (1698) Cyr argues:

According to Muffat, the first basic principle of orchestral playing in the French style is that all important notes must be played with a down stroke. His examples show that good notes are those that receive strong metrical accents: the first and third beats in Common time, or the first beat in triple meter... in order to maintain the principle of downbow strokes on first beats in a triple meter... it is necessary to retake the bow at the beginning of each measure, or in more lively tempos, to play two notes on the same upbow stroke in a detached manner, which he calls *craquer*. The resulting articulations produce a strongly accented, separate articulation, without the addition of slurs, and with a silence of articulation created by lifting the bow before the downbeat (Cyr, 1992: 91).

Here it is clear how convention might articulate a particular style that only research into historical treatises might illuminate. In fact, Donington, Neumann and Cyr (and many others) all suggest that what was written in the score may not reveal much of the manner in which articulation should be executed:

Where the composer failed to indicate the desired articulation—the keyboard works of Bach and many of his Italian and German contemporaries are prime examples—the very neglect to specify slurring and detachment marks articulation to be a minor concern. Here the performer must supply some design of articulation with a view to supporting the expression of the work and its phrasing. For Bach, for instance, it will be wise to derive guidelines from the study of his many fully articulated forks for melody instruments, from which we can extract leanings both positive and negative (Neumann, 1993: 89).

Again I interpret this here as the mobilisation of the autonomy of the musician only in service of the work, and specifically, a historical approach to the investigation of articulation. Here it becomes very clear how the assumption of the value of an Authenticist approach is conveyed. I will now conclude this section on practice by looking to a final line of inquiry, ornamentation.

### **Ornaments**

Ornamentation is perhaps the most iconic musical convention utilised in Baroque music and, in turn, in historical performance. Ornamentation refers to the addition of what are known as ‘grace’ notes: that is, notes that do not form the core harmonic material (though they may have great harmonic effect) but are used to add tonal and rhythmic variety to melodies. These ornaments may have been written, or more importantly for HIP, in the baroque era *improvised*. Lawson and Stowell refer to C.P.E. Bach in highlighting the centrality of ornaments, while also, in a sense, building the case to come for the use of ornaments in contemporary performance:

The essential ornaments, comprising the appoggiatura, mordent, trill and turn, served not only as additional embellishment to a preconceived melody but essentially formed an organic part of that melody. C. P. E. Bach considers

embellishments 'indispensible ... they connect and enliven tones and impart stress and accent; they make music pleasing and awaken our close attention' (Bach in Lawson and Stowell 1999: 67-68).

Indeed, throughout the seventeenth century, more and more different kinds of ornaments were dictated to use in treatises and on scores, though it is not possible to know the vast array of improvised ornaments never put to paper. To gather a sense of the vast number of ornaments I would turn the reader's attention to the lists and tables in these didactic texts and the treatises they mention. Indeed, looking towards the Classical and Romantic eras, it is safe to say the trend towards notating ornaments continues. As Clive Brown points out:

Throughout the period 1750–1900 musical notation in European art music was generally viewed as something much more flexible with respect to pitch, rhythm, and embellishment than it has been for much of the twentieth century. But as the tendency for composers to specify their requirements with ever greater precision grew progressively during that period, performers became inclined to observe the letter of the notation ever more punctiliously... The present-day musician who wishes to understand the ways in which, with respect to embellishment, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century performers might have responded to the notation of their day, or the sorts of expectations that composers might have had about the interpretation of their notation, needs to be conscious of a number of important distinctions. At one extreme was the addition of more or less elaborate fiorituras to the given musical text, substantially modifying the melodic line or introducing new material at cadences: at the other was the application of various less obtrusive embellishments, ranging from vibrato, portamento, and subtle modifications of rhythm to the interpolation of arpeggiation, trills, turns, and appoggiaturas (Brown, 1999: 415-416).

Of particular interest here regarding my main argument is the didactic tone present in the direction towards use of ornaments. This tone is echoed in a heightened form in the following passage, again from Lawson and Stowell:

A great deal of selection must be exercised in the 'replication' of earlier approaches to ornamentation, and period performers should consider some or all of the following questions when seeking to interpret a particular ornament in a manner commensurate with the music: On what note should the ornament begin? Should it start before, on or after the beat? How fast should any repercussion be? What are the harmonic implications and how long should the dissonance (if any) last? How flexibly should the ornament be executed? Should nuances be added? ... Answers to these questions will inevitably vary according to the style, character and nationality of the music, the context and the type of ornament, and the views of those theorists whose treatises are deemed most relevant to interpretation; but it is imperative that answers are sought and carefully considered in appropriate contexts if an informed performance is to evolve (Lawson and Stowell, 1999: 69-70).

Here the onus is thrown onto the performer to do their historical research. Although the inverted commas around the term 'replication' might point to the theoretical concerns surrounding the matter of seeking verisimilitude, the simple fact remains that it is still present, in turn lending itself towards the interpretation of HIP as an Authenticist venture. The didactic tone of the text is shown in the use of terms such as 'should' and 'must' in the attempt to discipline young (this particular text is an introduction after all) student musicians into asking appropriate questions. And indeed, the immense detailed expected of the performer indicated in the vast array of precision questions indicates the level of didacticism through a near micro-managerial level of involvement on the part of the author.

To explore all of the practices of HIP, particularly in this moment in history, would likely take several volumes of books. Indeed, I would suggest that this fact is one of the reasons there are so few texts within this genre being produced in recent years. Authors are instead opting to explore individual concepts in detail. In this section I have only demonstrated a small sliver of the practices of HIP, and I would direct the reader back to the texts from which my analysis has stemmed in this chapter for further information.



In this chapter I have demonstrated that the didactic texts of HIP, through their distinctive instructive tone and deferral to the historical, create the grounds for an 'Authenticist' interpretation of HIP that seeks truth and origins as justification for practice. Again, to be clear, I have not suggested that these texts are in fact representations of a distinct Authenticist position; rather, I have suggested that this position rests latent in the tone and underlying assumptions displayed by various authors intending to direct practices of HIP. I have also argued that through these various articulations, 'mainstream performance' stands as the displaced 'other.' In Weberian terms, it is constructed and perceived as the 'play affirming' 'un-historical' 'tradition.' In this sense, as I turned to an exploration of the scope of repertoire, instruments and practices of HIP as evinced in these 'didactic texts,' I demonstrated this othering as an important mode or aspect of identification for HIP. However, as I have already suggested, the didactic texts of HIP may reveal a great deal about the mode of historicity underpinning the movement, however, it does not speak to the movement as a cultural phenomenon. The following chapter is dedicated to texts that attempt to theorise HIP as such.

## Chapter 2 - Theorising HIP: The 'Non-dogmatic' Orthodoxy

The second body of literature to consider is that which actively seeks to come to an understanding of exactly what kind of cultural phenomenon the Historically Informed Performance movement is. I call this literature the 'theoretical' literature of HIP, though the sense of unified genre as implied by the term is too hastily implied at this point in time. In reality, these works generally sit within musicology, and more specifically, within what has been conceived of as the increasingly interdisciplinary and growing academic field of 'critical musicology.' Even that categorisation is inadequate, given the generally accepted integration of the language of this once 'new' musicology into the *lingua franca* of musicological practice.

That said, the production of 'didactic literature' (that more closely linked with traditional historical musicology), dealt with in the previous chapter, also builds into this body of work, and an argument could well be made for the consideration of these two genres of texts on commensurate terms, despite their striking difference in tone, on the basis of their shared motivational grounds: the explication of practice by an invested scholar-performer. This very fact comprises much of the basis of my own project, and more precisely this chapter, insofar as it seeks to understand how insiders understand HIP.

As my analysis proceeds, I again acknowledge my own investment in the movement, perhaps providing what the above texts fail to: a theoretical model of analysis inclusive of the personal bias inevitably brought to the study of cultural worlds. In blunt terms, I argue that the literature does not take into account the institutional and personal stakes involved in arguing for particular 'Authenticist' or 'orthodox' positions, deferring, instead, to moralising absolutes. I manage this with a (re)consideration and (re)articulation of involvement: a 'reflexivity' in the Bourdiean sense. In other words, I am fully conscious of the risks of falling into the category of 'scholar-performer' as I go about my commentary on the movement, and as best as possible, I seek to mitigate such an eventuation.

This aporia—the lack of reflexivity in the body of literature— happens to also provide the perfect grounds through which to piece together at least a part of the process of meaning-making within the HIP movement. Indeed, it is the unique role of the scholar-performer, their function and veneration as ideal figures within the HIP movement, that bestows authoritative weight upon their accounts of practice. These figures are the value creators: those with the potential to distribute positions and consecrate new forms of capital within the movement. In such a sense, they provide more than 'mere' commentary on the sidelines of the field; rather, they play a central role in the meaning-making process and the very construction of the field.

The most obvious manner in which this role is played out was outlined in the previous chapter, in which it became evident that scholar-performers held a privileged position in dictating practice resting upon the weight of (often institutionally-endorsed) historical research. However, that privileged position of dispensing cultural value based on 'rationalistic,' 'academic,' and 'historical' grounds becomes complicated, as I will demonstrate as this chapter unfolds, as the literature begins to take on more culturally (self)conscious perspectives. This involves a turning of analytical focus away from a simple disciplining of practice, and towards, instead, the movement as a contained collective and its navigation in the broader cultural and institutional landscape. Indeed, the very relationship between text—that is, in the broadest sense of HIP, its use of historical

treatises and methods as well as the nature of the efficacy of the theoretical in question—and practice or ‘performance’ comes into question front and centre, rendering opaque the role that the scholar-performer might play in the development of the movement.

I will return to this theme in this chapter. However, before doing so, I want to articulate the overarching argument I am making regarding what these texts reveal about the manner in which HIP is perceived. I argue that an HIP orthodoxy emerges in much of the current literature, a literature that purports to be ‘non-dogmatic’ in the treatment of historical texts, as well as practices. This translates into the denouncement of ‘Authenticist’ approaches as ‘dogmatic’ or ‘authoritarian,’ and as such, represents a rejection of customary, ‘common-sense’ conceptions of HIP as manifestations of a rationalist, revolutionary, anti-establishment counter-culture. I argue that this puts at risk any attempt at useful definition and outlines a potential classification struggle within HIP. Through this internal struggle for capital, I argue that HIP runs the risk of resisting delineation to the point of discursively mis-classifying itself. The danger of making such a bold thesis is that it is easy to fall into the trap of semantics; that is, simply joining the internal debate of HIP, rather than seeking a certain distance in order to attempt to explicate the nature of the debate.

Therefore, I will once again return to the Weberian theoretical framework. Placing the question of *interpretation* itself under the microscope. Again, I will understand the arguments posited within the movement as (textualized) interpretive moves which seek to displace existing, institutionalised interpretations, all of whom seek to attain or maintain dominance through struggle in what Weber describes as the ‘obscure economy’ of the pragmatics of interpretation as practice.

At the core of Weber’s hermeneutics lies a fundamental assertion, based upon his reading of Derrida’s 1967 essay ‘Structure Sign and Play’ of two possible interpretations of interpretation, observable only from a third position that bears witness to this struggle. In his essay, Derrida asserts two interpretations of interpretation: one seeks origins, the end of interpretation, unmediated truth and fundamental closure; the other ‘affirms play,’ leads interpretation to an endless play of signification and an expansive approach to knowledge. Seemingly, these two interpretations are mutually exclusive, and, as Weber

notes, Derrida's own writing leads the reader to identify with the 'playful' interpretation of interpretation. Weber, however, draws his reader's attention to (in Derrida's text, an obscured) third interpretation of interpretation—the ground apparently divided between these irreconcilable interpretations. Weber characterises this ground as a battleground: the scene of a struggle for dominance, within which, as it were, anything goes.

I take up this position and utilise it in the attempt to explicate exactly what is playing out in the HIP movement's literature. In doing so, I am able to divide the literature into two opposed interpretive camps, which I designate respectively as the 'Authenticist' and the 'non-dogmatist.' By 'Authenticist,' in this chapter, I mean more than that implied in the previous chapter, in which the Authenticist position rested latent in the very composition of the texts I delineated as 'didactic.' In the current context, I extend the conception to include theorisation on the relationship of performer to historical text. In this conception I explicitly refer to those authors who state the desire for unmediated access to history (in whatever formulation, be it composer's intent, of historical sound world etc.) or historical 'truth' in the ontotheological sense implied by Jacques Derrida in his work 'Writing and Difference'. At the same time, I seek to remove the punitive moral overtones of Derrida's anti-metaphysical position in favour of a deferral of evaluation.

In this conception of Authenticism, the relationship of text to practice becomes clear: text provides an accurate 'blueprint' for practice, and that the past can be relived through such an engagement. This is the formulation labelled by Derrida as 'Logocentric', in which writing figures as organising authority. Writers positing such an 'Authenticist' view are rather thin on the ground. Two explicit exponents of such a view are Historical Performance pioneer Niclaus Harnoncourt and neo-classicist composer and early HIP proponent Paul Hindemith; few others faithfully maintain this position on the question of historical Authenticity. At the same time, these few voices are accorded what I claim to be an inflated authority by the advocates of the 'non-dogmatist' camps, for whom they constitute a convenient straw-man against which to mount reactionary counter-arguments.

This non-dogmatic position is the position that makes up the current orthodoxy of the Historically Informed Performance movement, at least insofar as its internal dynamics

are concerned. The view I argue is of the 'play affirming' interpretive gesture: it seeks to reject 'single truth' conceptions of practice, such as the 'Authenticist' view on rationalistic truth, in favour of a more 'open' approach that liberates practice from the limits of texts suggesting a radical gap between text and act, as in, for example the formulations of prominent HIP theorist Richard Taruskin. I suggest that the majority of texts written on Historical Performance espouse variations upon this theme, even those that have been touted, including in the previous chapter, as being particularly 'dogmatic.' I suggest that it is because of HIP's particular position within musicology that such a state of affairs has played out, particularly the moves within musicological literature away from 'text-fetishism' and concept of *Werktreuw* as guiding analytical perspectives.

The current chapter also seeks to place HIP within a musicological context, understanding HIP as a movement moved by and, in turn, moving musicology's particular struggle in dealing with the 'sticky' nature of performance. This is reflected in shifting interest in particular objects of analysis away from the text as the locus of meaning, towards performance. In such a process, this chapter will be divided into three parts.

The first section orients the reader to the musicological situation of much of the twentieth century, the context within which the literature in question first emerged. This environment can be understood as one heavily concerned with text for the construction of meaning, and by extension, the 'harmonic', and is epitomised, compositionally, in the work of the Second Viennese School of Berg, Webern and Schoenberg and the general 'formalist' attitude that persists in musical institutions still to this day. In such musicological formulations, texts precede performance; that is, the performance is understood as only a derivative, if not corrupted, version of the pure, unadulterated text. This is what Nicolas Cook calls the 'reproductionist' model of performance which, he argues, has dominated musical institutions since Romanticism. I will demonstrate how the HIP phenomenon presented and continues to present a challenge to this position, and show how HIP, in this challenge, provided an alternative analytical perspective to the reproductionist model through its historical revisionism. At the same time, however, despite its explicit efforts to free itself from logocentrism, HIP remained bound to textual authorities.

After exploring the musicological context of this genre of literature, I will turn to a consideration of the nature of texts of the 'Authenticist' disposition. My main argument will be that there is a striking lack of literature that takes this particular interpretive stance. I will demonstrate that even in the cases of what I have described as 'didactic literature' in the previous chapter, the theorisations of practice are inevitably more pragmatic than they are, perhaps, committed to historical accuracy. By taking such a position, I will illuminate what I perceive as the construction of an Authenticist straw-man.

On that note, I will turn to the final category in question, namely the 'non-dogmatic' collection of works that seek to make sense of HIP within a framework that fundamentally rejects the 'solid' narrative of origins presented by 'Authenticists.' I will demonstrate several of the (re)iterations of this interpretive frame.

Before concluding this chapter, I will return to some of theoretical concerns which, by this stage, will have been raised regarding musicological attempts to deal with performance through academic investigation. I will highlight the recent work of Nicolas Cook, who has made possibly the most explicit attempt to deal with music as performance. I will outline some of the issues regarding 'performance' as a category and by doing so provide more of a theoretical backdrop to continue my own investigation into the HIP movement within a performance studies frame. I proceed now, however, with a consideration of the musicological context in which the literature of HIP, and by extension the movement itself, has arisen.

### **Musicology, Performance and HIP**

In the investigation of how the literature of HIP reveals a particular insider understanding of Historically Informed Performance, it is first important to come to an awareness of the contingency of these ideas within the field of musicology. These ideas of contention and struggle surrounding questions of Authenticity and history do not exist in a vacuum; rather, they play out in a field already fraught with discourses of the relationship of the composer to his work and the work to performance, even if these discourses play out only implicitly.

Most significantly, as the movement of HIP is indeed a largely performance focussed movement, it is of interest to consider how the relationship between musicological literature and performance is conceived of in the HIP literature.

### **Musicological Context**

For the purposes of orientating the texts to be analysed in this chapter, it is first useful to come to a historical understanding of the nature of the field within which they were written. I will provide an interpretation of the field of musicology in the mid-twentieth century. Underpinning this interpretation of the field is a cognisance of the heavily text-based nature of the field, which is nowadays becoming less and less tenable as research into performance has sparked whole new fields of inquiry. As such, the argument I am putting forward here is far from controversial, however, it is still important given the enduring prevalence of formalist research into scores over performance.

#### **The Common Narrative of Classical Music: The Textual Turn**

The field of musicology has a relatively wide reputation for holding what Richard Taruskin famously labelled a 'text-fetishist' approach to analysing music. Taruskin described text fetishism in his book *Text and Act* as 'the exultation of scores over those who read or write them' (Taruskin, 1995: 187). Taruskin's contribution to the field of musicology and HIP more broadly is still widely acknowledged. Yet, still in recent times, complaints of over-eager deferrals to scores are being aired. Take for example HIP theorist Bruce Haynes's statement:

Texts still form the principle subject matter of the history and analysis of music. Arthur Mendel, for instance, in distinguishing the history of the arts from other kinds of history, wrote that 'what we have before us in an old manuscript or print—or in its modern reprint, for that matter—is much more than a trace of the doer [of a deed]: it is his deed itself.' This statement breathes the assumption that a musical deed—all of it—can be captured on paper (Haynes, 2007: 91).



This 'text-fetishism' has been a strong foundation the Historically Informed Performance critique of the mainstream performance world. I will return to that conflict shortly. For now, it is important to acknowledge the significant role that 'text-fetishism' has had in the construction of the commonplace narrative of music history.

The first thing to point out is the nature of the relationship between music performance and musicology. In the case of music education, most performance degrees in western classical music (at least in Australia) have a compulsory music history component. This is certainly true of the Sydney Conservatorium. Musicologists or music historians, each with their own particular interests and sub-fields of disciplinary expertise, teach these history subjects. Core music history subjects are generally conceived of and organised through a chronology of distinct historical 'eras.' At the Sydney Conservatorium the sequence is: 'Middle Ages to Baroque,' 'Classical and Romantic,' 'Music in Modern Times' and 'Musical Worlds of Today.'

The mode of engagement with history within these subjects primarily involves a chronological examination of the changes in compositional style through time and of the social conditions in which such works emerge. This is strongly reflected in the main music history textbook in use at the Conservatorium, Burkholder et al's *History of Western Music*, which offers a chronological survey of music history through the great composers and historical events. The important fact to maintain here is the primacy offered to composers. As Nicholas Cook puts it:

What are sold as histories of classical music represent music as something made by composers rather than performers (Cook, 2014: 9).

The following excerpt is a transcript of a public lecture given by the greatly revered, composer and pianist Leonard Bernstein in which he outlines clearly the general narrative accepted by the music community:

What we're trying for is a high overview of musical development in terms of a vocabulary constantly being enriched by more and more remote and chromatic overtones. It's as if we could see the whole of music developing from prehistory to the present, in two minutes. Let's again pretend we're hominids, and that the

smash hit of the moment is, say, 'Fair Harvard.' Here we are, in our hominid hut, crooning:

[Sings/Groans and plays single monophonic melody on the piano]

Now maybe our wives, and maybe our prepubescent sons, join in, and automatically we're singing not in unison but in octaves, since men's and women's voices are naturally an octave apart.

Now that octave interval happens to be the first interval of the harmonic series... ..Centuries pass, and inevitably the next interval of the harmonic series is assimilated by humanity, namely the fifth...

Of course, this little change brings us forward a mere ten million years, into the tenth century A.D., and into a fairly sophisticated musical culture. But now we admit the next interval of the series, the fourth: so that we can mix intervals of the octave and the fifth and the fourth: That's beginning to sound like polyphony.

Again comes a great leap, as music absorbs the next overtone, acquiring the interval of the third... ..It's a whole new music, richer, mellower, with a new coloristic warmth... ..As we know, this new interval of the third introduces into music the phenomenon of the triad... And so now Fair Harvard can begin to sound more like its Victorian self... And so there is born what we now call tonal music, a stable tonal language firmly rooted in the basic notes of the harmonic series, the fundamental: and its first different overtone, the fifth... ..Now and forevermore to be known as the tonic... ..And the dominant...

Bernstein goes on to outline the movement of history towards chromaticism through the discovery of the twelve tones of the western scale. This involved the stacking of fifths (a 'circle' of fifths) upon one another, and those notes being grouped together within the octave. Bernstein continues:

What's more those twelve tones generate a circle of twelve keys. Through which, thanks to the perfecting of the temperate system, composers can now go free wheeling at their own chromatic pleasure... ..that's chromatic porridge and in our own century it's going to become goulash (Bernstein, 1979).

Perhaps the most obvious omission from Bernstein's account is any sonic signifier other than pitch. One might well ask, what of prehistoric rhythm or instruments or texture for

that matter? Of course, this was a public lecture; a certain schematicism may be expected and excused. However, what is most significant in Bernstein's account is his exultation of what I will describe as the 'harmonic turn.' This can broadly be understood to be the logical musical extension, if not *reductio*, of the structuralist 'textual turn'. The harmonic turn is the tendency of research to seek to 'uncover' the structure of any given musical work by revealing its requisite parts.

One of the most prominent musical theorists of the twentieth centuries, and perhaps one of the most taught, Schenker, can be understood to be the epitome of such a conception. He formulated a system of analysis now known as 'Schenkerian analysis.' As Thomas Pankhurst states of this system:

Schenker shows that although tonal music is richly complex, it can be understood as the elaboration of simple structures that lie beneath the surface; it is this essentially simple idea of music as the art of elaboration that lies at the heart of Schenkerian analysis (Pankhurst, 2008: 5).

This form of analysis, determined to find meaning in music in the score, is taught at conservatoires including the Sydney Conservatorium, through the textbook *Harmonic Practice in Tonal Music* by Robert Gauldin.

There is, in Gauldin's textbook, an implicit chronology intertwined into the structure of the work. Students progress through increasingly complex exercises aiming to train a complex, habitually understood series of ideal 'voice leadings': that is, the manner in which separate voices move in pitch melodically so as to produce a 'good' vertical collection of tones or 'harmony'. As they move through combinations of cadences and progressions towards the increasingly chromatic, complexity is tied to a teleological narrative of historical progress.

This is the same chromaticism referred to by Bernstein as 'porridge' and 'goulash.' It is a chromaticism most commonly associated with the works of the second Viennese school of Schoenberg, Webern and Berg. For Gauldin, Berg is the end point of his harmonic analysis. It is no surprise that these composer's works came to be understood as

representing the ‘crisis of tonality,’ with their move away from functional tonal harmony, towards twelve tone music and serialism and ultimately atonality.

However, re-examining to the ‘goulash’ to which Bernstein was referring in 1979, one cannot help but notice in 2018 that composition, as a whole, has not moved towards a state of consistent atonality. Nor are we headed there. As Cook points out,

[In the histories] the twentieth century emerges as dominated by atonality, Schoenbergian serialism, post-war serialism, and a variety of postmodern reactions against it; depending on the market, there may be a few chapters on jazz and popular music. You could not tell from this that most classical music making in the twentieth century consisted of the performance, recording, and consumption of earlier music (Cook, 2014: 9).

If anything, movements such as minimalism and neoclassicism better point towards a retrospectivity in composition that mirrors a current day murmur of, if not a real, decline in audience, and a countering of this narrative. Yet, as indicated in Cook’s statement, this narrative remains strong, propped up by the entertainment industry that is classical music. As Cook points out of Schoenberg:

Arnold Schoenberg—who himself had ideas of writing a book on performance—once remarked that the performer was ‘totally unnecessary except as his interpretations make the music understandable to an audience unfortunate enough not to be able to read it in print’ (Cook, 2014: 8).

Cook describes Schoenberg as part of the very strong current still operating in the music world within a ‘paradigm of reproduction’, insofar as they believe that performances stand only as reproductions of what is already in the score (Cook, 2014: 21). Indeed, this reproductionist paradigm is clearly in operation in practical music education: the score is sacred, annotated by the student only in pencil, followed meticulously; sight-reading—that is, the capacity to render faithfully what is on the page without prior preparation—is elevated as the highest order of performative competence.

This positivistic history dominates the music performance world. It is one predicated on the sanctity of text. It is in the enduring ‘reproductionst’ setting that

Historically Informed Performance found its feet. However, Historically Informed Performance, or 'Early Music' as it was originally called, was not interested in the latest compositional developments of the twentieth century. It is of course no surprise that the early literature of HIP found closer connection with historical musicology than music theory given the movement's penchant for revival and rediscovery rather than harmonic expansion. Moreover, an attempt to deal with the question of performance marked a major shift in musicological research, one that necessitated the development of a new relationship between score, literature and performance. As such, the theoretical texts of HIP found their place.

### **Discourse of Dogmatic HIP**

Perhaps the Authenticist position could be understood as the unreflective default position of HIP. With an awareness of the early roots of HIP literature finding a close relationship with historical musicology, it is no surprise that the 'short circuit' response of HIP, the speedy resolution of the problem of text and act, would be to ignore the issue, instead opting for the assumed equivalence between the two. I have already indicated that this assumption is very present within the didactic texts of HIP. Indeed, it is hard to argue for a 'historical' practice without at least some kind of endorsement of this position. It is from this that it can be seen how narratives of HIP as reactionary, grass roots and/or counter-culture might emerge from HIP in the formation of an HIP identity. Indeed, recall from the previous chapter that the Authenticist position operated and still operates as a point of distinction with mainstream performance. However, while this might have been the common-sense interpretation of HIP, upon closer inspection, theorists have seemingly avoided explicitly endorsing the view.

Perhaps the most striking observation to be made of the Authenticist position is that there seems to be a great deal of discourse *surrounding* it, but seemingly few theorists operating within its framework. In terms of actual theorisations as to the construction of HIP around these ideas, I argue that HIP comes up short. There are very few theorists who take a strict Authenticist interpretation of HIP. By presenting this fact, I am beginning to suggest the image of the Authenticist position as something of a straw man, at least on a theoretical level.

However, it is useful to briefly look at some of the few articulations of the Authenticist position. John Butt (not an Authenticist himself), in opening his book *Playing with History*, presents us with a short quote from Paul Hindemith, the twentieth century neo-classical composer, who, Butt argues, 'advocated the wholesale restoration of the instruments and practices of Bach's age':

[w]e can be sure that Bach was thoroughly content with the means of expression at hand in voices and instruments, and if we want to perform his music according to his intentions we ought to restore the conditions of performance of that time (Hindemith in Butt, 2002: 3).

Of course, the assumption here is, that by reconstructing the exact conditions of performance of the time the composition was written, HIP will find the 'correct' interpretation of the work, bound to the composer's original intentions. As Butt points out, the assumption that the composer's intentions might be of the most significance in interpreting music might reflect the values of Hindemith *the composer*. In other words, Hindemith being a *modern* composer might have cast upon the compositions of times past the modern ideal that the composer's vision is paramount. Taking this idea to its logical conclusion, one might suggest that this is an ironic extension of the 'paradigm of reproduction' out of the realm of the score and into the realm of historical literature.

Regardless, Butt goes on to offer a second proponent of this position, an ardent follower of Hindemith, namely, the famous HIP scholar-performer Nikolaus Harnoncourt. Butt argues that

[Harnoncourt's] countless essays from this pioneering period did much to popularise the virtues of associating earlier music with its original performance practice. More importantly, he was perhaps the first to stress that music and its performance before the nineteenth century involved a different aesthetic, one stressing the speech-like and rhetorical aspects of music (Butt, 2002: 3-4).

Already in the early pages of his book, Butt problematizes this initial narrative of HIP, pointing out the troubling 'modernist' tendencies of these two theorists:

Both in his rejection of the status-quo, and his early alliance with Hindemith, Harnoncourt's case is symptomatic of the association of HIP with a particular strand of modernism. Indeed Harnoncourt was one of the first to suggest that his historical reconstructions represented a 'modern' adventure, not simply a direct return to the past (Butt, 2002: 4).

Here I interpret this as the obfuscation of the Authenticist position. I argue that this is the beginning (if not a ver yearly example) of a theoretical thread that permeates the literature of HIP, that HIP is in fact a modern venture, not a past one. It is presented as a reactive corrective to a culture in decline, rather than a past practice on its own terms. At least, in Butts' formulation, there was very little place for a truly Authenticist position, even from the outset.

Even if I look to my own claim that the narrative of HIP starts with the work of Arnold Dolmetsch, a similar dilemma is present. For all of his work on historical reconstruction, it would appear that Dolmetsch too was not satisfied with the 'wholesale restoration of the instruments and practices' of the past. In an essay titled 'Early Music defended against its Devotees: A Theory of Historical Performance in the Twentieth Century', Lawrence Dreyfus points out that

[d]espite his enormous pretensions to historical accuracy and empirical method, one sometimes gets the impression that he not only wished to revive the past, but actually improve on it. Take for example, his reconstruction of the harpsichord in a now-forgotten account from the 1930s by his pupil Robert Donington. We learn, perhaps to our surprise, that Dolmetsch was not entirely happy with his reconstructive labors (Dreyfus, 1983: 305-306).

This echoes his relatively 'soft' stance on the use of historical instruments noted in the previous chapter whereby he demonstrated little remorse upon the caving to demands of practicality in the pursuit of historicity. Indeed, Dolmetsch, as Dreyfus points out, was very willing to make very unhistorical alterations to his instruments, or what Donington called 'historical oversights' (Dreyfus, 1983: 306).

While Dreyfus argues most ardently against conceptions of HIP as purely an Authenticist pursuit, he asserts that

[i]f there is an idea that cements together this diverse collection of people and things, it is Authenticity. Whether or not it is named, this highly charged concept underlies every conscious act of Early Music (Dreyfus, 1983: 299).

Yet at the same time, even the pioneers of the movement struggled to meet up to this ideal. This is an idea that must be held in mind as this thesis continues.

### **Non-Dogmatic HIP**

#### **Taruskin on Authenticity**

Richard Taruskin is perhaps most famous, particularly within the HIP movement, for his work throughout the 1980s and 90s on the idea of Authenticity as it relates to Historical Performance. His greatly influential book *Text and Act*, published in 1995, is a testament to this labour, comprised of a compilation of some 20 pieces—journal articles, talks, reviews, book chapters— each dealing in some way with questions of historicity and Authenticity in the movement. Unifying these pieces is Taruskin’s central critique of Authenticity: that it stands not as an adequate descriptor for the Historical Performance movement but as a deeply unethical marketing ploy. In his words: ‘It is neither description nor critique, but commercial propaganda, the stock-in-trade of press agents and promoters’ (Taruskin, 1995: 90).

Indeed, Taruskin’s gesture against such an Authenticist interpretation of HIP is made clear in the opening of chapter four, a chapter originally published in 1988 in *Authenticity and Early Music*, edited by Nicholas Kenyon, in which Taruskin poses the question: ‘Do we really want to talk about ‘Authenticity’ anymore?’ In this prosaic rhetorical question, the full force of an act of institutionally endorsed de-legitimation is felt. For Taruskin, and indeed, any reader seeking to retain their personal intellectual integrity, it would seem the case is closed. Continuing, Taruskin moves to an evaluation of an entry in the *New Harvard Dictionary of Music* from 1986, which suggests that Authenticity is, ‘[in] Performance practice, instruments or styles of playing that are historically appropriate’ (in Taruskin, 1995: 90). Taruskin’s response is magisterial:



here it is in all its purloined majesty, this word that simply cannot rid itself of its moral and ethical overtones (and which always carries its invidious antonym in tow), being used to privilege one philosophy of performance over all others (Taruskin, 1995: 90).

Scoping out the breadth of the problem he has highlighted, Taruskin turns to the entry on 'Performance Practice' in the same publication, glossing the definition:

historically, the study of performance practice has concentrated on periods and repertoires in which the gap between what was notated and what was thought necessary for a performance (especially a historically Authentic performance) was greatest, [nevertheless] the recent history of this study has seen the extent and importance of this gap recognised in repertoires ever closer to the present' (paraphrased in Taruskin, 1995: 91).

Taruskin argues that this is evidence of the perpetuation of the problem of Authenticity as it retains in its definition of the field: a privileging of the Authenticist line through its seeming act of institutionalisation through narrativisation brought about by the use of the past tense (*was* notated...*was* thought necessary). Taruskin springboards from here towards an evaluation of the state of performance practice in practical life, suggesting that there is a real threat from such a conception.

The application of the loaded term to virtually unlimited musical and historical terrain (effected by carrying over the word 'gap,' which has been invested both with the notion of the problem and with that of its approved solution...), The definition has become authoritarian, and it signifies a definite encroachment of 'historically Authentic performance' beyond areas of traditional historical concern into areas where it now threatens the status of artists not trained in 'historically appropriate instruments of styles of playing (Taruskin, 1995: 92).

Taruskin points to this as the cause of tensions (at least in the 80s and 90s if not beyond) within the classical music field, bringing into it the image of a 'bloody battlefield, one in which he is staying on to 'fight it out' against the Authenticist push. This imagery is

strikingly evocative of Samuel Weber's conception of the field of interpretation as a *battleground*.

Taruskin, describing Authenticity as a 'shibboleth' used to 'scourge' the opposing party, argues that the phrase should be left 'to moral philosophers, textual critics, and luthiers', pointing to others who share a disdain for the term, and citing, in support, musicologist Joseph Kerman and historian Gary Tomlinson. And it would appear, in what Taruskin suggests, that the weight of the academy had some success in fashioning a partial retreat on the part of the Authenticists demonstrating various 'ersatz shibboleths' touted by musicological forums and several contemporaneous concert series such as 'historically accurate' or 'historically informed' (formulations, indeed, still in currency today).

In seeking an alternative descriptor for the movement—one that might do a better job than 'Authentic'—Taruskin turns to the work of musicologist Joseph Kerman, who proposes, in a similar line to Tomlinson, another 'value-free' substitute, namely, 'contextual performance.' He argues that this term may pass the 'invidious antonym' test (though one simply need to add a 'non' to contextual to find an equally vindictive binary opposite from which to stake a counter-attack) but it still validates external factors to actual performance and in this sense subverts subjectivity and interpretation.

It seems to encourage what seems to me the naive assumption that re-creating all the external conditions that obtained in the original performance of a piece will thus recreate the composers inner experience of the piece and allow him to 'speak for himself,' that is, unimpeded by that base intruder, the performer's subjectivity (Taruskin, 1995: 93).

The next attempted descriptor, or new-fangled 'shibboleth,' to come into Taruskin's line of fire is the suggestion that what is sought in historical performance is 'verisimilitude' with the past. To this Taruskin suggests that where this proposal may seem uncontroversial, it is actually deeply controversial, asking not only 'Why should this be our aim?', but 'what does such an aim say about us?' In the former question it becomes clear again that he is pointing toward the moralistic overtones present within the suggestion that the task of seeking verisimilitude implies; for the latter, Taruskin provides a now

famous quote from musicologist, Donald Grout in 1957, in the early days of the early music revival:

Have we no living tradition of music, that we much be seeking to revive a dead one? The question might be embarrassing. Musical archaism may be a symptom of a disintegrating civilization (Grout in Taruskin, 1995: 94).

Taruskin carries this line into the debate in 1988, demonstrating that the term 'verisimilar' as used in relation to performance practice was still as speculative and contingent as it was in Grout's time and he goes on to demonstrate the practical flaws of this thinking in the performance world. He points to what he sees as three extremely influential styles or schools of 'historical performance that arose in the mid-twentieth century; the 'Mediterranean' school, the 'Nederlandish' school and that of Pothier and Mocquerean. He demonstrates that 'in not one of these cases can the historicity of the style in question withstand the slightest scrutiny on any positive documentary basis' (Taruskin, 1995: 94). As he explains:

Those whose scholarly superego insists that everything they do must survive a trial-by-document are doomed to a marginal existence as performers' (Taruskin, 1995: 94).

However, Taruskin is willing to concede ground to the term, providing the first hint at his solution to the problem (which can only be pieced together by an engaged reader) as resting within the idea of a 'persuasive' performance:

what makes for persuasion, I want to emphasise—and hence, what makes for authority and Authenticity in a sense I would approve—has to do both with the persuaders and the persuaded (Taruskin, 1995: 94).

I leave this thread open for now, focusing instead on Taruskin's introduction of what he sees as a viable alternative, rendered in the construction of a binary opposition.

For Taruskin, this argument about 'historical verisimilitude' is at the core of the debate around how HIP should be understood. He takes as a case study, the performance and discourse espoused by two practicing musicians as illustrative of the nature of the

debate dragging the discussion into a broader binary opposition between 'Authenticists' and 'experimentalists.' On the one hand, he presents David Wulstan and his work with the Clerkes of Oxenford as one who represents the 'Authenticist attitude', while demonstrating that, through his artistic decision to use 'women rather than boys on the stratospheric treble parts in Tudor music', he contradicts in practice his statement, admitting that '[t]he primary object [of this work was] to obtain as nearly as possible the sound of the great English Sixteenth Century Choirs' (Wulstan in Taruskin, 1995: 96). On the other hand, he presents Peter Phillips and his work with the Tallis Scholars as a more open-minded endeavour, in which non-historically accurate performances practices are actively employed and suggested to be 'ideal,' and the discourse on it acknowledges this.

[I]t is unlikely that any choir in the sixteenth century had at any one time a group of singers who were sufficiently young to perform in a manner which we should consider ideal— conditions then were not so conducive to experiment and choice as they are now, and it is for that very reason that we can be so bold as to say that we think we can do better (Phillips in Taruskin, 1995: 95).

It is clear here where Taruskin's allegiances rest. It is clear in the emergence of his veneration of concepts such as 'persuasion,' 'experiment', and 'choice' as a part of the formulation of an alternative reading to the 'Authenticist' understanding of HIP. But Taruskin continues to thicken his conception of this binary through attributing to Wulstan the full weight of his academic credentials and to Phillip, the full weight of his performance credentials. The result is the stark presentation of his primary dichotomy between the academic world and performance, between text and act:

These differing perspectives on what they are doing... points up the ambivalences in the relationship between musical scholarship and musical performance. Scholars seem to assume it is they who have furnished the impetus for historical performance. A glance at the historical record shows that musicology has been a Johnny-come-lately to the Authentic performance movement, and I will make bold to assert that musicology has been responsible for more of what has gone wrong with 'Authentic' performance than what has gone right with it... It is the academic mind, not the performer's, that is trained to generalise and to seek normative

procedures—even when this means elbowing off the table the difficulties and ambiguities that surround, for a notable example, the renaissance mensural system...The academic mentality tends to operate on the basis of authority ('Objectivity') not identification ('Subjectivity') (Taruskin, 1995: 96-97).

And thus Taruskin couches the binary he has drawn within the broader, well-known Cartesian discourse of the Subject-Object, venerating the subjective in response to the rationalistic. Further, he carries this into his dealing with the issue of 'composer's intentions': that debate within the Authenticist camp that suggests verisimilitude must be associated most closely with what the composer wanted. It should come as no surprise now that Taruskin holds no candle for such an idea. He does, however, make some interesting suggestions regarding performer's claims to maintaining composer's intentions.

Taruskin presents us with the points of view of the standard Authenticist position outlined above and convincingly argues, along with Wimsatt and Beardsley, that it is a 'red herring': that it is impossible to know what the composer intended. Labelling the pursuit 'consulting the oracle' and an example of the 'intentional fallacy', he suggests that the appeal to intentions 'bespeaks a failure of nerves' on the part of the performer, as it obscures the obligation of the performer to 'understand what he is performing.' However, Taruskin turns to the work of famous twentieth century harpsichordist Wanda Landowska, conductors Bruno Walter and Kenneth Cooper, whose explications of practice have evoked a different interpretation of faith to composer's intentions.

The key difference Taruskin suggests, of the approach of Landowska, Walter and Cooper, is that they maintain an idealist line; that is, their version of intentionality is 'spiritual,' or 'metaphysical,' pertaining more to the *effect* of the performance and the internal and personal negotiation of the performer with composer. Taruskin cites Landowska:

If Rameau himself would rise from his grave to demand of me some changes in my interpretation of his *Dauphine*, I would answer, 'You gave birth to it; it is beautiful. But now leave me alone with it. You have nothing more to say; go away!' (Landowska in Taruskin, 1995: 98).

However, Taruskin's most compelling articulation and explication of his argument here comes in his reference to a friendly televised exchange between two collaborating high profile HIP performers, Kenneth Cooper and the famous harpsichordist and director Christopher Hogwood.

Cooper: 'It should be remembered about history... that what we know about history was only a small part of what was done, so that when we represent what we know about it, we are distorting it; and therefore to try and fill in a little of the creative energy— even if it's not exactly the same creative energy...— [helps us in] getting closer to a fuller picture'...

Hogwood: 'That's the wonderful thing, I think, about coming across new versions of pieces or new evidence. Suddenly that gives you this extra energy: 'Ah, a new set of instructions for embellishment... ah, wonderful!' (Hogwood and Cooper transcribed by Taruskin, 1995: 100-101).

Here, as is Taruskin's intention, the difference is laid bare. On the one hand, he provides an acknowledgement of the impossibility of a wholly historically accurate performance on the part of Cooper along with his willingness to reconcile this failing with the impetus of a 'creative energy.' On the other, there is a certain stubbornness in the words of Hogwood who, as Taruskin would no doubt intend to highlight, seemingly 'misses the point' of his colleague by reaffirming the values of rationalistic, evidence based practice despite the already established premise of impossibility. Finally, Taruskin succinctly sums up his argument:

The difference, to put matters in historical perspective, is that between idealism on the one hand, which recognises a sharp distinction between content and form and between spirit and letter, and positivism on the other which denies the existence of any but sensory experience, and hence any knowledge not based in sensory data. To a positivist content is a function of form, spirit a function of letter. Content and spirit as concepts in themselves are illusions born of reifying subjective sensation (Taruskin, 1995: 99-100).

So, summarising the ground covered above, Taruskin reveals and reifies, in his work, two camps within HIP. On the one hand, he presents the Authenticists, a group within which he associates a theorisation of HIP that involves valorisation of 'historical accuracy,' 'Authenticity,' 'authoritarianism' and 'objectivity,' and is represented by performers and scholars such as Christopher Hogwood and David Wulstan. On the other hand, Taruskin presents what I will label the 'non-dogmaticists' or the 'experimentalists,' that group of HIP scholars and performers open to a more flexible engagement with historical text and performance, the 'idealists' who venerate creativity, spirit, subjectivity and persuasion made up of scholars and performers such as Landowska, Cooper and Phillips. In Taruskin's view these two groups are separated by irreconcilable philosophical differences, with the former standing for nothing more than a petty, economically-motivated, publicity play.

### **HIP as a Modernist Movement**

Having outlined Taruskin's famous deconstruction of Authenticity and seen how he affiliates more with a conception of HIP (and at least to some extent 'Authenticity') that involves creative and intuitive engagement with history, I now turn to his resultant proclamation of the nature of the movement and his tentative solution. Taruskin argues that:

[the] 'historical' today is not really historical; that a specious veneer of historicism clothes a performance style that is completely of our own time, and is in fact the most modern style around; and that a the historical hardware has won its wide acceptance and above all its commercial viability precisely by virtue of its novelty, not its antiquity (Taruskin, 1995: 102).

Later he writes:

I hold that discussions of Authentic performance typically proceed from false premises. The split between 'modern performance' on the one hand and 'historical performance' on the other is quite topsy-turvy. It is the latter which is truly modern performance — or rather, if you like, the avant-garde wing or cutting edge of modern performance — while the former represents the progressively

weakening survival of an earlier style, inherited from the nineteenth century, one that is fast becoming historical (Taruskin, 1995: 140).

His solution:

In the end I hope to foster alternative models of Authentic performance, which I would prefer not to call 'irresponsible' but 'postauthoritarian,' a term that chimes with some of the more encouraging symptoms of the post modern attitude... Postmodernist performance values, I would like to think, have to do with the opening-up of borders, in particular that border between the creative and the re-creative that began closing two long centuries ago. The postmodern attitude challenges the 'strong concept of art,' and its exclusive claim to seriousness. It is attempting to undo those life-transcending formalist commitments that have stifled musical creativity and reactivity alike (Taruskin, 1995: 47).

It is in these undefined notions of the creative and the 'recreative,' the postauthoritarian, and in a sense, the 'postmodern performance values,' that the expansive 'play affirming' interpretation of HIP is to be found. It is that interpretation that resists the 'yearning for origin' those modernist interpretations seek to exploit. It is this position, this particular argument that has come to be what I describe as the 'non-dogmatic' orthodoxy of HIP.

### **The Non-Dogmatic Orthodoxy**

In a recent chapter titled 'Historiographically Informed Performance', George Kennaway makes the observation that 'Historical performance research was seen over a decade ago by some as something of an intellectual cul-de-sac, in the post-Taruskin aftershock' (Kennaway, 2016: 160). In illustrating his point he refers to Mark Everist and Nicolas Cook's book *Rethinking Music*, in which they argue that

it proved impossible to find an author who could feel that there was something useful that could be said [about HIP] beyond a summary of conclusions of arguments current in the 1980s (Everist and Cook in Kennaway, 2016: 160).



Indeed, Kennaway is quick to point out that the era in which Taruskin made his famous critique of Authenticity has passed.

In particular, the critique based on statements made by Christopher Hogwood, among others, to the effect that conductor-less performances of classical orchestral music meant being able to do without 'interpretative' performances – which, for Taruskin, led seamlessly to his mapping of 'period style' onto Stravinskyan modernism – was insecure then and now reads as particularly antiquated. Individual interpretation is alive and well, if it was ever ill in the first place. Much of the anguished debate of the eighties and nineties looks now like the over-earnest attacking of straw men (Kennaway, 2016: 160).

Of course, I am not the first to point out the appearance of the straw man that is the Authenticist position—that position, to put it in Weber's terms, that 'dreamed of the plenitude of presence, of reassuring foundations, of origin and the end of play' (Weber, 1980: 35). However, more to the point, Kennaway seems to suggest that perhaps Taruskin's vision of 'postauthoritarian' 'creative and recreative' performance has been realized. Indeed, the efforts towards the liberation of the historical text and the performer's subjectivity is palpable in Kennaway's veneration of the following HIP 'tool':

Chopin's First Editions Online enables detailed comparison of significantly different 'first editions' of his works published in several different countries, while the Chopin Variorum offers the ability to compare individual bars of the same work in different manuscript sources. In principle, then, interested pianists can in effect construct their own 'edition' of a work by Chopin (Kennaway, 2016: 161).

This demonstrates the ubiquity of the move towards unbridled non-dogmatism in the treatment of both texts and performance.

### **A Note on Performance as Object**

Cook points out that 'there has been a steady, even spectacular, increase in academic studies of musical performance from a wide range of complementary directions, to the extent that today there are perhaps more conferences about performance than about any other area of music studies'(Cook, 2014: 10). However, goes on to caution that

this new consciousness of the role and importance of performance has for the most part been grafted onto traditional ways of thinking about music, or squeezed in as a new specialist area, whereas thinking about music as performance should prompt a fundamental rethinking of the discipline as a whole. It is that rethinking to which I hope to contribute (Cook, 2014: 10).

This is the new analytical shift towards *music as performance* that has emerged in recent times. The hat tip to Performance Studies theorist Richard Schechner is well placed, as Cook makes the parallel between the emergence of Theatre Studies from literary studies:

Seen this way, traditional musicology is like literary studies: it sees meaning, of whatever kind, as embodied in musical notation, from which it follows that performance is in essence a matter of communicating that meaning from the page to the stage. The performer's work becomes a supplement to the composer's. The musicological approach, then, has been to study music and performance, in contrast to studying music as performance—a term which in recent years has started to be used within musicology, but has a specific provenance within the field of performance studies (Cook, 2015: 10).

I am in sympathy with such an approach. By changing the focus of music analysis from text to act, the wider array of signifiers available for the construction of meaning becomes apparent. Through such an approach, texts become a part of a much broader network of signifiers, from the sonic to the visual to the kinesthetic and so on.

However, such an approach does not offer us a theoretical magic bullet. There is a striking lack of useful framework for comparative analysis of any kinds of music if performance is to be the new focus of study. How is it that analysis is to move forward from here? Having already shown my preference for a phenomenological ethnographic approach, how can one draw from these to build a clearer picture of the broader musical landscape. I hope to offer something of a solution to this issue by providing a framework based on Lowell Lewis's theory of genre. This is the aim of part two of this thesis.

## **Part 2: Act**

## **Chapter 3 - The Performance of Authenticity and the Construction of Community in HIP**

In the previous chapters I dealt exclusively with texts on and in the Historically Informed Performance movement. Specifically, I looked to the manner in which these texts, as documents examined from the perspective of ethnographer, reveal something of the way in which insiders understand and define their movement discursively. In Chapter 1, I looked to the didactic texts of HIP, those that aimed to discipline and direct practices, and revealed the hidden assumptions of the salience of an Authenticist interpretation of the movement. I argued that this interpretive stance, this historicist vision towards an origin, exists in the context of, and in antagonism with, what it perceives as the misguided 'mainstream' that valorises the individual performer's expressivity at the expense of 'historical correctness.' In chapter 2 I argued that the theoretical texts of HIP, those aimed at explicitly defining the movement or at the very least understanding the logic behind its emergence and sustained presence, maintained a proclivity towards an interpretation of the movement as 'non-dogmatic,' 'playful' and 'experimental' as defined against what they perceive as an 'authoritarian,' 'dogmatic' authenticity. Importantly, I argued, utilising the work of Samuel Weber, that both these seemingly irreconcilable positions seek to at once deny the legitimacy of the other at the same time as denying the presence

of the very ground of this contestation. As such, through this reading, I conceived of HIP as a contested space, as a 'battleground' or 'struggle.'

Of course, as implied from the outset by the acknowledgement of these texts as objects observable from the position of ethnographer, what could be gained from looking only to these texts can only ever be a part of the story. Most obviously, what is missing in the first place is a conception of these texts as *disseminated* in practice. Indeed, to look further still one need only ask as to the nature of relationship between text and practice in HIP, an issue only explored partially, and when so, only in contention in the aforementioned genres of text. As such, this chapter seeks to take an alternative approach to understanding HIP. Having already accepted the premise, through the very nature of the project of ethnography, that HIP consists of a more or less loosely bound collection of people, practices and things, this chapter asks one simple question: Where and how does HIP 'happen' in Sydney, Australia?

At once, this question, from my observation alone, throws up a multitude of responses, revealing a complex network of locations and practices. In particular, the epicentre of the movement is the Sydney Conservatorium of Music, the performance and tertiary education space within which HIP competes with other practices, knowledges and discourses of music. Here the movement finds its champions in the likes of scholar-performers Neal Peres da Costa and Daniel Yeadon, both of whom hold significant institutional status. Having founded the Historical Performance department at the Conservatorium (the only dedicated department in the country), built international reputations as performers, and published extensively in the academic field of historical performance research, these figures have accumulated the institutional capital to inform syllabuses, programming and some of the very structures of the institution.

HIP also happens in classrooms and teaching studios, in the tutoring of aspiring historical researchers and in instrumental pedagogy of the master-apprentice dynamic. It is in the instruments themselves, either historical in their own form, or historically reconstructed and in the privilege of access to such instruments.

It happens in a dispersed network of performers, teachers and students in bedrooms and domestic spaces, in the dispersed temporary performance venues of

churches, community centres and town halls. In the fixed venues where the more professionalised ensembles such as the Australian Brandenburg Orchestra might gather. It is in these locations that the practices and discourses of HIP are disseminated, shared, maintained or developed implicitly if not explicitly, in habits, practices and ultimately, in the flow and unity of such practice, through what Lowell Lewis terms the *microevolution of significance*, into ‘culture.’

This chapter argues that it is through ‘events’ that HIP is performed and that the sense of unified ‘community’ emerges as shared embodied practice, bestowing upon insiders a kind of experience of HIP authenticity. In what follows I will present a performance analysis of such an event. However, I will first offer the event as a narrative in the attempt to not only capture what performance theorist Gay McAuley would call the ‘material signifiers’ (McAuley, 1998: 4) but also the ‘feeling’ of the room: what Clifford Geertz might call the ‘sensibility’ of the culture (Geertz, 1983: 99).

**Concert: Mozart Reimagined**

**Thursday 19 October 2017, 6.30pm**

**Verbruggen Hall, Sydney Conservatorium of Music**

The stage was set as for any other classical music performance at the Sydney Conservatorium. Upon entering, we were greeted by ushers, dressed in black handing out programs and reminding patrons that it was general admission. Looking to the program, it was revealed that this performance was a ‘co-presentation’ between the Sydney Conservatorium’s Early Music Ensemble and Kaldor Public Art Projects. I had simply come to watch my friends in the Early Music Ensemble and was unaware of what ‘Kaldor Public Art Projects’ was. I would later discover that it was a series of projects produced by art collector John Kaldor aimed at showcasing public art as a means of ‘transform[ing] the cultural landscape of Australia’ (Kaldor Website).

Entering via the back-left sound lock, the Verbruggen hall opened up into a large 500 seat venue. The house and stage lights were illuminated, or rather, the distinction

between the two was unclear due to the wash of penetrating natural late afternoon light streaming in through the small stain glass windows lining the upper part of the high walls of the hall. Directly in front of us, upon entering the hall, was a raised platform stage with a four-tier orchestral riser system, forming a partial horseshoe shape, typical of a standard concert hall. On stage, the black empty seats and stands of the orchestra were arranged in a semicircle around the deep blond-brown wooden fortepiano positioned centre stage, lid off, with its strings exposed and black keys on display. Resting on the floor, several other instruments were displayed to the audience: on their sides, a double bass and two cellos; on some of the risers up-stage left some violins and violas.

Behind that, up-stage centre, a wooden, slatted veneer masked the two-metre rise to the choir stalls: two rows of maroon/pink fixed seating. Yet again, further behind that, raised a fraction higher, the choir stalls gave way to the grand organ chamber: a semi-domical space housing a massive dominating wooden framed organ, with pipes of varying diameters stretching up into the heights of the hall. This was capped with a pitched wooden shaped top and two wing-like formations made up of the progressively large reflective metallic silver organ pipes, stretching symmetrically outward.

The concert was part of the Conservatorium's Greenway Series, named after the original architect of the gothic section of the building housing the Verbrugghen Hall. From my knowledge of the Conservatorium, this was a series presented for the performance of university student ensembles and comprised the culmination of work undertaken throughout an extended rehearsal period. On discovering the project to be a shared venture with Kaldor (of whom I knew nothing until that moment), I was a little surprised.

The reason behind the one-time partnership became clearer as I read through the program in my seat before the concert began. The program was made up of four pieces, three of which were of the classical repertoire and one contemporary piece:

- Johann Baptist Vanhal (1739-1813) *Sinfonia 'Comista,'* Bryan C11
- Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756-1791) *Concerto in A major for Clarinet and Orchestra* K 662

INTERVAL

- Padre Antonio Soler (1729-1783) *Concerto for Two Organs in D Major No.6* (from *Sies Concertos de Organos Obligados*, 1771)
- Anri Sala (born 1974) *The Last Resort*, based on Mozart's Clarinet Concerto in A major K 622

While it is not unheard of to include a contemporary piece in an early music performance the work by Anri Sala, *The Last Resort*, based on Mozart's Clarinet Concerto, struck me as being particularly interesting. I sought more information on the piece and its composer in the program. As it turned out, the event was linked peripherally to the City of Sydney Council's 'Art and About' Festival—'Celebrating' the 'city's creativity and imagination', insofar as what was to be performed was the sound (based on Mozart) of a larger site-specific public art work on display at observatory hill, across Circular Quay from the Conservatorium. The program notes explained:

French-Albanian artist Anri Sala has created an innovative new installation of sculpture and sound ... which was developed over three years ahead of its world-premier in Sydney...

...Sala's project has transformed the Observatory Hill Rotunda, a site with expansive views from the most elevated point in the city. Audiences are invited to step beneath a gravity-defying ensemble of custom-built drums, to experience their rhythmic, live response to a contemporary interpretation of Mozart's Clarinet Concerto on A major. Set against the sight and sounds of the harbor below, this musical dialogue animates the relationship between sound, place, time and history on this evocative site...

Anri Sala's variation on Mozart's concerto substitutes the original tempo indications for wind conditions described in the diary of James Bell, a settler who voyaged to Australia in 1838. The composition is opened to the impact of wind and waves, its bars and phrases overtaken by breezes, gales, hurricanes and storms – as if, like a message in a bottle, it had been washed ashore in Sydney after a long voyage at sea (Performance Program Notes: 5).



My interest piqued. I deduced, given such a specific programming, that we were in some way being invited to compare two works, or rather, two interpretations of Mozart's Clarinet Concerto.

### **Tuning and Waiting**

The performers trickled onto the stage, the left stage door locks occasionally clacking, echoing into the hall, as the musicians entered to find their positions. All wore concert blacks, the standard attire at the university, and in many professional chamber ensembles. Against this low level business, the audience chatted, murmured and gossiped.

The performers began to check their instruments, adjusting their tuning, some running through some of their parts, looking into their stand, as if, at the last minute, 'trying to get' some of the tricky moments in their parts. As the ensemble began to swell in numbers, so too did the sound. Where it had begun as one clear violin line, it moved into the dissonance of several instruments, and ultimately into a wall of chaotic sound and movement. To match this, the audience spoke louder, the effect a resonating, vigorous, mutually encouraged chaos.

At one point, a lull emerged from the sound. As some of the musicians stopped, having seemingly 'warmed up' sufficiently, the ensemble somehow cottoned on, and stopped all together. The audience followed suit.

There was an expectancy in the air. The ensemble stood still, looking at each other, some smirking, registering the awkward gap in sound. The audience, in the silence, awaited the entrance of the director, as would mark the beginning of the performance by convention. There was no movement. Cough.

I watched as the lead violin, a young and inexperienced boy I knew, looked to his left at his desk partner, as if seeking advice. There was no response. Hesitantly, and wide-eyed, the principal violinist lifted his bow back to his violin and began playing a little more.

Finally, the door opened, the house lights dimmed leaving the stage illuminated. There was relief in the hall. The cellos and bass stood, acknowledging the entrance of the

conductor, Nigel, who made his way onstage deliberately and swiftly, bowed and directed the cellos and bass to sit.

### **Vanhal**

The performance commenced. The Vanhal Sinfonia was played through, the orchestra mostly in tune, mostly following a typical three-movement classical symphony structure: Fast-Slow-Fast. The opening movement, *Allegro con brio 'La Speranza'* [translated 'The Hope'], was driven by a motoring bass line and overlaid with a balanced lyrical melody, repeated and reformulated throughout, unifying the work. There were moments of solid rhythmic unison, moments of separate parts, and fleeting moments of polyphony. The second movement, *Andante Cantabile*, was titled '*il sospirare a languire*,' [sighing in languish]: sonorous, slow, offering tensions of dissonances and resolution. The final movement was in two parts *Adagio piu andante 'La Lamentatione – L'Allegrezza'* [The Lamentation – Rejoicing]. As Stephen Yates wrote in the program notes on this composition (which he no doubt transcribed himself): 'What [these titles] indicate we will probably never know, nor is it important that we should' (Program notes: 3).

The piece ended to polite applause. Nigel bowed and greeted the audience, thanked them for their presence and said a few words on the program, acknowledging John Kaldor, director of Kaldor Public Art Projects, who was to later in the performance say a few words on the work of art, the details of which reflected the program, but which I cannot recall. Nigel introduced the next piece, the Mozart Clarinet concerto and invited onto the stage the solo clarinetist, Paul, who entered, wearing a deep purple shirt, and gave a short talk before the work.

### **Mozart**

Paul made sure to comment on the use of a historical instrument, specifically a classical basset clarinet. As he explained, this instrument had fewer keys than its modern counterpart, and the instrument had an extension, which enabled it to reach lower notes (some four semitones) than the ordinary clarinet. This performance, he concluded, would be 'as Mozart would have heard it.'

After very quickly checking his tuning, and allowing the strings to do the same, Paul turned to the ensemble and conducted them in with one hand, holding his clarinet in the other. Eyes scanning across the ensemble, he gave a small gesture curling his hand up and down . . . *three, four* . . . The musicians came in, *allegro*, with a polite elegance, legato e piano [smooth and soft]. Paul continued to conduct in very small gestures, only his back visible to the audience. The violins played the opening theme, stated as a part of the exposition, with the rest of the strings and the fortepiano playing an accompanying motoring quaver line. Suddenly, this gave way to a repetition of the phrase with woodwind and brass added to the mix. The effect was bolder, thicker and more powerful. The horn contributed a round and present weight to the melody with its rhythmic unison, and the flutes added more complex texture in unison with the violins.

This homophony, the juxtaposition of a melody and accompaniment parts, continued through in metrically and temporally balanced phrasing typical of classical music as the melody evolved, gaining volume towards the climax of the exposition. There was a brief denouement giving over to a breath-length pause then giving way to the solo clarinet.

Paul had turned around, flicking his clarinet up gently in time with the beat. As the bass line gave its concluding semiquaver flourish, he prepared himself, bending his legs, looking to his part and nodding his head in time, sending air through the reed on the beat, and releasing the same melody of the opening.

The sound was mellow, more gentle, softer in volume and warm in the lower registers. The violins now took on the role of accompaniment with the rest of the orchestra, offering several different figures at different times, some detached and syncopated, creating a steadying effect and others smooth, and flowing. The clarinetist ran through the part, the line developing into increasingly virtuosic moments; the main melodies fragmented and reworked into rhythmically ornamental moments, melodic runs high and low showcasing a range of dynamics, pitch and textures.

The second movement was the *adagio*, begun in unison. The clarinet provided a sonorous long phrased melody in a slow pulse, the pitch stepping upwards before descending in terraced fountain like motion. The accompaniment was a thick string wash,

the beat emerging from the violin's quiet string crossings and quaver note oscillations, the bass line ever so gently articulating the down beats. In a wave of movement, the melody was taken by the orchestra and restated with a newfound vigor, the string physically flowing with bows together. The beat was steady, sustaining an insistent momentum.

## INTERVAL

Beer and gossip in the foyer with a friend

### Soler

This piece showcased the Department of Historical Performance's recorder cohort. The work, originally composed for two organs, had been arranged for recorder ensemble. The group of musicians stepped out on stage, three young women and a bearded man, wielding a variety of different sized recorders, small to large, from a distance each looking like carved gold brown sculptures.

The music bounced, fast moving middle semiquavers, an ornamented descending line and a chugging lower line on bass or tenor recorder. The volume was relatively fixed, but the gentle sound of recorders drawing the listener in, hearing distinction and interest in the moving parts.

### Sala

Paul returned to the stage with a different clarinet, black instead of wooden brown, covered in silver metallic keys. He explained that it was his modern instrument, that he was using it due to the technicalities of the music, and that it might even be more appropriate.

This time he did not conduct. Instead Nigel stood in front of his keyboard and waved his arms at the ensemble to keep it together. A quick nod at Paul... cracking a smile ... and a curling, flopping gesturing with both hands out wide ... three, four . . .

The orchestra set out, a gentle wash of strings. I recognized the same *adagio* from the strings, only before, the clarinet played with them. Moments later he began his line,

the opening of the same famous slow melody, but not quite, it was cut short and the sound was brighter. The strings eased off, the sound died away very quickly... a small pause... again, something similar, but more string wash, the clarinet, adding just a couple more notes, placed carefully. The whole orchestra came in with the melody as it had in the Mozart before, but this time it didn't follow through. Upon the consequent part of the phrase, the cellos and bass offset the beat. Then before the beat. A confusion. A dissonance where it was not, my ear drawn towards moments and then lost again.

No long line here anymore... gone again. I could certainly hear the waves. A moment of clarinet behind the beat?... no? yes? Then alone, isolated, echoing through the hall...

Notes were held longer, intruding upon the harmony of following passages, half resolving, and some not at all. Rhythm was tossed around too. There was silence where there had previously been none. Legato moments were intruded upon with shortened notes, staccatos. There was melody without accompaniment and accompaniment without melody. Syncopation in strange spots. It was morphed.

The ensemble stood with brows furled and eyes glued to music, and then at Nigel. An uneasy attempt to keep or find beat was observable from the players at moments.

And then, a moment of unison! A moment of relief. Something roughly like the original . . . but short lived. Back into mess.

The next movement was different.

It was the *rondo* reworked. Mozart's version hadn't been played previously, but I already knew the work. The movement was swifter and lighter now. The melody of the rondo, another famous tune, was played near identical to the Mozart version, the clarinet playing a skipping, and directed part. I recognized this, most of the lines sounded almost as they should. But there was something not quite right. I couldn't put my finger on it, and still cant. I believe it must have been chopped up, copied, pasted reworked in some ways. However, the beat remained throughout, maintaining a consistency lacked in the previous movement.

Paul played through runs, occasionally in unison with the orchestra, sometimes apart. Some moments stood out, a linking moment in the violins, a descending connective passage sliding chromatically, very 'non-historically.'

The piece ended on a light note, a short clarinet quaver, and as it did, the audience gave of a short burst of laughter. The audience applauded, for many minutes, some giving a standing ovation in the seats in front of me. Paul smiled and bowed at the waist, Nigel directed the ensemble to stand and they followed suit in a unison bow, instruments in hand. Paul hugged Nigel, Nigel shook The principal violinist's hand, and joined the applause. Paul took another bow, and again the Ensemble before Nigel and Paul exited stage left and the rumble subsided.

### **Analysis**

The Geertzian style thick description I have offered above speaks largely to parts 1 and 2 of McAuley's schema, capturing the material signifiers and segmentation of the performance in question. While it could be argued that it might also begin to move in the direction of an identification of connections between signifiers, the beginnings of 'clusters' of significance or 'paradigms', this will be the main purpose of the following section. From the outset I will identify three such paradigms: the conventions of the concert as harking strongly to the genre of the classical music concert; the historical impetus signified in objects, sound and embodied practices; and finally, the experimentalist impetus embodied in the partnership as well as in the practices. As I will demonstrate, each of these broader categories must be understood as interrelating, but more importantly, these categories work together, coalescing into a genre which embodies HIP.

### **The Classical Music Concert Genre**

Perhaps the most important observation to make regarding the presence of particular signifiers is the cluster that works together to produce connotations of a performance tradition, and indeed, an already existing highly codified genre, that of the (mainstream) classical music concert. While this may seem quite unremarkable to an outsider, and indeed, might often go unacknowledged by invested insiders, it has

significant implications in interaction with traditional narratives of HIP. One of the most prevalent and enduring aspects of HIP culture, as has already been explored in previous chapters, has been the movement's rejection of 'mainstream' performance. However, while the movement has made every effort to distinguish itself from the mainstream, the distinction is challenged if one looks to the movement on the level of material performance. This points to a deeper problem: that of the assumed mode of engagement with music itself as implied by convention and architecture. In other words, if looked to in this way, it is difficult to sustain the counter-cultural narrative of HIP. It follows necessarily that the mode of engagement with the performance obscures such a reading.

To begin with, I turn my attention to the very structure of the hall and the manner in which this informs a particular mode of listening. The Verbrugghen hall is a concert hall 'much like any other.' It is a five hundred-seat space with rows of seats in stalls, galleries and balconies all directed and descending towards the raised stage. The object is clearly the action on stage. However, I would be remiss not to add to the mix the noted highly codified structure the stage: the riser system and the semi-circular arrangement of the orchestra with conventional black seating and stands. There are fixed choir stalls and the grand organ takes up-stage centre position. The roofline and height matches any European concert hall. There are ushers and performers dressed in black, and a segmentation of performance into discernable 'works.'

This codification, or standardization, implies a certain neutrality of features in their accepted continuity. The recurring tones of black imply a desire for invisibility, or unobtrusiveness in so far as black absorbs light, enabling a kind of disappearance. What can be made of this disappearance? I would argue that it speaks to an institutionalized and conventionalized diminution of the visual in the pursuit of heightening the sonic.

This idea speaks strongly to the very well-documented idea in musicology of 'absolute music,' the romantic conception that music should be understood in and of itself, in which meaning rests within the work itself and not in reference to anything external. And indeed, this notion has a history itself, further, I would argue that in the manifestations I am outlining here, it endures today. A close relative to this idea is that of *Kunstreligion*.

Elizabeth Kramer offers a succinct definition of *Kunstreligion* in her published PhD thesis:

In the simplest formulation, *Kunstreligion* is the belief that art manifests the divine. In *Kunstreligion*, art is thought to enunciate divine ideas and feelings, artistic experience is compared to religious ritual, and artistic works are seen as divine presences on earth. Works can be understood as divine in and of themselves or as striking manifestations of the divine; they are produced as a part of the creation and reception of art. In the combination of these beliefs the phenomenon of *Kunstreligion* approaches the status of an actual religion that can stand as an alternative to other types of religion (Kramer, 2005: 1).

Kramer goes on to highlight that this concept was likely coined by the German hermeneutist and theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher in the late eighteenth century. This is after the emergence of the concert genre, but at a time of increasing secularization in repertoire choice and increasing sacralisation in the form of 'absolute' music. The connection between the classical concert genre and *Kunstreligion* has been explored in some depth by Ana Petrov in her essay 'Listening to Music in 'Holy' Space: The Role of 19th-Century Public Concert in the Construction of *Kunstreligion*.' Petrov makes the following observation concerning the co-constitutive relationship between the term *Kunstreligion* and the features of the concert:

One of the most obvious indicators of this 19th century tendency was the design of the concert halls having in mind that they were modelled after churches and temples (Petrov, 2013: 228).

Indeed, this trend is carried through in the structure of the Verbrugghen hall. The stage, under lights glows as an expanded altar, the choir stalls sit where they would in a church, behind the altar. Importantly, however, they are raised and face the audience, where they might otherwise have remained out of sight and facing the wings of the church. Where important iconography would be placed, in a semi-dome at the very rear of the altar, sits an organ in pride of place its pipes a grand verticality stretching into the canopy of the hall. Perhaps this is the ultimate musical iconography. The point here is that even when the



organ is not used, it is revealed and ever present. Where the visual *is* engaged, it is through veneration of sonic paraphernalia.

However, moving deeper into these conventions surrounding classical music performance and *Kunstreligion*, it is important to consider the mode of engagement of the audience with the performance. Classical music is received in silent reverence in the concert hall. Correct etiquette dictates that the audience must listen attentively, silently and not clap between movements. This is the historical point famously put forward by William Weber, who argued that pre-romantic performance would have most often been spoken, sung or gossiped through by the audience, his argument being that:

prior to the late seventeenth century, there was no formal and independent settings whose central purpose was the performance of music. Musical activities had been attached to so many other institutions and social locales – courts, taverns, the Church, markets and families – and for the most part served their social and cultural needs (Weber, 1975: 3).

While the veracity of the claim that silent reverence was not a mode of engagement with the music object in pre-romantic times may be difficult to prove (and indeed, there is still debate on the issue), the point that music was mostly only used to accompany other ceremonial or leisurely events makes it compelling. It also raises questions as to the contingency of this particular mode of engagement with music in the Verbrugghen Hall.

The Early Music Ensemble performance certainly played out within this paradigm, though it remains conspicuously unreflective of this fact. It was listened to in silence, and further, the short moment of confusion preceding the entrance of Nigel, speaks to a minor thwarting of this convention, whilst at the same time demonstrating the very presumption of its presence. In HIP, the tuning of instruments is more difficult. The instruments are more temperamental and the orchestra plays in different tunings regularly (as historical considerations might dictate)- in this case they used what is called ‘Valotti’ temperament at A=430hz. This variation means tuning usually takes some time. This is a marked difference to the modern orchestra. Modern instruments by contrast are more stable in tuning and they usually tune to equal temperament at A=441-442hz, depending on the orchestra, meaning the process is honed and efficient. In modern orchestras, the

convention is that either the conductor will walk on stage after an announcement and direct the oboe to play and A and the orchestra will tune in seconds, alternately the orchestra will tune briefly before the conductor enters and begins the performance.

In the absence of such a convention, and the difficulty of adopting the later (more realistic option), the Early Music Ensemble and the audience together struggled to make sense of the moment. Of course, it was brief and had little impact on the overall performance, probably passing from most of the audiences memory, however, it does point to the manner in which there was a disjunct between the particular behaviours of HIP and conventions of the genre form in which HIP, at least in part, inhabits.

If HIP seeks to define itself against classical music performance, in either an experimentalist or Authenticist discourse, a limit is that it must contend with such performative considerations of genre. Read another way, however, it could be said that this *is* the process of genre construction and that the adoption of mainstream classic music conventions is just a positively endorsed part of it. In either case, I posit the argument that at the same time as contributing to the confluence of factors moving towards the emergence of a distinct HIP genre, this paradigm, the underpinning conception of convention, hints at the possibility that a HIP genre might be better described as a *subgenre* of classical music performance. I will now turn to the next paradigm in consideration, that of the 'historical' impetus of HIP.

### **Historicity**

Without a doubt, one of the strongest defining discourses surrounding HIP has been the emphasis put on history. However, where discourse of HIP assumes a rationalistic, rigour in the pursuit of historical truth, here I am concerned with the *performance* of history. In such a sense, I am suggesting that HIP performs historicity as much in sound, objects and movement as in books and study. I posit here that it is in instruments, repertoire and a broad range of practices that HIP constructs a historicity bound to implicit notions of assumed historical authenticity (and in turn the related but distinguishable idea of an insider sense of HIP authenticity). This move is likely troubling for historical performance whose approach to the concept of authenticity has been at once to either valorise the idea or reject its possibility all together. I return here to the main argument of this chapter

that the paradigms outlined here coalesce in a complex of signification, material and bodily, that build into the evidence for the 'authenticity' of HIP. In this context, rather than considering the historical pursuit and the related HIP discourse as central to the formation of HIP culture, I argue it to be a single, but important strand in the emergence of the HIP genre.

I begin with issue of the instruments. The question of historical authenticity of course breaks down upon becoming aware of the distinction between the instruments onstage as reconstructions and truly historical. Without descending into the debate myself, I would point out that most of the instruments on stage during the Early Music Ensemble performance were in fact replicas, save for perhaps Danny Yeadon's cello or Nicole Forsyth's viola. I suggest instead that it is in the construction of these instruments, in the practice of building 'historical' instruments, rather than their age, that a historicity in this context emerges. Further, I argue that it is in the difference of these instruments, when compared to their modern counterparts.

In the case of the violins, it is sometimes, but not always in the shape of the instruments, the lack of shoulder or chin rests, the slightly lower angle of the fingerboard that history is connoted. However, there are also those modern instruments (that I know are on stage) that simply have gut strings attached, and from afar, all this is relatively difficult to observe.

I turn to the fortepiano standing centre stage. Its keys are black and its body a golden-brown, the wood giving the impression of age and its marked difference to its modern counterpart the piano in size and shape creating a sense of ambiguity, leaving itself available to the interpretation of age.

There are horns with no valves and black wooden flutes. All this feeds a sense of history upon the invitation of the audience to 'compare' them to their modern counterparts.

However, it is also in the presentation of instruments. Upon entering the hall, these instruments were left on display on the stage. I know the reasoning behind such a decision is purely practical; taking instruments in and out of the hall for entrances leaves

them susceptible to expanding and contracting in the varying conditions of humidity and temperature. However, one can also look to the aesthetic quality of these instruments on display. What are notoriously valuable instruments are left away from their owner's possession, on stage. Left vulnerable out of sight, the stage an assumed safe space, the larger instruments rest on their sides and the smaller violins are laid out on risers. One might suggest this evokes the image of a baroque painting, a still life of a Dutch Master.

But these instruments are played as well. Where, as I have demonstrated in chapter 1, discourse might direct the performers to a particular 'historical style' of playing, I would suggest, perhaps to the dismay of many within HIP, that much of which is directed to, the audience would not be privy. What remains more pertinent in the construction of historicity is sound. Here I turn to something much more difficult to access in discourse, that is the emergence of a distinguishable HIP 'sound.' Attempts made to describe sound inevitably fall prey to analogy or comparison. What I am referring to is the 'warm' or 'round' sound of the clarinet in its opening notes of the Mozart concerto, or the guttural sound of the gut strings of the violins, violas, cellos and bass, the muffled tinkle of the fortepiano and the hum of the wash of the mass of instruments blending together in that particular way. Here is 'historical sound,' or 'that HIP sound' as my friend and violinist Donovan might put it (though not without drawing contentious opinion from other HIP members in ear-shot). But this sound is also tied to a particular historical repertoire.

In previous chapters I have indicated the overlap in jurisdiction of repertoire between the Historical Performance world and the mainstream performance world. However, it is important to note that where mainstream 'sound' might extend to a broad repertoire, what Bruce Haynes might call a 'one size fits all' approach, HIP is arguably linked closely (if not absolutely) to a 'historical' repertoire. This is the mostly the renaissance, baroque, classical and romantic, where, within each category (and further subcategories of composers, nationalities and musical types) a distinct harmonic vocabulary informs the quality of sound produced to quite a large extent. In the case of Mozart, this involves a general consonance, with moments of fleeting placed dissonance and resolution within the confines of a more homophonic structure.

Given this evidence for the construction of a historicity based less on historical fact as espoused in books and treatises and more on the material and bodily engagement with instruments, practices, and repertoire, I posit the argument that a more loose sense of historicity is engaged here, and further, that in interaction with the classical music genre, a distinctive HIP sensibility begins to emerge. I turn now to the final driving interrelated paradigm of HIP performance, Experimental HIP.

### **Experimental HIP**

The final paradigm I am drawing out from this performance, as indicative of the construction of a sense of what HIP is, is that of the impetus towards an experimentalism. Here, again, I make a distinction between the discourse that sees HIP solely as the ‘playful’ pursuit of musicians—that John Butt might describe as those who are simply ‘*Playing with History*’ [my italics]—and an experimentalism as performed through various other modes of signification, broadening and complicating the former definition. Adding such a paradigm into the mix of those outlined above—the contingency of the concert genre and historicity—speaks above all to an inherent contradiction that discourse struggles to overcome, but that the reformulation of historicity in former sections may allow for. Where notions of historical truth and the weight of convention (i.e. tradition) alone might be seen as largely incompatible with an experimentalist discourse, through the further reframing of the latter in a performative framework, it becomes evident how the concepts are, following the words of Samuel Weber, ‘reconciled in an obscure economy.’

Again, the thorough reader will note the thread of ‘experimentalist’ discourse in previous chapters as emerging in the dominant interpretation of HIP as ‘non-dogmatic’ in approach to history, texts and performance. Such readings easily invite criticisms of ‘cherry picking’ or ‘sloppiness’ in dealing with historical sources from the more ‘hard-line’ end of the movement who might simply ask of the project in such a context ‘if we are not using history properly, what are we doing here then?’ In positing experimentalism as a dominant paradigm through which an insider sense of HIP authenticity is constructed through performance, I aim to divorce the term from its ‘progressive’ or ‘transgressive’ connotations as implied in such formulations. Such reactive notions of the ‘experimental’ resonate with a near absolutism ironically born out of the sheer fervour through which it

articulates discursive distinction from Authenticist conceptions of HIP and the mainstream. In other words, I seek to remove the term from its negative definition *within* the movement and reframe or extend to indicate performed effect- as a 'sense' of the experimental. This necessarily involves the clustering of signifiers around objects and gestures that connote and denote, through complex historical contingency, such a received sense.

Here I point to several aspects of HIP practice present in the performance in question. First, I point to the choice of repertoire, in particular the work by Anri Sala *The Last Resort* through which not only the contemporaneity of the work but also its structure— its harmonic, melodic, rhythmic, articulatory and dynamic formulations— bespeak an ethos of the 'experimental' albeit one unavoidably bound up in a modernist compositional text-based 'tradition.' Second, I point to the willing partnership of the Early Music Ensemble and Kaldor Public Art Projects, a representative moment of interdisciplinary engagement of the movement. In this particular case, in reference to the broader art work *The Last Resort*, I observe both the active effort to soften traditional (mainstream) boundaries of musical genre and also the foundational referencing of the world of modern art. Both of these features, through connotation and denotation work to compound and reinforce the sense of an experimentalist spirit. The last point I will draw from the performance is the instrumental performance of experimentalism. I posit that the process of performing history is one bound up with inherent dangers. In this sense, I invoke the term 'improvisatory style' to characterise what I see as not only explicative of efforts towards whole genres or subgenres of performance (i.e. improvisatory Jazz or in the case of HIP the improvisatory baroque style 'prelude') but also extra-notational practices of tempo modification, experimenting with pitch, dealing with dangers of temperamental tuning and ornamentation. This improvisatory style feeds the 'sense' of the experimental in itself, but moreover, it enables the potential for the generation of whole new sound-worlds in its dealing with stimuli of history and, in turn, the navigation of contemporary compositions. As such, I suggest that HIP, through its willingness to make radical changes to practice, based on, but not bound by, the historical, against the force of convention (although always with certain bounds), holds a unique position of musical generation.

The choice of repertoire for the program in question heavily implies an attempt at the definition of HIP as an ‘experimental’ endeavour. In the first instance, even prior to the performance, the audience was faced with the prospect of the performance of a piece of contemporary music side by side with common practice era classical music repertoire. Of course it is not uncommon for traditional performances to include in a project the performance of a contemporary piece (from within the classical music compositional tradition), but I would posit the argument that it is ironically less endorsed in the mainstream ‘modern’ classical music performance world as it is in Historically Informed Performance movement. As evidence for this, I point to the concerted attempt in this performance to curate a program that so thoroughly thematises the very content of the music.

In the timely selection of Anri Sala’s *The Last Resort* along with the *Mozart Clarinet Concerto* we witness not simply a superficial ‘paying of lip service’ to the old and the new. Rather, we see a more deeply layered and sensitive curatorship characterised by an attention to the evolution of segmentation and narrative as largely informed by compositional structures (i.e. the formed concerto and the deconstructed concerto). In other words, the choice of repertoire has been shaped around the contemporary work, rather than the contemporary work standing in contrast as the ‘odd one out’ in the program of the classical music concert.

*The Last Resort* is a compositional reworking of the Mozart. Notable musical material from Mozart’s Clarinet Concerto has been fragmented and augmented, diminished and repeated, and sections have been juxtaposed upon others—the ramifications for performance only compound the point. This is significant for the programming as it demonstrates willingness on the part of HIP (at least in this manifestation) to not only perform ‘new’ music, but further, to engage with radical (re)interpretations that in some circles might be deemed (at risk of hyperbole) ‘sacrilege.’ Again, under a strict historicist paradigm, this would not be possible. As such, it is evident that the synergy of this experimentalism and a loose historicism plays a heavier role in the formation of a distinct HIP genre than might first meet the eye.

Of this structural significance, one might rightly ask how the composition of *The Last Resort* itself speaks to such an experimentalist paradigm. Here I point to traditional notions of 'transgression' or 'breaking boundaries' or 'the shock of the new,' though such ideas may well be at play incidentally or partially in the generation of interest through novelty. Instead, I would direct the reader towards the musical modernist text-based tradition within which I believe this work (as music divorced from the context of the larger artwork) falls. Evidence for this lies in Sala's acknowledgement that this was text-focussed compositional project completed with the aid of a team of musicologists and composers of whom I can assume are of the western classical music tradition (Kaldor promotional video). Understanding this to be an artistic limit, I observe in the work a chromaticism of harmony reminiscent of the tonal limits reached in the aesthetics of the early twentieth-century second Viennese school of composition or even at a stretch, moments of the work of mid-century serialist composer Karlheinz Stockhausen.

The limit to this idea, of course, comes in the acknowledgement that this performance occurred on instruments that extend the tonal and temperamental range of the western classical tradition by virtue of the historical perspective that might ironically work to cleave the composition from such a particular 'modernist' historical framing. In short, it could be argued that the extension of harmony into the levels of microtonal differences as brought about by the HIP use of alternative historical temperaments and pitches (in this case what is known as Valotti temperament at A=430) makes null the suggestion that *The Last Resort* performance is of a modernist musical tradition. However, I point here towards the production of the original artwork and specifically to the engagement of the Munich Chamber Orchestra, a 'modern' orchestra, for the original recording of the sound for the installation (an orchestra that performs at the conventional classical music concert temperament 'Equal Temperament' where A=440-442).

In other words, where the attempt to thwart the idea of an experimental aesthetic connotation as tied to 'modernist' compositional tradition might play out in the formulation of the performance through alternative genre frames such as HIP, it fails through reference to itself— or to its original intentions. Further, where the resultant sound differences might be audible (and I would argue that it is a less audible difference



out of context, and particularly to the untrained ear) I would argue that it still reinforces the notion of HIP connoting the experimental, albeit through the aforementioned appeal to novelty.

Regardless, this point moves beyond the question of repertoire choice as implicated in the production of an experimentalist 'sense,' and moves closer to the question of embodied musical performance. I will return to this issue shortly, however, it is first pertinent to make a further point regarding the role of repertoire.

It is important to make reference to the manner in which musical projects are funded at least at the federal level through the Australia Council for the arts, in the form of grants. This is pertinent as I am arguing that the funding model encourages small-scale ensembles, if they wish to compete with other larger and better resourced arts organisations, to explore the performance of original Australian and/or 'experimental' repertoire.

The Australia Council outlines three criteria in its assessment of the eligibility and worthiness of any applicant for the award of a grant: artistic merit, viability and alignment with the council's strategic plan. Provided the latter two criteria have been appropriately or successfully addressed, a group must focus on the artistic element of their proposal:

Peers will assess the artistic merit of the work or works at the centre of your proposal.

They may consider:

- vision, ideas and artistic rationale
- level of innovation, ambition, experimentation or risk-taking
- rigour and clear articulation of creative process
- significance of the work within area of practice
- contribution to diverse cultural expression
- timeliness and relevance of work
- quality of previous work
- responses to previous work from peers or the public.

(Australia Council website, <http://www.australiacouncil.gov.au/funding/funding-index/arts-projects-organisations>)

Upon assessing the various elements under purview by loosely defined 'artistic peers,' it becomes clear how organisations with greater resources and a much longer history of performance might be well situated to respond to the relevant literature. It is fairly safe to suggest that most HIP groups in Sydney (and indeed all of Australia) stand at a certain disadvantage in the application process due to the relative youth and small size of the movement when compared to the institutional staples of the organisations such as Opera Australia or the Sydney Symphony Orchestra. This is particularly the case when put into a position of demonstrating such messy concepts as quality, contribution and timeliness. However, points at which these groups hold some advantage is in the demonstration of 'vision' or 'ideas', which, as I have already demonstrated, hold great weight in an ongoing 'revolutionary' discourse, and more importantly, the 'level of innovation, ambition, experimentation and risk-taking.' In such a funding climate, HIP takes a unique position. Given the ever increasing competition for government funding, HIP has been put into a position where, to compete, there must be a more concerted push towards an engagement with an 'experimentalist ethos' and in this case, I would argue that it comes in the form of (amongst other things) an *active* involvement with new repertoire. Importantly, I am suggesting that this engagement is by no means a superficial engagement; rather, it has informed the very identity of HIP. As final evidence for this, I point to the trend in the educational setting of the Sydney Conservatorium (out of the realm of questions of funding) for the commissioning of works written specifically for historical instruments and ensembles.

To illustrate this, I direct the reader to the work of up and coming composer Alice Chance who has written several compositions in such a manner. Of particular note is her work *In Earth's Gallery: Orchestral Suite in E minor for Period Instruments* a work composed for and performed by the Sydney Conservatorium Early Music Ensemble in

2013. Also of note is her *Viola da Gamba duet – ‘O Pastor Animarum* inspired by the plainchant of 12<sup>th</sup> century composer Hildegard of Bingen.

This trend extends into the realm of professional ensembles that also demonstrate their interest in contemporary composition. I make a particular note of the work of Sydney based Historically Informed Performance ensemble Ironwood.

Ironwood is an Australian-based ensemble, committed to exploring music of the baroque, classical and romantic periods on early string and keyboard instruments... Ironwood believe that historically informed performance should be complemented with new material and has an active commissioning program for music on early instruments. (Ironwood Website)

Of these commissions and engagements, the most important facet to note is the necessary awareness of composers as to the particularities and possibilities present in writing for ‘period’ ensembles. To be clear, I am suggesting that composition for these groups requires an added awareness of temperament and embodied skill—particular HIP conventions of performance as related to reading scores. As such, it follows that compositional vocabulary is expanded in such projects, and that rather than simply ‘paying lip service’ to a contemporaneity that commissioning new works allows, HIP, quite possibly through necessity, builds into an organic production of musical works that conveys a unique mode of experimentalism.

It is in these ways of HIP relating to repertoire—the choice and engagement with contemporary works, their structure and co-constitutive relations— that I argue HIP ensembles bespeak a particular experimentalist sense. It is not simply in their choice to perform, but in their interest in having an active input that reinforces the strength of this relationship. This is very much the case with the performance of Anri Sala’s *The Last Resort* in the context of the broader classical music performance genre, building into the emergence of a distinct HIP subgenre, and in turn, the experience of a HIP authenticity.

In continuing my investigation into the paradigm of experimentalism in the performance of *Mozart Reimagined* as contributing to the emergence of such a HIP authenticity, I turn now to the issue of the interdisciplinarity. Before continuing, I must

make note of the increasing reach of HIP literature into realms beyond musicology such as psychology, history and literature. These cases are not of concern in this section. Of interest instead is the *performed* interdisciplinarity of HIP as connotative of a 'boundary pushing' or an experimentalist sense. Quite simply, I am arguing that in the performance of *The Last Resort*, HIP demonstrated its underlying interest in extending the bounds of performance beyond the traditional concert genre. In this particular case, by making the particular and strong link with this work, the Early Music Ensemble drew from a symbolically laden source in the form of its collaboration with Kaldor Public Art projects.

In setting the tone of the performance, the program provided the first sense of a broken or at least expanded convention in the form of a partnership. It is difficult to gauge the attitude of the audience, which was notably larger than the average Early Music Ensemble audience perhaps in large part due to the partnership with Kaldor, however, it is safe to suggest that expectations were in the very least unclear.

In reading about the installation that the performance of *The Last Resort* made reference to, expansive notions of place, technology, instruments, of course sound, but also the very place of sound in reception were signified not only breaking conventions of absolute music, but doing so with reference to wholly new modes of engagement with art- those more present in the world of contemporary art.

In the program I was informed of the transformation of the rotunda over looking Sydney Harbour, for those of us audience members in the know, our mind being drawn across circular quay to the highest point in the CBD. We, the audience were invited to visualise ourselves standing 'beneath a gravity-defying ensemble of custom-built drums to experience their rhythmic, live response to a contemporary interpretation of Mozart's Clarinet Concerto on A major'- the preposition disorienting implicit understandings of instrumental convention.

Where were these drums? Were they suspended? Were they upright or upside down? How was this to work? Drums responding? Only those in the audience who had view the installation in person (or been keen enough to research up on the piece) would have been able to make sense of the otherwise cryptic description. The rest of us were left

with two things, a list of questions and a *sense* of thwarted convention in the unarticulated ethos of an 'experimentalist' contemporary art.

It was only after further research, looking into records of the installation and descriptions that the nature of the work became clear to me. The drums were suspended from the roof, speakers installed inside, under the skins and the collection of snare drums were altered or 'rigged up' with mechanisms holding drumsticks on a loose pivot. This enabled them to respond, swinging gently on and off the skins sympathetically as the sounds from the speakers vibrated the skins. The result was, as recorded in videos found online, amidst the sound of the aforementioned compositions, an un-rhythmic, intermittent tapping and gentle rumbling (far from the typical sound of a struck snare).

While the audience was not immediately privy to this information, it was clear that, in reference to the artwork, and to the partnership with Kaldor (and in turn the city of Sydney 'Art and About' festival), there was an explicit sense of the experimental implied. Of the latter, the mere reference of Kaldor, in the eyes of the informed and seasoned art aficionado, no doubt stirs-up significations of some or all of a near half-century of contributions to Australia's cultural landscape. Indeed, as I write this chapter in mid-2018, the Sydney Morning Herald has published an article advertising an upcoming 'Retrospective Exhibition' in 2019 in celebration of 33 successful projects and coinciding with the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Kaldor's initiating project. The project in question is Christo and Jean-Claude's 1969 wrapping of two-and-a-half kilometres of Sydney coast at Little Bay in white fabric. Concluding the article, the author and *Sydney Morning Herald* Arts Editor, Nick Galvin, provides a statement by the 82 year-old John Kaldor, the Philanthropist and namesake behind Kaldor Public Art Projects who reflect upon that early work:

It was a much more adventurous time. Unrestricted... you know you couldn't do it today, it would take years to get permission (Galvin, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5.9.2018: 5)

It is this ethos of experimentalism bound up in discourses of liberation and adventure that is harkened to in the partnership of the Early Music Ensemble with Kaldor. Far more than a concrete experimentalist material practice, this experimentalism is one connoted and

denoted. However, it is also have manifestations in the practice of HIP as is observable in the instrumental performance of Mozart Reimagined.

The final note to make of the performance's connotations of the experimental is to the complex space of instrumental performance in constructing a sense of distinct genre and in turn a insider sense of HIP Authenticity. Indeed, this is a complex space due to the many formulations in which performance might be conceived of as 'experimental.' Most obviously, for example, one could make reference to notions of 'creative' practice inherent implicitly or explicitly in theories of performance such as habit, habitus, performativity or embodiment. I maintain these concepts to be useful analytical tools that mobilise a convincing argument for an experimentalism in all facets of practice; in particular, for the purposes of this thesis, for the formation, maintenance, alteration and application of habits in the Peircian sense. However, in the formulation I am suggesting in this chapter, I see experimentalism as the 'effect' borne out of the complex *microevolution of significance* but not equivalent to it in this context. I make this distinction for the purposes of highlighting the cultural specificity of the formulation of experimentalism in question.

In order to be clear about this distinction, I am employing an insider term and altering it to include a broader range of practices. Here I am mobilising the term 'improvisation' or more specifically 'improvisatory style' to include not only the well understood practices or genres of practice generated around the idea of 'making it up in the moment' unaided or unbound by notation or form, but also a style of performance associated with notation but in a more flexible manner or reading. This mode of reading incorporates not only the process of reading music, but also the inseparable reading of historical evidence- the interpretation itself an experimental endeavour in its potential to generate radical soundworlds. I suggest that this is an aesthetic of experimentalism in so far as it stands in contrast to inculcated aesthetics of mainstream performance which can be generally understood as adhering to principles (as to notation) of strict temporal metricism, consistent mathematically standardised pitch and even a levelling of instrumental tone-colour. This distinction is what Richard Taruskin might have described

as 'Straight Style' versus (endearingly termed) 'Crooked Style' (the former, for Taruskin, being a curse within HIP as much as in Mainstream performance). In his words:

The mind of a straight player is like a well stocked and well ordered musical emporium: The customer (conductor, score, evidence) places his order (for a tempo, an articulation, a dynamic), and the proper item is quickly found on the shelf or rack, just where it was the last time... The crooked players, the ones who claim my heart, do not get their phrasings and tempos off the rack. Their responses are not generic... [they are] unclassifiable, personal, intensely subjective... Every musical event ideally possesses a unique, never-to-be-repeated shape—even phrases in a sequence. (Taruskin, 1995: 317)

Indeed, this notion is adopted by HIP theorist and advocate Bruce Haynes who fleshes out this idea with reference to the fact that mainstream performers lack the capacity to improvise:

Because our society is exceedingly literate, these classical musicians have evolved in a curious way: they're so good now at reading music that their natural ability to improvise has atrophied. Most of them have no choice but to perform from written pages (in memory or on the stand) (Haynes, 2007: 3).

It is the above reformulation of improvisatorial style that I am arguing is a salient experimentalist signifier (or set of signifiers) at play in the performance of Mozart Reimagined. It is relatively difficult to articulate such minute differences in sound in writing. However, of the performance in question, I utilise my embodied sensibility and turn to the 'warm' sound world presented to me. In it I hear the tone colours generated by the instruments used; the gut strings and ferule-less 'transitional' bows (those argued to be historically appropriate for the repertoire in the program), the different lengths and diameters of tubing on valveless horns, the different shape of turned bores of wooden woodwind instruments. Added to this is my knowledge of the tuning system mentioned above, which no doubt contributes to this sense of 'warmth' and indeed demands a performance, along with temperamental instruments, flexible enough to make improvisational, minute alterations in pitch.

Add to this the temporal dislocations of '*notes inégales*,' the 'historically informed' improvisatory style of playing in which notes of equal written value are played unequally, often swung (much like in jazz) following some such pattern as 'short long short long' or more accurately, following only a lilting, 'never-the-same' sensibility. This is perhaps one of the most obvious explications the 'crooked' playing so well endorsed by Taruskin. The style of performance pulls the listener away from a measured metricality— a sense of where every notated beat sits— into a 'groove.'

Of course, these aspects of sensibility are not explicitly available to the uninitiated audience. Perhaps the only way that it might become so is through training or a side-by-side comparison of modern and HIP interpretations of the same piece.

One aspect that is a useful point of comparison however is in the comparison between the performances of Paul on the Bassett Clarinet versus Modern Clarinet. Here, the interested audience, already aware of the different clarinet on sight (and by his explanation) would have been able to hear a difference. The move from a warm round clarinet sound to a bright penetrating one marks the difference in aesthetic between not only modern and historical performance, but more to the point, the 'experimental' nature of the whole endeavour, even beyond the articulation of HIP as inherently experimental in and of itself.

In conclusion, I have argued that it is through 'events' that HIP is given space to perform itself and that the sense of unified 'community' emerges as shared embodied practice, bestowing upon insiders a kind of bodily experience of HIP authenticity. I noted the contention in this between insider conceptions of historical authenticity and authenticity. Moreover, I looked to three main paradigms or sign systems emergent from the Early Music Ensemble's performance 'Mozart Reimagined.' First, I explored the nature of the unspoken but heavily present conventions of the classical music genre and made the argument that through such heavily codified, embodied practices, HIP rested itself problematically within a genre that insider discourse would suggest the movement is irreconcilable with. I suggested that HIP might better be understood, in some sense, as a subgenre of classical music performance. In addition to this, I made the argument that there is a particular embodied and connoted historicity inherent in the objects, practices



and repertoire of HIP. I suggested that this historicity could be very well distinguished from the discursive rationalist historicity that underpinned the major defining concept of authenticity. At the same time, however, I posited that this discursive historicity remained influential in the formation of the former's aesthetic. I revealed that such a historicity begins to differentiate a distinctive HIP genre and in turn a sense of HIP authenticity. Finally, I pointed towards the impetus towards an 'experimentalism' also distinct from, but informed by the term as a discursive reaction to 'Authenticist' accounts of what HIP is. Instead I argued that this experimentalism was one bourn out of the complex network of signification and became most apparent in the performance of Mozart Reimagined in the Programming of the repertoire, the interdisciplinary of the venture (an indeed the movement) and in the instrumental improvisatory styles of performance practices evident in the informed audiences perceptions of temporality, pitch and soundworlds.

Having outlined these paradigmatic frameworks, I have demonstrated the limits of insider discourses upon determining a sense of the 'authentic' as evolving from either the historical pursuit of truth or a solely experimentalist drive. Instead I have argued that it is in the confluence of these strands that an embodied performed 'authenticity' emerges in the generation of a wholly unique, but contingent performance genre.

## Chapter 4 - Performing Historical Performance in Domestic Space

In the previous chapter I made a move away from a concern with texts on and in the Historically Informed Performance movement as wholly explicating the nature of the movement from the perspective of insiders. Having explored in detail, in chapters one and two, the dynamic of struggle present within two main genres of text, that is, between two seemingly irreconcilable interpretations of what HIP is—namely the authenticist vision and the non-dogmatic ‘experimentalist’ interpretation— in chapter three I made the assertion that these discursive definitions or delimitations of HIP could only ever be part of the story. In doing so I suggested that if these texts were to be considered in any way revealing, then they must be understood as, in the best case, *disseminated* into discourse and action. At the same time, by inquiring as to the relationship between text and practice (beyond the attempts within the field’s literature itself), I implied that these texts must be understood as products of a set of contingencies too complex to be articulated self-referentially within the texts themselves.

Leaving this explicit fact somewhat out of the equation (though its implicit ubiquity will be obvious to the reader by now) I turned my analytical lens away from text, and towards practice. I reframed my approach to the project by asking the question: Where and how does HIP ‘happen’ in Sydney, Australia? This question led me firstly to list some of the many manifestations that HIP could observably be said to have—a performance in a

hall, a lesson in a teaching studio or a conversation in a café for example— and then directly to the assertion that it is through these ‘events’ that an understanding how HIP identity is *performed* emerges. I argued that events are the spaces in which HIP community is formed or ‘emerges’ on the level of shared habituated practices and that this constructs a *sense* of authenticity as distinct from the various iterations of ‘authenticity’ that have become the vocabulary of insiders (historical authenticity or personal authenticity). In proving this argument, I turned to an analysis of an incontrovertibly HIP event type, the concert genre, and took as an exemplar a performance I observed at the Conservatorium, *Mozart Reimagined*.

By taking an analytical approach inspired by Gay McAuley’s semiotic ‘schema’ and Clifford Geertz’s concept of ‘sensibility,’ I drew out three main interwoven systems of signification at play in the performance as contributing to the emergence of the aforementioned sense of HIP Authenticity; the adaptation of the classical music concert genre, the utilisation of a historicity as distinct from historical accuracy and a impetus towards a loosely defined ‘experimentalism.’ The combination of the latter two demonstrated the manner in which two dominant discourses of historical authenticity and non-dogmaticism might be ‘reconciled in an obscure economy.’

In this chapter I intend to continue along the same line of reasoning—I will focus on another event as yet another moment in which HIP is performed. However, this time I seek to further, more explicitly, the argument laid out by Lowell Lewis that cultural formations emerge out of a process or the flow of events of various significances. To be sure, the last chapter was a first step in this direction in so far as it explored an event — the concert— that would uncontroversially be argued to be of one of the most important genres to the HIP community. However, I seek now to expand the scope of this study by honing in on event types that are of less apparent significance to any given social world. These are events that maintain less of a marked distinction in any given cultural life-world— what Lewis might describe as small ‘p’ performances. In mobilising Lewis’s term here, it is necessary to briefly rearticulate, for clarity’s sake, his conception of ‘special event.’

For Lewis, in any social world there are what he calls 'special events,' that is, events that are 'set apart from the ordinary daily round of activities.' (Lewis, 2013: 4) These are events that are marked or framed as special by insiders either explicitly (through codification or prescription) or implicitly (as organically emerging events). Importantly, he argues that these events are set against the background condition that is everyday life, the quotidian and 'that human cultural worlds are made livable partly through this contrast between special events and everyday life.' (Lewis, 2013: 5) In other worlds, Lewis argues that humans generate special events through the *intensification of awareness* or the *thematization* of different aspects of human experience.

This speaks to the co-constitutive relationship between special events and everyday life. However, Lewis goes further by arguing that this implies a 'common-ground' of the emergence of these two categories. Here Lewis employs the term *performativity* to account for this common ground and defines it as the 'potential to enact self awareness, or the possible thematisation of an event sequence.' (Lewis, 2013: 7) As a result of this definition, he points out that it follows that there is no 'hard and fast' boundary between the two categories, and instead he argues that events must exist on a continuum between more (big 'P') and less (small 'p') special events or performances. Lewis reserves the extreme 'special' end of the spectrum for 'Ritual events,' the most culturally significant, important and all encompassing events. On the polar opposite end, he places everyday life, moments that tend to recede from awareness altogether into the realm of unconscious habit. In this chapter I am sliding our focus down the scale towards those *more* everyday events.

The event I will provide analysis of in this chapter is one I will describe for now as a *conversation* between two HIP insiders, an important emerging scholar-performer figure in the movement and myself. My hesitance in labelling the performance genre within which this event might fall speaks to the lack of consistent convention denoting signifiers and confusion felt over the very framing of the moment. As will be revealed in what follows, this event might be understood as much as an interview, a harpsichord lesson or, a 'hangout' amongst two friends and housemates. On a theoretical level, this confusion no doubt supports the argument that this event falls well and truly within the category of

small 'p' performance. Regardless, I frame this event as a moment in which an important HIP insider revealed to me a verbal and musical articulation of his research and his (not unrelated) interpretation of HIP. He provided not only a commentary of his practice, but importantly *demonstrated* his discursive conception of 'authentic HIP.' Considering the aforementioned assumed relationship between small 'p' and big 'P' events, it should become clear as this chapter unfolds the relevance of looking to such a seemingly abstruse moment as important in the disclosure of a cultural world.

Importantly, I do not intend to provide a verbatim transcript of the event, nor is it my place to provide a thorough in depth account of the research presented to me in that moment—that would be the purview and jurisdiction of critical musicology and one would need to await the publication of the research. Instead, through the use of thick description, I hope to do justice to the spirit of the research and at the same time, tap into the material, sensory excess of the performance as as informative an approach—indeed much more so—as the former in revealing the manner in which a distinct HIP authenticity emerges to insiders.

I will now present this thick description. Following this I will begin my analysis of the event through a similar process as executed in the previous chapter. I will utilise Gay McAuley's schema insofar as I will draw out of the event the various semiotic clusters, grouping them into 'paradigms' and ultimately draw out of this process some sense of how these events create meaning for insiders.

### **15.12.16**

#### **A Conversation in Alistair's Bedroom**

We arrived home. It was a hot muggy summers day. We had just strolled down to a local café, about five minutes around the corner, to pick-up a couple of take away coffees. It was just the two of us, Alistair and myself—two peers, two friends— and we had been walking and talking, as we often did, about life, study and the field within which we held a shared history: Historically Informed Performance. Alistair had become a busy man. He was in and out of the house, lugging various keyboard instruments to and from rehearsals

or concerts and was often out teaching or sitting in the Conservatorium library working on his PhD in HIP. For a few weeks up till this moment I had been meaning to get Alistair to sit still for long enough to elaborate on something that he had mentioned to me in passing. On a previous shared stroll up to Redfern station, on his way to work and university at the Conservatorium, he had commented that he had a particular issue with the manner in which chords were *arpeggiated* in harpsichord playing—that is the timing of the distribution of the notes that would be otherwise notated vertically— in eighteenth century music.

in recordings everyone seems to want to arpeggiate everywhere to a really exaggerated extent... I mean, it kind of makes sense in Recitative, but people are doing it *everywhere*... and I'm wondering where this came from... there is no historical basis for it.

I was taken by his comments. I had never questioned the way people played chords in those moments that Alistair was suggesting. I knew they were never meant to be played as notation would imply— all notes struck in unison as by modern performance convention—and had assumed that that was all there was to the story. I reflected momentarily as we paused our perambulation by the station. I visualised what he was saying in my head, imagining the spread of notes struck before a singer in a baroque opera might begin their line. I imagined, then, the sound of the harpsichord in recordings I had heard—though I couldn't put a name to the performance. In my mind I saw Nigel place a chord in a flourishing run of notes placed consecutively and accelerating into a resonant ring. I responded that Nigel, our much-loved professor and head of the Historical Performance department at the Con, 'does it too.'

*'everyone* seems to do it.' Alistair moaned

I recognised the implications of his point in performance, the effect of a less flourishing chord placement in particular compositions would be no small thing. It would involve a radically different style of performance—a completely different aesthetic. I imagined it would be a sparser, thinner texture, but I needed to know more. I called to him as he passed my bedroom one day:

'Hey, want to grab a coffee? Lets chat, I want to pick your brain a bit.' He stopped in his tracks, a little flustered. I realised I had caught him at a bad time.

'Yeah... lets make a time' he said. I made a face, raised my eyebrows, widened my eyes and maintained straight face. I was struck by his formal tone. Before I could respond with a candid 'really?' he interrupted his own seemingly overactive thought processes.

'Oh come on man, we live in the same house, why are we scheduling this?'

I responded with a assuaging 'no, no it's fine.'

We made an arrangement.

—

We arrived home. I followed Alistair closely up the old Victorian darked-blond wooden stairs, coffee in hand; our effort to keep the buzz of our day going. Gazing forwards my eyes scanned upwards from the white soles of his well-kept sneakers making each tread, up the length of his brown chinos to his belt-line where his collared white-toned shirt was tucked. On his back he lugged a weighty black backpack seemingly over-packed, the zipper flap bulging out.

We made the first flight... I tapped his butt playfully with the back of my hand on the way... the second flight... 'careful' he joked suggestively... the third flight... Finally we ascended into the attic of the building, his room in the share house that he shared with his then partner.

Upon our ascent, the room opened up before us. It was a medium sized bedroom, large enough for one occupant, cramped for two. The room was painted a vivid white, and the wall and ceiling lines were angular. The room was an attic conversion; in construction the external pitched roofline was followed internally, a small front dormer jutting out, creating a small internal alcove, and on the opposite end of the room, a section of the pitched slope was elevated to create the bulk of the liveable dimensions of the room. The old brick chimney flu that ran the vertical length of the house had been preserved and stood out as a triangular jagged feature against a framing of, again, white plasterboard walls, this time shaped and indented so as to compliment the outline of the brickwork. All

these lines created a distinct, uneven modernist geometricism that jarred with the rectangular ornamented aesthetic of the preserved Victorian house upon which it was perched.

The floor was covered in a wearing, thick, cream-beige coloured carpet and was spotted with two small, deep red, tasselled and ornate Persian rugs. Tracing my eye around the room from left to right the collection of furniture became apparent. The aesthetic decisions might be described as Asian inspired. Ahead of me stood a simple tall deep-brown wooden cupboard, behind that were white built-in cupboards on either side of the front dormer. On the following wall, beneath the brickwork feature, was a black-varnished bedside table with gold coloured trim and inlay invoking a Japanese garden scene and beside that was a double bed with a thin black steel frame. On the brickwork feature rested books and little ornaments. Moving my gaze around, there was a large brown wooden ornamented Chinese chest and beside that a large red-washed cupboard decorated in Chinese floral images. A small wooden desk with brass Victorian draw handles sat in front of the back glass and wooden sliding doors of the space. But most strikingly, across from this, with its manuals facing the same windows, and along the low dividing wall on its perpendicular face that prevented unsuspecting visitors from falling into the stairway void, sat the large red Harpsichord, on its front the words reading 'Carey Beebe circa 1988'.

The instrument looked like a large angular box, at a stretch the size of a coffin and it was perched on its matching legs at around waist height. The lid was down, concealing the mechanisms within, but the front flap rested open displaying the grid of tuning pins, the nut over which the many strings were run and the jack-rail, a piece of wood restricting the movement of the jacks (which each housing a plectrum) ensuring their descent after plucking the string. On top of the instrument spanning across the front of the instrument, was a wooden music stand at this point holding sheets of paper and an open book, obviously Alistair's current work.

Alistair sat at the Keyboard, his back to the now open large sliding door. The open space, giving way to a small balcony, framed an outlook onto a canopy of jacaranda and gum trees which gave way on the left to the roof-scape of the inner-city suburb towards



the university buildings in the distance, and on the right, beyond the terraced perspective of corrugated iron roofs and chimneys, to the Sydney CBD skyline, a bricolage of concrete, lights, glistening steel and glass.

The sun shone through the window onto the off-white coloured carpet filling the space with a golden haze and adding its thermal energy to the already oppressive heat that characterised the attic space at the best of times, let alone in the summertime. We sat, sipped and spoke.

—

### **Historically Informed Performance Research**

Alistair perched himself on his harpsichord stool, crossed his right leg over the other, rested an arm on the keyboard, caressing his coffee in his left hand and leaned forwards a little. His eyes were on me, he was giving me full attention. I sat myself opposite him in a wooden chair, my feet were planted firmly and evenly before me and leaned forward resting both arms on my knees. I held a notebook in which I had quickly scribbled what I wanted to know. I asked him how his research was going, if he could outline what he was looking at. He became animated, sitting forward in his seat. He responded with an authoritative tone, his deep, paced and measured voice began:

I'm looking at something that I always found problematic... that ...there was no consensus on in the literature, and it [frustrated me] that ... when people were approaching this topic, they were answering the question within a specific paradigm of thought rather than standing outside and asking well what paradigm or rubric are we using to answer this question...

'What's the question?' I asked him. To which he eagerly responded:

...The specific question was about basso continuo in the late eighteenth century and what frustrated me was that people would dismiss it outright based solely on the idea that continuo is a baroque practice, and as soon as we enter a new period, this disappears, but the idea that there are periods is what frustrates me already. So now I'm questioning our understanding of style [of the past], and using that as a

way of understanding basso continuo... and then taking that as a general idea, and using it to approach the topic of continuo in the late eighteenth century.

how can style... this understanding of style, help us come to decisions about basso continuo in general? I'm using Austria as a case study.

Because the evidence is overwhelming as soon as you find that... that... that Basso Continuo was practiced on a number of different levels you know, its just then asking how was it done, but then also what were *their* fundamental categories that were used to define how it was done.

Is that what you mean by different levels? Different Categories?

Yeah, so, style I think is very important. This is the main section I'm at at the moment. We find that what style *means* in definitions of style in dictionaries and lexicons doesn't really change much 1700 to 1800. Most people just paraphrase [Sébastien de] Brossard 1701 and the primary thing there which I think is left out from nearly all academic discussion are the three fundamentals of style which for him was composition, performance and communication. And then he lists what phenomenon can influence a style: nationality, personal style. But the most important thing is composition, which informs style, and then how this composition can be realised using performance practices, and then how this then leads to a certain way of communication. And the thing is that once you read this and understand this concept, you find this riddled throughout the way that performance treatises talk about how you should play. There is this fundamental idea... is instilled in everything you read.

Cool man, and so what sorts of sources are you going to?

Well, dictionaries and lexicons from the time like I said, are really important. Just as a general way of understanding something. Because there you get to see the same things that are talked about, what is important, you find that definitions are just as important as the words that people use, words are regional, and they have

different connotations as well, so one word can mean something different 20kms away.

And treatises?

Treatises do mention some things, depends on the treatise, [Johann] Mattheson *Der vollkommene Cappellmeister*, is more lexicon...ographic dictionary-like, and that has a really... really um intense definition of style. With the treatises you find that people are writing within this framework but never quite articulating it as well as the theoreticians do... right?... because they're primarily concerned with performance which holds many aspects of what we consider theoretical, but speculation like this is something that was really left to theoreticians.

Interesting, and how is it all coming together in your playing, or is it all theoretical at this stage?

No it should be something that should be applied practically. What it's made me realise, how it's made me change my playing, my approach towards basso continuo, is it's really switched my understanding of the fact that your Basso Continuo playing should be simple, when in fact it should be just as complex as the composition you're playing, but at the same time, shouldn't be obtrusive. So my understanding is that when I play now I play the whole composition within a certain style, following stylistic parameters and the other people I am playing with are just reinforcing strands or lines of that composition that I am already playing in my fingers. And I think this is true for most styles, of course you have to simplify.

Are you talking national style?

Well that's the thing, compositional style. So national style was something that was *considered*, but it was the compositional style that I see is more important.

Which would be the difference between things like?

Dances, fugues, sonatas, concertos, old style, new style, there are many different ways... theoreticians argued about how styles should be divided, but they didn't argue about the idea that styles should be *distinguished* and divided. So it's just terminology, I mean Mattheson uses the age old 'church chamber and theatre', but Scheiber talks about 'high middle and low,' then at the end of the eighteenth century Koch talks about public and private music.

Right, so different ways of dividing the same thing.

Different ways of dividing the same concept

So if you were to take some of these ideas, maybe one which you are taken by, what would the difference be in actual practice be do you reckon?

So, lets just take something which is... let's just take one major division, which is national. This could be a German writing or playing a dance, but a dance is French, so you'd have to play it in the French manner. You would have to play a much more rhythmic continuo, something which highlights the characteristic of the dance and if you really want to play in a French, in a francophone manner, you would have to use the appropriate ornamentation, not just in the bass voice, but in the inner voices of your continuo part as well.

Can you give an example of that?

## A Minuet

‘So if you were to. So lets take the same bass line for the same example. So... A minuet... for example’

Alistair lifted both hands slightly above the manual, suspended them momentarily in mid-air before dropping them together, at the same time, with anticlimactically little force to strike the first chord. The sound of the first note set the tone. The instrument produced a soft but present twanging, metallic sound, with an immediate attack. The sound quickly dissipated as it passed. It was a minor chord, some several pitches stacked upon on another. In very quick succession, in something of an *allegro* like tempo (fast and lively), before the sound had fully dissipated, his left hand lifted off, and, his fingers leading the way, he began to move the bass-line along in upward-moving fashion. I felt the movement in three, typical of a minuet. The upper voices seemed only to nuance the bass line, complimenting it with a pleasant consonance at key moments in the phrase. As the bass line moved forward, it drew my attention, it rose up in a scalic manner (stepwise motion) four steps, the first three even, and the last lingering slightly longer before breaking into a swinging minim and crotchet pattern. The line moved one step higher and Alistair added a very quick trill in an upper voice. He then passed that idea to the bass line before it began it's descent, marking the consequent part of the phrase with a faster moving rhythmic pattern of four quavers and a crotchet. This passage rose one step before descending several more, and Alistair repeated this figure at a lower pitch, taking the phrase to its harmonically logical conclusion at the same tonic chord that graced the opening. As he played, the instrument shook ever so gently and I could hear the gentle clicking of light weight wood on wood, the mechanics of the instrument engaging busily.

## French Style

Without losing focus, Alistair said:

‘Now If I wanted to play some ornamentation in the bass I could play...’

He began the tune again, this time, only the bass line. He altered the timing of the first two notes, it sounded wonky. He added a trill on the second note, a speedy oscillation no longer than the note upon which it was placed, gaining pace and resolving into a turn-

quickly up and down in pitch, before resolving upwards to the third note. He hit the peak of the phrase and began the decent, adding more trills to the third of the four quavers. He stumbled on one. He made too many oscillations and lost his speed. Focusing his eyes towards his fingers and lifting his left hand deliberately, as if to be very exact, he tried again, this time with more success. He placed the trills each time with poise and measured timing.

I recognised the style of playing, the ornate frills and turns , as what would be described as 'French Baroque.' Seeing assurance I commented:

'So, a French style'

'That's right, in a French manner' he responded. 'So... I might have to play the minuet a little bit slower then if I do...'

He continued.

### **Sonata**

'If that was marked sonata though, for example, in three four, you would have to change the way that you [play]... you wouldn't add so much ornamentation... you might want to play a thicker continuo then as well...'

He struck four chords, the same harmonic idea as the tune before, this time all voices placed together, there were no lone lines. The effect was a full, thick sound, the parts not so easy to aurally separate. The first two chords gave a little ring, the third one was somewhat more cut short, giving the feeling of a kind of 'skip' on the up beat to land on the following down beat.

'something like that.' He explained. 'A more full style... *and* if you wanted to be *very* Italianate in the sonata, then you could use Italianate techniques, like, what they called the arpeggio, which is not...'

He rolled a chord as I would have expected an arpeggiation to sound. Within a short moment he split the notes of the chord, striking them consecutively, dovetailing in

sound from the lowest to highest, each iteration adding to the tinkling effect that the prior set in motion.

‘...but instead...’

### **Italian Style**

He confidently, with no pause, began a motoring an oscillating quaver pattern that, again, harmonically matched the tune, but gave it a certain directedness, a forward momentum. The bass line was audible throughout but was complicated by upper voices determinedly bouncing off each beat. The movement, though only three bars long, was unwavering and the rhythm was relentless. He continued his explanation:

### **Recitative**

‘then if we had the same bass line for a recitative, you’d have to play it entirely differently all together. You’d use a lot of arpeggio and a lot of dissonance...’

He rolled the opening chord again, this time adding to it more notes and spreading them more slowly the sound jarring slightly, but still flowing.

‘something like...’

He swiftly rolled again, as if getting comfortable.

...this acciaccaturas [short ornamental notes struck on the beat of the principal note] between the note... they also advocate using very short quick arpeggios...

Picking up on his previous comments regarding inappropriate ornaments I asked him, ‘This is what you were talking about before?’ He nodded with a large slow gesture and went on:

‘Exactly, and then if this was a motet, you would have to play it differently as well, you’d have to be much more conscious of the individual voices within the parts. So all you’re doing really is just reinforcing the composition... it makes total sense. Why would you, if the piece is written in the Italian style, why would you ornament

using French ornaments, which is something you hear a lot... unconsciously, its just the continuo players fear of making a enough noise.

### **Intimacy, Social Roles and Event**

The most pressing observation to address regarding the event above is the difficulties that were had, and indeed I am still having, regarding the very framing of the event. As I have already indicated, I am attributing this largely to the lack of consistent convention determining signifiers that would be present in event types that would otherwise be conceived of as significant—in the case of HIP, this would include the concert or the lesson format. That said, it is very well worth attempting to draw together some of those incongruent signifiers as, in themselves and their very incongruence, as meaningfully laden as would those more cohesive clusters. Rather than simply attempting to pigeonhole the event within an existing genre, or simply ‘inventing’ an appropriate one, I have chosen to acknowledge the various interpretive possibilities and turn towards an investigation of a broader paradigm that I believe both subsumes and causes this tension; this paradigm I will describe as that of a quality of interpersonal ‘intimacy.’

By using the term ‘intimacy’ here, I am quite simply referring to the complex interrelationships between individual HIP insiders—largely positive, but also potentially negative. What discursive interpretations of HIP—that invariably define the movement as ‘reactive’ in nature— almost inevitably fail to access is the element of camaraderie and sociality of insiders in their quotidian, bodily shared existences. What I am arguing here is that HIP is not only constructed out of the shared musical practices in shared musical spaces that characterises the HIP concert genre, but they also share domestic space within which daily behaviours or routines, that is, deep-seated habits in their complex multiplicity are negotiated. Put simply, I am pointing out that HIP insiders, for better or worse, at any given moment, live together, eat together, recreate together, sleep together, joke, laugh, chat and argue together. Of course, this fact is not to presume a strength of bond comparable to a community strongly bound by kinship, or even practical necessity, however it does suggest a certain level of intimacy however much qualified.



Whilst the presence of this intimacy may not, on the surface, appear to be of particular note, it should be understood with an awareness of the small size of the movement and its interaction with various institutions (in this case the university).

Within such a framing, I argue that a picture of HIP begins to emerge in which there is a necessity of individuals in their shared temporal and physical space, to operate within many different, seemingly conflicting, roles. For example, where an individual might play a distinct role as teacher in a professional or institutional setting, this may require reconciliation with the more familiar role of a friend or roommate where a pupil under his or her tutelage might take on such a role. It is this intimacy that I argue is an important constitutive factor in the way HIP authenticity performed and received by insiders.

In order to explicate this point, I utilise Lowell Lewis's conception of role-play as integral to performance and the mediation of the individual and collective, and as such, the cultural formations. To recap, Lewis believes that social roles 'precede organised social selves or subjects.' (Lewis, 2013:99) In this sense, Lewis is arguing that, humans, rather than simply performing roles as a superficial enhancement of the already existent subject, roles are integral to the social formation of the subject not only in development, but also through adulthood. At the same time, Lewis resists the assertion that follows from this formulation that there is no essential self, and that humans simply perform their personal collection of accumulated roles. For Lewis, it is enough to suggest that the phenomenal sense of unified self is sufficient, and he adds to this the notable awareness adults have to their own (sometimes cynical) performance of socially constructed roles.

For Lewis, performance often presents us with enhanced modes of social roles. In the particular case of music, for example, Lewis suggest that a performer is celebrated as somehow enhancing the processes of habit formation latent (in different forms) in the consciousness of their audience. Following from this, he argues that:

If role-play depends on roles that are intersubjective signs, recognisable to anyone within a given cultural life-world, then acting them out can be seen as a form of group experience. (Lewis, 2013: 98)

The manifestation of this in, and as constitutive of, Historically Informed Performance is clear. Perhaps the most prominent HIP role, the most venerated, would be the scholar-performer. Other important roles would include 'artistic director' of an ensemble or the rank and file musician (a category again subdividable into various subcategories of instruments and their functions). Of course, as is clear by now, within HIP, friendship and personal relationships hold weight as well. All of these particular roles are historically contingent (on several levels), born out of a complex confluence of factors far too complex to fully explicate here. I am arguing that, the event in question, and indeed HIP, must be thus understood as the product of such a complex confluence of roles and the related confusion of convention brought about by their necessary negotiation.

Attending directly to the event in question, I point towards a system of signifiers that denote such a paradigm of intimacy. It is in the signifiers of roles as well as of space that such a paradigm begins to emerge as a part of the construction of HIP.

The first thing to point out is the setting of the event; the bedroom space marked most obviously by the presence of a bed, cupboards and the personal effects of the inhabitants. It needs no explication that in western society, the bedroom is a particularly meaning laden space. It is a location of vulnerability. It is here that the 'private' as a discursive effect is enacted as the dichotomous alternate to the public face. It is the space in which the individual's sense of bound 'self' becomes marked as the necessity of highly coded roles is diminished. Thus my invitation into the room for a 'conversation' could be read as a symbolic gesture of trust, or intimacy.

That said the space is complicated by the dominating presence of a harpsichord, and, indeed, the practicalities born out of the relative immovability of the instrument. This feeds a sense of the room as a locus for action. Take for example the fact that this space operated as a rehearsal space, where, from past experience, ensembles would gather to rehearse for upcoming performances. At these moments, performance collaborators, who unsurprisingly happen to also be friends, would congregate in the room, slightly altered to accommodate the size of the ensemble.

Another factor to consider is that in these kinds of circumstances, there is an economic logic at play, namely the increasingly common commodification of floor space in

tertiary institutions. In other words, there is competition for rehearsal space, and the operation of a rehearsal in a domestic setting in a sense circumvents the problem, even as it blurs traditional divisions between public and private, and personal and professional.

Perhaps this blurred line could be best navigated through understanding another related utilisation of this particular space as a room for personal practice. In this conception, the proximity of the 'tools of the trade,' the harpsichord and the collection of musical scores (a mere roll away from bed), speaks to the intensity of the investment and immersion of at least this insider, in the movement. The insider is never 'away' from the movement in daily life. One is always at work, the relationship to tools of HIP rarely severed. Beyond this, however, the rehearsal can be understood as an intensification of personal practice. In this sense, rather than outside musicians being simply invited into the personal realm as might be a superficial insider conception, it would perhaps be more accurate to suggest that HIP *is* social, and that intimacy is a defining feature of the musical project, the extension of the self into the collective.

However, in the case of our conversation, this moment can also be understood as a social engagement in space— as a 'hangout' for want of a better term. It is here that I return to my original argument, that my invitation signified a certain degree of trust, outside of the 'professional'. I need only give evidence here of my long standing friendship with Alistair, our shared history in the HIP movement, the Conservatorium and even as travellers in the Netherlands, scoping out the Dutch HIP movement. It was upon *these* grounds, rather than any particular convention of genre, that this moment occurred. It was upon a ground of shared experience, a common institutionally formed and forming vocabulary, shared understanding of the institution within which we both studied, but perhaps, above all, a simple 'closeness' born out of the former and more.

Whilst the setting of the event is revealing regarding the nature of the intimacy of HIP, the event itself, the manner in which we framed it, as the involved insiders at the time is as important. Upon requesting a 'chat' with Alistair, I was presented with a rather confronting moment in which my expectations of our relationship did not immediately match with his and I argue that this begins to build up an understanding of this complex intimacy and layering of social roles. The interaction I had with Alistair whereby I sought

his company to 'pick his brain' as it were, presented a moment of discord. What I had perceived to be a rational request for the company of a friend over coffee was met with an officiousness that I felt jar with my sense of relationship to him. I should note, of course, that this moment did not evolve or escalate into anything more interpersonally dramatic. Furthermore, I would stress this fact by pointing, instead, towards its short-lived nature and the fact that, after the moment, no more needed to be said. At the same time however, where such a small interpersonal confrontation might be passed over, minimised or simply forgotten within the cultural world in question, for the analyst, it can be read as particularly weighty.

Regardless of the larger frame impacts of the moment of discord in question, the immediate moment itself provides a brief insight into the complex navigation of social roles in HIP. Indeed, I inquire as to the roles that both Alistair and myself were seeking to perform in the moment. To begin with, Alistair was dressed for work, backpack on, collard shirt, pants and sneakers (this was a common dress code for Alistair). He was moving swiftly enough to mark a directedness — was he simply in a rush to get to work? Myself, dressed in shorts, thongs and a t-shirt, calling out into the corridor from my bedroom, I was operating on several levels. On the one hand, I presented to Alistair as a relaxed housemate and friend but also a rent collector and further a peer.

To stop him in the corridor to deal with a concern not immediately present to him would not doubt have been momentarily disorienting and possibly frustrating. His immediate response to my request was to officiously 'pencil it in' to his diary, perhaps as his way of reconciling the encounter within his particular momentarily enacted social role. Further evidence for this would be in his candid expression of self-reflection.

His comment, 'come on, we live together,' and his associated slumping gesture, was a moment of direct identification with the assumed friendship I have already identified. I can even identify my personal relief in finding that moment of mutual affinity. Here is an insight into the navigation of social roles. My acceptance of the resolution of the tension might indicate my personal awareness of such a tension in itself. This navigation of roles, I believe, continued apace into the heart of the conversation that followed those weeks later.

The event was predicated on the assumption that what was of concern was an explication of his thoughts and specifically, his research. I had asked him for a chat, specifically following up on his particular ideas surrounding continuo playing. As such, he was at the very least, mentally prepared to speak to me about it. His awareness of my research, in addition to my inquiry into his, marked a mutual identification as research students. As it had become convention over time for research students in HIP at the Conservatorium to talk through their ideas, it is realistic to assume that we were operating within this paradigm. However, added to this was the potentially subtle overtone of competition, and possible performance of institutional hierarchy. In this sense, Alistair is a graduate several years older, he is pursuing a more advanced degree, and teaches within the institution. To think in Bourdieuan terms, I was in fact at one stage a student of his and I have not attained the same amount institutional or research capital to compete. Indeed, I would argue that we are competing in different fields. Regardless, if there is any amount of truth to that assertion, then it is of fractional import to understanding the event. However, I will return to Alistair's role as a teacher in the following section where I look to Alistair's performance as 'scholar-performer.'

The last point I will argue in relation to this quality of intimacy is the immediate issue of friendship and camaraderie. In this sense, I wish to pay tribute to the simple fact that in shared time and space, we have attained a particular familiarity, one that I argue characterises much of the Historically Informed Performance movement. This is a closeness that appears in many cases to transcend notions of competition, or rival 'schools' of musical production. It is here where discourses around authenticity and experimentalism become blurred. This is the obscure economy of relationships within which these discourses are 'reconciled.'

Characterising this is the movement of insiders into the physically close, the extremes of which—the engagement in a more serious relationship—are not evident in this event. However, the jovial boundary transgression suggested in the thick description, whereby I physically tapped Alistair on his rear-end, is suggestive of such a physical closeness. At risk of 'spelling out' a joke, it was not that I had any pretensions towards any kind of eroticism; instead, it was a sarcastic gesture and a playful exploration and

transgression of boundaries. Alistair's response, 'careful' in a drawn out lowered tone, marked a general sarcasm and was thus not so much a direct warning to watch the boundary, but an acknowledgement of the transgression and a playful demonstration of the closeness of the relationship.

It is thus reasonable to suggest that intimacy is an important constitutive element of insider perceptions of HIP authenticity. It is an intimacy born of the small size of the movement, the limited number of institutionalised positions, and the necessity of insiders to play multiple social roles at any given time. It is also a result of the immense investment of time and resources into the pursuit of HIP. This generates an intensity of temporal and spacial proximity amongst insiders that translates into a layering and blurring of traditional social roles across assumed broader social categories of private and public or personal and professional and further, a blurring of the very bounds of the event in question. I will now turn to a more determinate and related paradigm with which this intimacy is bound, namely that of the aspiration towards the ideal of 'scholar-performer.'

### **The Scholastic and the Scholar-Performer**

So far, I have painted something of a picture of HIP as somehow a space of transgressed boundaries and blurred roles. Indeed, this is the case, however, it is important still to draw out of the event points of cohesion of signification so as to be able to make more concrete, positive arguments about the generation of a HIP authenticity, or sense of what HIP is. As such, the next paradigm I will be drawing from the event is one predicated upon the performance of the 'scholastic' and the role of 'scholar-performer'.

By using the term 'scholastic' I am not simply referring to the academic conventions that might point towards the attainment of positive educational achievement—though it is that as well—rather, I am referring to all the interactions of a range of signifiers both bodily and of objects, symbolic and indexical, that coalesce to construct a 'sense' of the scholastic. By this, I am referring to an aesthetic of the scholastic, or perhaps more accurately, an aesthetic of the institutionally conceived academic.

Here I can point to the stacks of books in eyesight throughout the conversation. Of course, books alone might not necessarily denote the 'scholastic,' however, in volume,

implications of a 'well-read' individual begin to emerge. Further, when conceived of in the context of Alistair's dress, a certain academic aesthetic does begin to emerge. His chinos, sneakers and button up, textured and white-toned collared shirt harken to a laid back professionalism—a gesture towards the professionalism demanded of an aspiring academic, tempered by the rejection of a business suit. I would go so far as to argue that all that was missing was a tweed jacket— which I happen to know he owns.

I would add to the mix Alistair's tone of delivery, his authoritative, deep voice, measured pace and elongated, articulate tone. He spoke as though precision was key, concerned about being misunderstood and with a clarity becoming of a seasoned public speaker. He made a particular point of placing emphasis on words of significance, for example, '*style*' or '*compositional*' and he would further paint his words with body language, an animated-ness, upon broaching a topic of his interest.

However, this shallow reading of scholasticism must be understood in a broader context in order for it to attain the weight I am suggesting it holds to insiders. I have articulated the confusion of roles that has gone into the construction of the conversation and pointed towards the performance of self-hood, though role-play, in social space as indicative of being the source of that tension. However, in the spirit of seeking unity in the event, and in terms of coming to a complex interpretation of what HIP is, I believe that the notion that role-play is fundamental to social organisation may still prove useful.

Within this conception, it should follow that the performance of the HIP conversation involved the intensification of particular roles as, in some way, constitutive of HIP. This brings me to my next argument, that the series of signifiers raised in the event in question coalesce to strongly connote a the particular role of 'scholar–performer.' In other words, I argue that the 'scholastic' operates on the embodied level through the habitually inculcated and inculcating performance of the 'scholar-performer' as the paramount ideal HIP role. At this time I would remind the reader of the quotidian framing of this event, and, in light of the strength of signification, I would argue that it is indeed this paradigm of the 'scholarly' or the 'scholar-performer' that prevented this event from descending completely out of awareness, into the deep recesses of undifferentiated, habitual daily life.

To put my argument succinctly, I argue that Alistair, rather than simply attaining the role of scholar-performer through the enactment of the appropriate defining 'tasks' (the doing and application of historical research), he was (and is) in an ongoing creative process of self-creation within the already existing model of scholar-performer as a means of furthering himself within the field. In other words, due to the historical and socially constructed nature of roles, his presentation reveals something of the construction of the HIP movement.

The role of the scholar-performer has come to be an assumed category within the Historically Informed Performance movement. The Scholar-Performer is at once a historian and a theoretician, a pedagogue, palaeographer, archivist, and of course a performer. As insiders would no doubt love to emphasise, this is a category of musician that sets the HIP movement apart from the 'mainstream'. As they would have it, this role is the locus of research, the embodiment of that which justifies the very existence of the field. It is within this role that the historical is, in their eyes, meaningfully and honestly investigated and applied to performance. This stands in stark contrast to the mainstream performance world where (at least these days) the idea that a performer should be 'informed' in any particular way (not to mention historically so) appears to fall to the wayside (or at best to a status of only secondary concern) amidst the various iterations of the veneration of individual creative genius or artistry (a comparison of the HIP conception of 'scholar-performer' and the 'maestro' would be of interest in a future study). It follows logically that the role has an observable history, perhaps most astutely expressed by Christopher Hogwood who states explicitly:

The classification of 'scholar-performer' has risen in status along with the musical career of [Gustav] Leonhardt. (Hogwood, 2003: xv)

### **The Neo-Authenticist Position**

The centrality and importance of the role is thus not in contention here, however, being aware of it does provide us with a vantage-point from which the academic 'game' of HIP might be observable; that is the performance of the vying interpretations of HIP. I argue that this is the analytical nexus of the discursive and the performative. It is here where the words Alistair spoke begin to emerge as meaningful both within and beyond their



discursive power. As such, further comprehension of the event above requires another very brief foray into the realm of discourse.

It is my contention that Alistair, in his articulation of his research, was doing more than simply performing academic rigor as, his persistent reference to historical sources and his indignant demeanour might suggest. Rather, I argue that what he was performing was a thinly veiled attempt to diminish the salience of orthodox HIP views in the attempt to consecrate forms of capital more relevant to his own furtherance in the movement. I will again, for a brief return to the metaphor of HIP as a *battleground*.

To begin with, Alistair began to set his position up in antagonism with a perceived 'incorrect' or 'ill-informed' 'other.' In something of a 'David and Goliath' style dynamic, he sought to make a point of the fact that *everyone* was arpeggiating *everywhere* and that there was no 'historical basis for it.' Of course, it is important to account for hyperbole in the articulation of such phrasing in everyday language, however, taking into account degree, it still follows that what he was indicating was that the general consensus was wrong.

Here it is useful to harken back to the previous two chapters where it was established that the existing 'status quo,' or 'orthodox' interpretation of HIP is a 'non-dogmatic' position that places less weight upon the historical in light of the Taruskinian assertion that historical authenticity is impossible. It is also useful to remind the reader of the small size of the field and saturation of positions within it, making progression through the industry increasingly difficult. It is within this context that the assertion of a dissenting view, the 'othering' of the HIP orthodoxy, gains particular weight. What becomes clear is that Alistair, despite full awareness of the (arguably well grounded) orthodox position, is seeking to invest in an Authenticist stance—or perhaps more accurately, as it is by no means a stance born in ignorance, more of a 'status quo ante,' a *Neo-Authenticist* position.

What Alistair brought to the discussion was not only revisionist position lamenting the loss of the foundational school of HIP (though such lamenting may well be present in some form) (See chapter 1), but it also brings a theoretical opening, a new historical framework for understanding historical practices. I will return to this idea in the following section.

It is my contention that whilst Alistair frames his position as a search for 'truth' or indeed, 'origins,' in practice it marks an attempt to gain what Bourdieu would call *Distinction*. It is a creative utilisation of the role of scholar-performer. It is a reworking of the role that holds with it the memory of the founding theorist's conception of the historically authentic as well as the experimentalist disposition of current times. It is thus an attempt to redefine the very direction of the movement away from an, in his words, 'uncritical' non-dogmatism, towards a *new* historicity.

Fully conscious of the controversial narrative he is introducing to the field, Alistair does take steps towards 'softening' any accusative tone. Rather than pushing the point, or pointing to any particular individuals (even upon coaxing) he might see as complicit in what he is rejecting, he instead chose to rest the blame upon a practical and realistic, though by no means redemptive, concern.

Why would you, if the piece is written in the Italian style, why would you ornament using French ornaments, which is something you hear a lot... unconsciously, its just the continuo players fear of making a enough noise.

It is in this way that the paradigm of the scholastic and of the aspiration towards the ideal of this scholar-performer role builds towards the construction of an HIP authenticity. It is through the significations of books, clothing, language, body language and discourse that the scholastic begins to emerge as a distinctive aesthetic force. It is one captured best in the socially accepted, constructed and central scholar-performer role, authority is imbued upon an individual and through which attempts to discursively restructure the field might be launched. Of course, it must be remembered that this is tempered by the aforementioned paradigm of intimacy within which this dynamic of the scholarly emerges as a structuring phenomenon amidst a mess of insider interactions. In this sense, the battleground is but a thread in a more complex interpretation of HIP. To illustrate this further, I will now turn to the final paradigm to be drawn from the HIP movement, the paradigm of practice.

### **Practicing HIP: The Liberating Potential of the Conservative Stance**

Having explored how the scholarly and the role of the scholar-performer is central to the HIP movement in terms of the potential of that role to either enable an attempt at field restructure or maintenance, it follows that a consideration of musical practice, within this convention, will broaden our understanding of the mechanisms of dissemination and practice more broadly. As such, looking at Alistair's performance, specifically what I will term his *demonstration*, provides us with a unique opportunity to address the nature of this dissemination in much greater detail, exploring more explicitly the relationship between discourse and action. I am arguing that, throughout his articulation of his new historical model for the performance of Basso Continuo in the late eighteenth century, through his exploration of historical 'style' he provides us with the capacity to understand not only the limits of discourse, but also, within a performative frame, the potential of that discourse to engender changes in habit, building towards a more complex understanding of how the practices of HIP build a sense of HIP authenticity and what HIP is.

My argument is that whilst Alistair was discursively bound to an interpretation of HIP as a retrospective, conservative or (historically) Authenticist endeavour, this arguable 'limitation' creates fertile ground for the generation of new musical vocabularies or 'tools' that, truly historical or not, might otherwise not have eventuated and might not continue to eventuate. The important distinction to be made here is that, taking this stance, Alistair was explicating how he believed music *should* be played, not how it actually *was* played. I must rearticulate that I make this claim within the aforementioned climate where 'non-dogmatic' or experimentalist interpretations are the lingua franca of the movement, and I am fully aware of the potential for misreading in my own position. As such I must state here that I present this argument, at this moment (perhaps rather conveniently) as an outsider. However, at the same time, I would not wish to (nor could I) distance myself so thoroughly as to 'cop out' of the debate altogether. In this sense I would ask that this section be read as more of a payment of tribute to practice and to *a* practice (and within the frame of this thesis, to a friend), than to any given ideological framework.

In order to explicate my point, I will turn to an analysis of the practices of the demonstration utilising Lewis's conception of *Habit*. For Lewis, as I have shown, Role-Play involves the performance of habitualised, socially conceived practices, it follows thus, that understanding individual habits, whether or not they conform with a given role, goes a long way in uncovering the manner in which HIP is constructed.

In Lewis's view Habit formation, maintenance and change occurs through a process that he describes as the inverse of what Lewis calls the Microevolution of signification, that is the process of human meaning making. He argues that it is the 'phenomenological basis for the usual distinction between meaning (as idea) [or discourse] and action (as material reality).' This process involves the 'propagation of effects: first from pre-reflexivity through subliminal sense to conscious awareness and then from vague feelings to linguistic concepts' ... 'In the reverse process, humans consciously strive to acquire skills as embodied habits, and as the skills become incorporated more fully, the habits often recede from consciousness.' (Lewis, 2013: 95) This is the basis of what anthropologists describe as the 'naturalisation of culture.' Importantly for this analysis, Lewis points out, following E.V. Daniels, that there are some people who make 'habit of habits change,' out of necessity of their work, he gives the example of athletes and actors, who often develop habits for accessing other habits at different levels of embodiment (Lewis, 2013: 16, 95). It is my contention that musicians can happily join this list, and more so, I argue that HIP musicians experience this in a heightened manner.

By taking this theoretical approach, it will be possible to mount the argument that what was performed in that demonstration was not so much a simple establishment of equivalence with a lost past, but rather, a palimpsestic layering of, or a complex inter-relationship between bodies past and present, between embodiments of incalculable (and in many ways lost) complexity. It is in Alistair's particular approach to texts— texts born of the bodies past— along with his own embodied history and his present circumstances that the generation of a range of new musical possibilities are opened up through articulation and rearticulation. It is this complexity of practice that generates an unlikely, and unacknowledged *plurality of practice* and it builds into an understanding of what HIP actually is.

## The Plurality of the Historical

After articulating his distaste for the improper use of historical arpeggiation or ornaments, Alistair explained that it was historical compositional style that he believes should be used as the rubric for the interpretation of late eighteenth century Basso Continuo playing. In other words, he was suggesting that rather than a 'one size fits all approach' to music of the era, ornamentation and other markers of style of performance should be considered on a compositional basis i.e. the correct ornaments and techniques should be used for 'dances, fugues, sonatas, concertos, old style, new style, [etc].'

Already in this moment, whilst at the same time as espousing a historicist view, Alistair had indicated that there was a potential opening in the manner in which compositions might be performed. Rather than limiting historical performance to one particular manner of 'correct' performance as perhaps might be expected of a hard-line authenticity, his research had, for that particular moment in time, presented the movement with a new range of possibilities. That is not to suggest that his historical view was the facilitator of the maximal performative potential of HIP, rather, it indicated the framing—possibly a multiplier—for a plurality of performance styles. Whether or not that plurality might end there is a separate question, and one I am addressing in what follows.

When I asked him for some examples of what he meant, he proceeded by playing an outline of a base line, what he called a 'minuet.' He framed this as something of a 'blank canvas' bass line, ['so lets take the same bass line for the same example'] a bass upon which he would build the different examples that were to follow. The notion that there might be a 'blank slate' is of course unrealistic if Lewis's concept of Habit is maintained. This would be to assume an absolute ground eradicating the particularities and uniqueness, indeed the body, from the passage that he would so elegantly, expertly and confidently outline. Indeed, his demonstration was even improvised, the product of a complex history that he himself sought to suppress for the sake of articulating his point. None the less, that initial performance must be understood as bound to a musical rigour, a routine of practice spanning, at this stage, decades. It is a 'practice' routine, beyond the bounds of HIP. It is nestled in the training of a young boy beginning his piano lessons at a young age. It is bound to a history of listening to music of so many kinds, talking, reading

books and scores, trying 'it' out on the piano and/or then the harpsichord. It is the product of a labour of conscious efforts to fulfil a sound imaginary. This is the blank canvas from which Alistair sought to proceed.

As he continued, he problematized his 'blank canvas' with the ornaments he deemed from his research to be fitting. As a Minuet is French, French ornaments were required. He played a series of trills, beginning with such a confidence, but fumbling on one. It was his reading that had inspired these trills, turns and mordents. It was his understanding of historical convention, bourn out of books written by composers or theorists long gone. How was the trill to have gone? He did not specify the details of his understanding, however, the fact remains that there is a gap between text and act. It is the reconciliation of a body of the past and Alistair's historical body that created this possibility. It was one unique, always potentially transformative possibility. These trills, turns and mordents, following Lewis's microevolution of signification, were dependent on past internalisation, a repetitious and particular training allowing them to naturalise. His improvisation proved, for a short moment, an impediment to his embodiment as he fumbled to execute it in a fashion he deemed acceptable to his own sense of history and/or quality. However, it was quickly resolved and, at least partially, incorporated back into his body schema.

The same trend continues through his demonstration of the sonata and Italian style. In the former, this manifested as removal of ornamentation and a 'filling out' of the line. This process would require a knowledge of harmony to a great enough extent so as not to 'hit wrong notes. Indeed, all of his chords rang with a consonance; his harmony was 'good' as they would say. However, this is born of a knowledge of 'figured bass,' that is a knowledge of the conventions of 'realising' or 'voicing' (improvising within rules) a piece from a single bass line and some numbers signifying the placement of a particular chord or series of intervals. An advanced player could realise a baseline without these numbers. This indicates that a particular embodiment was *assumed* even in the research. This is a skill learnt not in days, or weeks even, but over months, years and decades. It is a reward of investment of time in repetitions daily work. This is the quotidian of HIP.

A final note should be made of the fact that this event was improvised. Here is the ultimate indicator of the place of embodied knowledge in HIP. To quote Bruce Haynes from his venerable text of HIP once again, '[Mainstream] classical Musicians have evolved in a curious way: they're so good at reading music that their natural ability to improvise has atrophied.' (Haynes, 2007: 3) The HIP revival of improvisation for classical musicians, and as a historical phenomenon, speaks to a potential broadening of creative possibilities. However, it is not unproblematic. Of course, again here is a certain paradox regarding the performance of historical creativity. More to the point, however, is the fact that the possibilities are again multiplied by the complex historicity brought to improvisation by individual musicians. Ironically, to bring into the equation Alistair's historical model as applied even within a seemingly flawed Authenticist paradigm presents us with the potential for ever more musical interpretive possibility.

By looking to these examples of the mobilisation of historical discourses for the purposes of influencing the practical, it becomes clear that a simplistic endorsement of what I have described as the orthodox 'non-dogmatic' relation of HIP to text is inadequate for describing the practices of the movement. It is only through a pragmatic exploration of event that an analysis of this complex relationship is in anyway possible. Indeed, I have begun to illustrate this complexity here however, I believe more work is needed in order to build up a more thorough picture of HIP.

I conclude this chapter by very simply paying homage to the labour of the practice of HIP. HIP is a space in which individual practice; the process of habit formation, maintenance and alteration with musical equipment, instruments, other musical bodies and imagination is central to the construction of community. It is a space in which time is spent on the refinement of rare skill and a space worth attention. It is a space characterised by friendship and intense sociality, where complex bodies emerge to mingle in shared space and build connections both through and beyond the musical. It is a locus for an intensive scholarship and a production of knowledge that, without practice, may never have come to fruition.

## Conclusion

The Historically Informed Performance movement is at once a contested space and a unified community. It can be conceived of as at once a space of music making, with all its requisite parts: a self-generating repertoire as it reaches retrospectively into the archives, particular and unique instruments, and a collection of distinctive 'HIP' practices. It might also be conceived of as a space within which ideas hold significant sway, wherein discourses of the authentic, the antique, the creative, and the historical are mobilised in service of the production and reproduction of not only practices, but also a community clearly distinguishable both from other forms of community organised around forms of music practice, and within the broader social field.

Both theorists and insiders of HIP (insofar as the former is distinguishable from the latter) have often framed their movement as a reaction to what they understand as a 'misguided' mainstream music performance. Indeed, notions that HIP might be a reactive movement may appear upon first glance to be bound to the apparent centrality of 'the historical' in HIP discourse. In this manner, HIP is presented as being historically rigorous, and in turn, more accurate or 'honest.' On this account, HIP claims a privileged position over the 'ill-informed' and overly liberal (at least on a historical level) mainstream. This is the position taken by HIP pioneers Arnold Dolmetsch, Niccolò Harnoncourt and Paul Hindemith. Against this hard line historicism, other insiders and theorists, such as Richard Taruskin, John Butt and George Kennaway have conceived of a more 'free' approach to history as definitive of HIP. In these cases, insiders might speak of being merely 'inspired'



by historical stimuli, rather than moved by the moral obligations of a reconstructive musical mission. Regardless of the particular philosophical disposition of any particular insider or faction within HIP, it is incontrovertible that (self)identification as ‘being’ HIP is linked to *some* negotiation with history and the historical. Yet, while such definitions might hint at something of what HIP is or how insiders perceive it, they do not go far enough.

What is missing is the awareness that HIP, in all these forms and more, is first and foremost something that is *done*. It is practised, in all of its messiness and in all its contradictions. HIP is located and situated in bodies in time and space, and in this particular case, in Sydney, 2016-2018. These bodies are themselves historical bodies, each laden with their own particular history, their own historical baggage. This involves the articulation of inculcated and inculcating habits and dispositions made ever more complex through the very tangled and tangling courses of shared and isolated lives and through the discipline of a musical tradition (and musical *traditions* as they move into HIP) most commonly fostered from childhood. Regardless of such variety of bodies, these bodies *converge* at moments in time and space, in halls, schools, bars, cafes and bedrooms. They converge in events: in concerts, rehearsals, practice, conversations and parties.

This thesis has been a first step towards elaborating such an understanding of HIP.

The first part of this thesis was concerned with the canon of texts of Historically Informed Performance and how they indicate the manner in which HIP might be conceived of, discursively, by insiders.

Chapter One took as its object a particular genre of text that I identified as ‘the didactic texts of HIP’: that is, texts purporting to mould and direct musician’s practice as musicians. These texts are characterised by a distinctly didactic tone, which, while potentially at odds with individual insiders’ broader justifications for specific forms of practice, remains latent in the assumed mode of engagement with readers. I argued that this didactic mode of engagement confirmed a process of differentiation, or more accurately, to use the Bourdieuan term, ‘distinction.’ Indeed, I demonstrated that it was through the deferral to the rationalistic historical—the Authenticist position—that this distinction played out in relation to the broader field of classical music, against which

explicit or implicit accusations of historical inaccuracy are projected. I described this as the 'external struggle for legitimation.'

In Chapter Two, I turned my attention to a second genre of HIP texts, which I identified as the 'theoretical texts of HIP'. Specifically, I looked to texts which aimed either to theorise the movement in a broader social and cultural setting, or asked the explicit question of what exactly HIP is. I argued that what emerged from these texts, mostly written by invested scholar-performers, was what I called the 'experimentalist position', or the 'non-dogmatic orthodoxy' of HIP. At the same time, I acknowledged the potential gap between the aforementioned Authenticist positions—that few theorists were able to sustain in the theoretical literature—and this non-dogmatic stance. I described this dynamic as the struggle for both existing specific species of capital and the power to be able to consecrate new forms of capital *within* the movement.

On a theoretical level, I argued, through the use of Samuel Weber's work, that HIP might be understood as a field of struggle: a *battleground*. I pointed towards the non-dogmatic and Authenticist stances outlined above as examples of seemingly irreconcilable positions or interpretations of HIP that generate such a dynamic. However, following through with Weber's theory, I demonstrated that these two positions do in fact endure concurrently, that they are, in Weber's words, 'reconciled in an obscure economy.' It is from here that I made a shift of theoretical focus, away from discourse, and towards 'performance': that obscure economy within which apparent contradictions are resolved in and through embodied practice.

In Part 2, upon the premise that discourses of HIP must necessarily be *disseminated*, I turned my focus towards the performance of HIP. In Chapter 3, taking on a Lewisian framework, I argued for a consideration of cultural worlds, and this one in particular, through the concept of *event*. This entailed a shift of analytical focus towards live performance, and I took as an object of analysis a HIP concert: 'Mozart Reimagined' adopting a methodological approach informed by Gay McAuley's 'semiotic schema' to draw out significant paradigms that coalesced to construct a specific sense of 'HIP authenticity'. With this approach, it was possible to identify not only the significant paradigm of concert genre conventions which necessarily imbued HIP with a continuity

with the mainstream, but also those more loosely-performed and constructed paradigms of historicity and experimentalism. Noting the Peircian semiotic foundations of Weber's work, I demonstrated the manner in which discourses of historicity (or authenticity) are reconciled with those of a looser historicity (or experimentalism) in the 'obscure economy' of the event.

However, HIP is still so much more than just a series of concerts. More, while HIP is a movement of musicians, it is also one of scholars, teachers, students, peers, friends, housemates and quite possibly family. In Chapter Four, therefore, I extended the scope of my analysis further still to turn to a conversation between an important insider and myself, arguing that such an exchange is as much a 'moment' of HIP as the concert analysed in the previous chapter. Taking to this moment the same approach as that I used to analyse *Mozart Reimagined*, I was able to draw out several paradigms of HIP that help to complicate simple definitions of HIP as being (merely) historically reactive, and to reveal the complex interpersonal dynamics of such a small-scale cultural formation. I specifically pointed towards a certain intimacy that close proximity and shared habituated roles and practices necessarily entail. The analysis revealed the layers of complexity born of the juxtaposition of various social roles as, in the small community, teachers would teach students who might also be peers or friends and those teachers might in other contexts, become students performing with other peers, or perhaps even a housemate.

Amidst the seeming chaos of this human interaction, I drew out a more stable but no less significant paradigm of the scholastic and the role of the scholar-performer. I highlighted the significance of the role, as a socially constructed and tacitly consensual model, in the maintenance of a distinct HIP identity and indeed, authenticity. It is through this figure's investment in particular species of capital, in objects of aesthetic peculiarity (books, dress, scores, demeanour and tone of voice) that I argued such an authenticity of HIP is evoked. This is not only in terms of an aesthetic that positively constructs a definition of an isolated movement, but also as one that, through such signification, ties the movement to the academy.

I also paid homage to the labour of HIP, pointing towards the intense investment of time and physical bodily energy in the acquisition, maintenance, alteration and

execution of particular instrumental and aural skills. By pointing specifically to (historically informed) ornamentation and improvisation as especially elucidatory of such skill, I argued that these skills are hard won over months and years of focussed internalisation. This level of skill is missed, or goes unacknowledged in much of HIP literature. Further, I suggested that understanding HIP in such a way enables a reconsideration of discourses of authenticity and experimentalism.

I made emphatic reference to the presence of what I described as the neo-Authenticist view in this last chapter, implying that this involved a resurgence of what might be conceived of by insiders as a now 'out-dated' hard-line historicist position in HIP i.e. that historical texts must be observed with rigor and performance moulded to match. I argued that the insider with whom I had that conversation sought to maintain this controversial position regarding the definition, philosophy and thus future of HIP. Most interestingly, by juxtaposing his particular 'neo-authenticist' position onto the context of the aforementioned 'battlefield' of discursive definition (the Authenticist versus the non-dogmatists) and by taking to the conversation a performative framework, I demonstrated that this was by no means so simply a reversion to a past authenticism. Rather, his position was one born *within* this dynamic, one conscious of, even informed by and sustained despite the contestations within HIP. I illuminated here the potential generated by Alistair's particular historical take as he demonstrated how he believed the repertoire *should* be performed. Noting here the potential contradiction and risk involved in adopting this position that, in particular, stands in stark contrast to the orthodoxy of HIP, I argued that this was, on the level of performance, indicative of the limits of discourse.

By taking the event as the object of analysis, I was able to assess, on the level of practice, and in particular habit formation, the practical possibilities laid open in the mobilisation of the neo-Authenticist position. Specifically, I argued that taking Alistair's new historical model of performance style (and the mode of 'appropriate' application) a great number of musical possibilities, or a broader 'vocabulary' of musical tools would be generated, or 'multiplied.'

Ironically, I showed that Alistair's position, whilst gently touting itself as historically accurate, proved its own negation, necessitating a reconceptualization of HIP's

relationship to history. In this sense, I argued that the outcome of the neo-Authenticist position, was not so much the performance of verisimilitude with the past, but rather, involved a 'palimpsestic layering' or complex interrelationship of bodies of the past with those of the present.

Here I leave the discussion with perhaps more questions than answers. What are the implications of this for the non-dogmatic orthodoxy of HIP? Is that to suggest that such a multiplying effect of possibilities might not be so relevant to this orthodoxy? Is the suggestion that there might be limits to the approach? Is this effect dependent on a dogmatic Authenticist interpretation of HIP or, in other words, does the interpretation *inherently* act as a liberating limit? What are the ethical concerns of upholding a discourse of historical authenticity? And perhaps most significantly (and I think most troublingly), what does this mean for the construction of communities more broadly? While I may have my own intuitions in response to these questions that I have perhaps already betrayed, here I resign myself to silence in the spirit of stimulating further discussion on the topic.

It is with this attitude that I restate my intention and hope that this thesis will be read as a contribution to the pragmatic project laid out by both C.S. Peirce and Lowell Lewis. I offer this thesis to the growing body of ethnographic work that aims to build an understanding of small-scale cultural formations in general and musical communities in particular. I will also taking this moment to offer an argument for the efficacy of the Lewisian approach to performance studies. In particular, I restate that I am in sympathy with Lewis's attempt to foster unity within the field of performance studies through the call towards both the ethnographic method and the pragmatic project. In particular, I am in favour of his conception of the term *performance*, as an analytical tool, as bound up with significance bestowed upon events by insiders, rather than being left open to either very loose or overly restrictive definitions.

It is also worth drawing attention to developments in the field of theoretical and historical musicology wherein a shift is currently (but slowly) underway towards a reconceptualization of the musical object as live and lived performance rather than score. Indeed, as I have already noted in Chapter 2, the work of Nicolas Cook is very promising, particularly in his attempt to find a parallel of this shift in the relationship of 'Theatre' to

Performance Studies. However, much work is still needed to bridge this gap. In regards to this shift of focus, Cook has done very well to identify the theoretical opening made by the Historically Informed Performance movement, through its interdisciplinary approach—that is its application of historical to practical performance. I hope that this thesis has demonstrated this opening particularly through its assessment of the complex relationship between text and performance. Indeed, if the various fields of musicology hope to find a fruitful path into performance, I believe it is necessary to grapple with the concept of performance itself more thoroughly. I believe Lewis provides a first step towards bridging this gap.

Regardless, what is clear by now is the complexity involved in the production, reception, performance and marketing of particular histories and the manner in which they interact with or, more accurately, build towards the construction of both individual and cultural identity. More significant still is the role they play the very construction of these communities, musical or otherwise. Such retrospectivity at the core of HIP opens up questions of the necessity of such historical narratives or claims to origins as grounds for group identification.

Here I make my concluding remarks with particular reference to Lewis's observation that in current times human (particularly in the western world) live in 'culture-like' formations, rather than strictly 'cultural' worlds. Where, on Lewis' account, the latter are marked by all-encompassing, all-involving, and culturally significant 'ritual' events, the former involve (merely) ritual-like events, those of less cultural significance or superficial importance (see Chapter 4). Lewis, referring to the emergence of 'religious revivalist' or fundamentalist groups, but extending his theorisation to other social groups, suggests that their proliferation could be read as a 'desire for greater cultural cohesion.' In his words:

One might argue that these diverse manifestations represent the various ways contemporary people are trying to cope with the shallowness and uncertainty of culture-like groupings, hoping to recreate the depth of a past in which human sociality was more clearly a matter of cultural continuity and integrity. There may be elements of nostalgia operating here, of course, figurations of a past more

integrated than it actually was, as has been common in many eras. Nonetheless, nostalgia may also be for a real past, or for a partially real tradition, and the question is surely an empirical one. Attempts to create or recreate ritual events, from religious practice to community theater, are concrete manifestations of this desire for social cohesion through the performance of a (re)constructive orthopraxis (Lewis, 2013: 57).

This is compelling. As I see it, despite the fact that HIP is not a fundamentalist group (I would not wish to cast such an aspersion upon the community by drawing such parallels), it inspires the question: might it be possible to draw parallels in patterns of human behaviour between HIP and different cultural formations as well as larger societies?

## Bibliography

Albrecht, Michael Mario. 2008. 'Acting Naturally Unnaturally: the Performative nature of Authenticity in Contemporary Popular Music.' *Text and Performance Quarterly* 28, no. 4: 379-391

Australia Council website: <http://www.australiacouncil.gov.au/funding/funding-index/arts-projects-organisations>

Bach, Carl Philipp Emanuel & Mitchell, William J. 1949. *Essay on the true art of playing keyboard instruments*. [1st ed.]. New York: W.W. Norton.

Bernstein, Leonard. 1976. *The Unanswered Question: Six Talks at Harvard*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Blood, William. 1979. "Well-tempering' the clavier: five methods.' *Early Music* 7, no. 4: 491-498

Christensen, Jesper Bøje and Robinson, J. Bradford. 2002. *18th Century Continuo Playing : A Historical Guide to the Basics*. Kassell ; Harlow, Essex: Bärenreiter.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction*. London and New York: Routledge

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1988. *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell.

Brown, Clive. 1999. *Classical and Romantic Performance Practice 1750-1900*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



- Burkholder, J., Palisca, C., Grout, D., and Hanning, B. 2014. *Norton Anthology of Western Music*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Butt, John. 2002. *Playing with History: The Historical Approach to Musical Performance*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, Nicholas. 2014 *Beyond the Score: Music as Performance*. Oxford University Press.
- Cyr, Mary. 1992. *Performing Baroque Music*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.
- Dolmetsch, Arnold. 1915. *Interpretation of the Music of the XVII and XVIII Centuries, Revealed by Contemporary Evidence*. London: Novello and Company Limited
- Donington, Robert. 1977. *The Interpretation of Early Music*. New version. London: Faber.
- Donington, Robert. 1975. *A performer's guide to Baroque music*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons
- Dreyfus, Laurence. 1983. 'Early Music Defended against Its Devotees: A Theory of Historical Performance in the Twentieth Century.' *The Musical Quarterly* 69 no.3: 297–322.
- Galvin, Nick. 5.9.2018. 'And that's a wrap: Fifty years of public art on show' *Sydney Morning Herald*.
- Gauldin, Robert. 2004. *Harmonic Practice in Tonal Music* . 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1972. 'Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight.' *Daedalus* Vol. 101, No. 1: 1-37
- Geertz, Clifford. 1983. 'Art as Cultural System.' in *Local knowledge: further essays in interpretive anthropology*. London: Fontana
- Grenfell, Michael. 2014. *Pierre Bourdieu: key concepts*. Second edition. Oxfordshire, England: Routledge.
- Haynes, Bruce. 2007. *The End of Early Music: a Period Performer's History of Music for the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Haynes, Bruce. 1995. *Pitch Standards in the Baroque and Classical Periods*. Ann Arbor, Mich: UMI.0

Hogwood, Christopher. 2003. *The keyboard in Baroque Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hefling, Stephen E. 1993. *Rhythmic alteration in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century music : notes inégales and overdotting*. New York: Schirmer Books.

Hudson, Richard. 1994. *Stolen time : the history of tempo rubato*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ironwood Website: [www.ironwoodchamberensemble.com](http://www.ironwoodchamberensemble.com)

Jerold, Beverly. 2016. *Music performance issues : 1600-1900*. Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press.

Jorgensen, Owen. 1977. *Tuning the historical temperaments by ear : a manual of eighty-nine methods for tuning fifty-one scales on the harpsichord, piano, and other keyboard instruments*. Marquette: Northern Michigan University Press.

Kaldor Arts Projects Website: <http://kaldorartprojects.org.au/>

Kaldor promotional video: <https://vimeo.com/238024550>

Kennaway, George. 2014. *Playing the cello, 1780-1930*. Surrey, England: Ashgate.

Kenyon, Nicholas. 1988. 'Authenticity and early music : a symposium', in 1988 Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kim, David Hyun-Su. 2012. 'The Brahmsian Hairpin.' *19th-Century Music* 36, no. 1: 46–57

Kite-Powell, Jeffery T. 1994. *A Performer's guide to Renaissance music*. New York: Schirmer Books.

Kramer, Elizabeth. 2005. *The Idea of Kunstreligion in German Musical Aesthetics of the Early Nineteenth Century*. PhD. University of North Carolina.

Kuijken, Barthold. 2013. *The notation is not the music : reflections on early music practice and performance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Lawson, Colin and Stowell, Robin. 1999. *The historical performance of music: an introduction*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, J. Lowell. 2013. *The Anthropology of Cultural Performance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lindley, Mark. 2013. 'Innovations in temperament and harmony in French harpsichord music.' *Early Music* 41 No.3: 403–420.

Maxwell, I. 2001. Sydney Stylee: Hip-Hop Down Under Comin' Up. In Mitchell, Tony (Eds.), *Global Noise: Rap and Hip-Hop Outside the USA*, (pp. 259-279). Middletown, Connecticut: Sage Publications.

McAuley, Gay. 1998. 'Performance Analysis: Theory and Practice.' *About Performance: Working Papers* 4. Centre for Performance Studies, University of Sydney.

Mozart, Leopold. 1985. *A treatise on the fundamental principles of violin playing*. 2nd ed. Oxford [Oxfordshire]: Oxford University Press.

Neumann, Frederick. 1993. *Performance Practices of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. New York: Schirmer Books.

Quantz, Johann Joachim. (2001) *On playing the flute*. 2nd ed. Boston: North-eastern University Press.

Pankhurst, Thomas. 2008. *SchenkerGUIDE: A Brief Handbook and Website for Schenkerian Analysis*. Routledge

Peirce, Charles S. 1931-1958. *The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Peres Da Costa, Neal. 2012. *Off the record performing practices in romantic piano playing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sydney Conservatorium Greenaway Series Performance Program Notes: 5.

Petrov, Anna. 2014. 'Listening to Music in 'Holy' Space: The Role of 19th-Century Public Concert in the Construction of Kunstreligion.' *Musicological Annual*, 50 No.2: 223-230.

Smith, Anne. 2011. *The performance of 16th-century music : learning from the theorists*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Taruskin, Richard. 1995. *Text and Act: Essays on Music and Performance*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wacquant, Loïc J. D. 1992. 'Toward a Social Praxeology: The Structure and Logic of Bourdieu's Sociology.' Pp. 1-59 in Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Weber, Samuel. 1980. 'Closure and Exclusion.' *Diacritics; Ithaca, N.Y.* 10, No.2: 35.

Weber, William. 1975. *Music and the Middle Class : The Social Structure of Concert Life in London, Paris, and Vienna* . London: Croom Helm.

