

THE MEANING OF AUTHENTICITY AND THE EARLY MUSIC MOVEMENT — A HISTORICAL REVIEW

DOROTTYA FABIAN

*School of Music and Music Education,
The University of New South Wales,
SYDNEY, NSW 2052
Australia*

Email: d.Fabian@unsw.edu.au

UDC: 781.68

Original Scientific Paper
Izvorni znanstveni članak
Received: February 21, 2001
Priljeno: 21. veljače 2001.
Accepted: March 27, 2001
Prihvaćeno: 27. ožujka 2001.

Abstract — Résumé

The concept of authenticity in musical performance has been debated extensively in British-American musicology during the 1980s and 1990s mostly in the context of early music and historical performance practice. What is missing from these publications is an acknowledgment and integration of research of the issue by European scholars and performers, which occurred some 20 years earlier. The current paper provides a comprehensive review of this earlier literature on authenticity and its meaning as it unfolded during the period from the 1950s to the late 1970s. It demonstrates that **many of the claims put for-**

ward by English and American scholars in the 1980s were neither new nor fair towards certain performers associated with the movement. For instance, several of the concerns expressed by Taruskin had already been declaimed by Continental writers such as Finscher and artists like Harnoncourt. The research also shows that the indiscriminate use of the word 'authentic' in journalistic and promotional publications provided the real basis for criticism because **certain leading scholars and performers have always regarded authenticity in musical performance as a chimera.**

The so called Early Music Movement of the 1950s to 1980s contributed significantly to the meaning of authenticity in performance; in a sense it is responsible for the widespread reference to this much contested concept. During the 1980s much scholarly attention focused on the various aspects of this complex idea and by the 1990s the term became discredited. Nowadays it is more customary to speak of 'historically informed performances' and avoid any reference to authenticity. It is generally assumed that this development is the direct result of the enlightening

and critical discussions of the meaning of authenticity during the 1980s.¹ This might well be the case yet it is time to note that most of these discussions provided little new material; instead they represented a catching-up in British-American musicology with issues that have already been exhaustively debated among Continental (mostly German speaking) researchers and musicians.² My aim in this paper is not to enter in the polemic or to provide a philosophically new perspective on the meaning of authenticity in musical performance. Rather, I intend to trace the development of the debate from a historical perspective by examining the use and meaning of the word 'authenticity' throughout the course of the early music movement during its formative period prior to the more familiar 1980s and beyond.³ I contend that a review of both the scholarly as well as popular literature of the 1950s-1970s attests to the need to adjust the established view regarding the roles and claims of musicians involved with historical reconstruction. The investigation shows that leading thinkers and musicians on the Continent regarded authenticity as a utopian concept some fifteen years earlier than in the English speaking world, and that the real basis for the attack of the 1980s on authenticity and its practitioners was the rather indiscriminate use of the term in interviews, record reviews, sleeve notes and other popular publications of the time. Therefore it is arguable that to take commercial propaganda material at face value (as some of the publications from the 1980s seem to have done) lacks scholarly justifiable reasons for the

¹ Some of the most important post 1980 publications include: Richard TARUSKIN, On letting the music speak for itself: Some reflection on musicology and performance, *Journal of Musicology* 1 (1982) pp. 101-17; Laurence DREYFUS, Early music defended against its devotees: A theory of historical performance in the Twentieth Century, *The Musical Quarterly* (1983) pp. 297-322; The Limits of Authenticity — A Discussion, *Early Music* 12 (1984) pp. 3-25; Stephen DAVIES, Authenticity in musical performance, *The British Journal of Aesthetics* 27 (1987) pp. 39-50; James O. YOUNG, The concept of authentic performance, *The British Journal of Aesthetics* 28 (1988) pp. 228-238; Nicholas KENYON (ed.), *Authenticity and Early Music*, Oxford: OUP, 1988; The Early Music Debate: Ancients, Moderns, Postmoderns — Symposium, *Journal of Musicology* 10 (1992) pp. 113-130; Peter KIVY, *Authenticities*, Cornell UP, 1995; Stan GODLOVITCH, Innovation and conservatism in performance practice, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55 (1997) pp. 151-168; IDEM, *Musical Performance: a Philosophical Study*, London and New York, Routledge, 1998.

² The key publications in German include: Theodor Wiesengrund ADORNO, Bach gegen seine Liebhaber verteidigt, 1951 (see fn. 17 for full detail); Harald HECKMANN, Die Verziehung von Musikforschung und Aufführungspraxis Alter Musik, *Musikforschung* 10 (1957) pp. 98-107; Wilhelm FISCHER, Die sogenannte »Werktreue«, *Wissenschaft und Praxis — Festschrift Paumgartner*, Zürich: Atlantis, 1957 pp. 12-21; Walter WIORA (ed.), *Alte Musik in unserer Zeit — Referate und Diskussionen der Kasseler Tagung*, 1967 Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1968; Georg von DADELSEN, Aufführungspraxis und originales Klangbild — Die Bach-Ausgabe der Archiv-Produktion der DGG, *Universitas* 31 (1976) pp. 1289-1295. Reprinted in G. v. DADELSEN, *Über Bach und Anderes*, Wiesbaden: Laber, 1983: 125-129; IDEM, Alte Musik in neuer Zeit, *Neue Zeitschrift für Music* 140 (2/1979) pp. 118-120; Reinhold BRINKMANN (ed.), *Bachforschung und Bachinterpretation heute — Wissenschaftler und Praktiker im Dialogue* (Bericht über das Bachfest-Symposium 1978 der Philipps-Universität Marburg), Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1981. See also Karl Gustav FELLERER, The problem of heritage in the musical life of the present, in H. C. ROBBINS LONDON & Roger CHAPMAN (eds.), *Studies in Eighteenth century music: A tribute to Karl Geiringer on his seventieth birthday*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1970, pp. 213-223.

³ For a comprehensive overview of the history of the movement that discusses details of changing performance style and the various issues involved in the revival of J. S. Bach's music see my: *Musicalogy and Performance Practice: In Search of a Historical Style with Bach Recordings*, *Studia Musicologica* 41/1-3 (2000) pp. 77-106.

criticism of certain performers associated with the movement who did not personally claim what the music industry used in marketing their performances. The need to be more careful in drawing general conclusions regarding the movement, its artists and viewpoints is also evident, as well as the necessity to be circumspect with terminology even in short journalistic articles.

H. M. Brown noted in 1988 that the early advocates of historical performance styles had a different view about authenticity from that of its proponents in the late 1970s and early 1980s.⁴ At the beginning of the 20th century Landowska claimed never to have ‘tried to reproduce exactly what the old masters did. Instead, I study, I scrutinise, I love, and I recreate ... I am sure that what I am doing in regard to sonority, registration etc., is very far from the historical truth.’⁵ It is useful to contrast her statement with Christopher Hogwood’s objectives voiced in 1984, for the difference in perspective is quite clear.

My interest in [Renaissance music] became exhausted, because we did not know whether or not what we were doing was authentic. Although the whole world thought that this type of music-making had a musicological foundation, the very opposite was the case: we had to do a lot on ‘feeling’, because there was insufficient basis and definite proof[s]. ... So I turned to a period which offered me reliable sources: the music of the 17th and 18th centuries.⁶

However, when we compare Landowska’s view with statements made by Harnoncourt it becomes clear that artistic attitudes may be independent from the general course of the movement, for his views were stated at around the same time as Hogwood’s above. In 1978 Harnoncourt claimed that there was no such thing as authenticity, that it was a fraudulent concept. ‘Ich tue das nicht, und ich habe das auch noch nie gemacht.’⁷ He deemed it a mistake to believe that being true to the score [Notentexttreue] is the same as being true to the composition [Werktreue], for scores are just as imperfect in terms of pitch, duration and tempo and do not display the ‘spirit’ of the music. He regarded ‘Werktreue’ as utopia as well; a disastrously harmful concept that leads to false directions, for it is not the score that is the work but what is behind the notes, the ‘musical sense’ is the work. A few years later, in an interview published in 1980 he formulated his aspirations very similarly to Landowska’s expression. He stated that his goal was to acquire as much

⁴ Pedantry or liberation? A Sketch of the Historical Performance Movement, in N. KENYON (ed.), *Authenticity*, pp. 27–56.

⁵ Denise RESTOUT and Robert HAWKINS (eds.), *Landowska on music*, New York: Stein and Day, 1964, pp. 355–356.

⁶ Authentizität ist nicht Akademismus; ein Gespräch mit Christopher Hogwood — Interview by Gerhard Persché (Engl. Trans. by John Kehoe), *Opernwelt* 25 (1984) pp. 58–61.

⁷ Podiumdiskussion Zur Situation der Aufführungspraxis bachscher Werke, Teilnehmer: Georg von Dadelsen, Hans Grüß, Nikolaus Harnoncourt, Robert L. Marshall, Emil Platen, Helmuth Rilling, Christoph Wolff (Leitung). Aus dem Auditorium: Reinhold Brinkmann, Werner Neumann, Friedhelm Krummacher, Werner Breig, Hans-Joachim Schulze. R. BRINKMANN (ed.), *Bachforschung und Bachinterpretation heute*, pp. 185–204, these citations: 187–188.

information about the work, its meaning and reproduction as possible and then to use all his abilities to make this work understandable for today's time. 'Eine authentische, historisch richtige Wiedergabe ist unmöglich, eine Illusion oder Scharlatanerie.'⁸

These quotations outline the polarities of the argument and provide a framework in which to examine the different opinions expressed through the passage of time and also in a geographical context. The question of authenticity in performance is manifold. Most commonly — as in the above Harnoncourt citation — it is associated with 'Werktreue', with the recreation of a score in a manner reflecting the composer's intentions and the work's original performance. On a more complex level this manner of recreation is debated in terms of what it should comprise in itself: only instrumental designation, size of performing ensemble, and a decision on which score represents the 'definitive version'; or, ultimately, interpretation as well. The collected statements on 'authenticity' show that these layers in the meaning of the term have not always been considered with equal emphasis. Those musicians and scholars who concerned themselves with the more complex issues of interpretation as well as the recreation of historical artifacts tended to regard authenticity as utopia.

Historical correctness in performance — meaning 'being true to the score' and 'letting the music speak for itself'⁹ — has been a persistent notion. It is customary to regard the flagship aim of early music practitioners to recreate the 'composer's intentions' as a typical twentieth century preoccupation. It is also customary to claim that it was the objectivism of Toscanini and Stravinsky (together with the recording studios' demand for precision) that fostered the vogue of matter-of-fact, 'objective' performances.¹⁰ However, already Geminiani explained musical taste, the final arbiter in interpretation, as 'expressing with Strength and Delicacy the *Intentions of the Composer* (emphasis added)'.¹¹ While pondering the age of the 'objective' performance style makes one wonder if it really arrived only with Stravinsky? Even Baroque writers complained about 'wretched' performers who only played the notes (and they did not just mean those who did not add ornaments)! Dolmetsch warned already in 1915 (prior to Stravinsky's neo-classical period or the 'onslaught' of recording companies on interpretative freedom in favour of power and precision) that quotations from old sources completely discredit the notion 'that expression is a modern thing, and that old music requires

⁸ Wir hören die alte Musik ganz falsch: Gespräch mit Nikolaus Harnoncourt (interviewer: W. E. von Lewinski), *Westermanns Monatshefte* 3 (1980) p. 33.

⁹ These are catch phrases that basically litter the relevant literature. Some of the key users include Putnam ALDRICH: *Ornamentation in Bach's organ works*, New York: Coleman-Ross, 1950 [R: Da Capo Press, 1978] p. 3, Th. W. ADORNO, *Prism*, p. 144, L. DREYFUS, *Early Music defended*, p. 303, and R. TARUSKIN, *On letting the music speak for itself*.

¹⁰ Taruskin was one of the first to point in the direction of Toscanini and Stravinsky. For the role of the recording industry see Robert PHILIP, *Early Recordings and Musical Styles: Changing Tastes in Instrumental Performance, 1900-1950*, Cambridge: CUP, 1992.

¹¹ Francesco GEMINIANI, *The Art of Playing on the Violin*, London, 1751/R1952, p. 6.

nothing beyond mechanical precision'.¹² If he considered it important to stress this point, 'matter-of-fact' performances must have been common in his day as well.¹³ His plea was echoed in Putnam Aldrich's words published soon after the Second World War:

Nowadays, we regard the composer's manuscript as the final authority on any debatable point of interpretation. ... to consult the autograph manuscript and follow, note for note and sign for sign, the indications that the composer set down on paper [...] is known as 'letting the music speak for itself'. Unfortunately, however, the music of the Baroque period cannot be induced to speak for itself. ... the autograph score is not an authentic record of how the composer or anyone else performed the piece.¹⁴

The impossibility of identical recreation so exhaustively debated in the later 1980s by Taruskin and others had already been voiced quite eloquently and succinctly in 1950. Jacques Handschin pointed out that the reconstruction of an acoustical phenomenon did not equal the reconstruction of the musical phenomenon, just as much as the contemporary man is not himself reconstructed with the same musical habits.¹⁵ Even the ideas of one of Taruskin's favourite, T. S. Eliot, were used as early as 1953 to support the notion that historical authenticity is nonsensical. Thurston Dart invoked him saying: 'The modern musician's approach to the music of his own time is obstructed by the past, and his approach to old music is through the gateway of the present.'¹⁶

The now famous criticism of Theodore W. Adorno was also published in the first half of the 1950s delivering a major blow to the 'philistines' of the movement, if not immediately then within a decade or so as its content became more widely known. Adorno's *Bach defended against his devotees*¹⁷ was the first thoroughly circumspect theoretical study of the early music movement as exemplified by the German Bach revival scene. Since the second half of the 1960s the ideas expressed in it have influenced some people's thinking about the tasks and achievable objectives in the process of rediscovering 'lost' compositions and performance tradi-

¹² Arnold DOLMETSCH, *The Interpretation of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Music*, London: Novello, 1949, p. vii (first published: 1915).

¹³ Indeed, already in the 19th century there was a school of pianists who performed Bach's keyboard works in an 'objective' manner with a literalistic adherence to the score. See Glen CARRUTHERS, Subjectivity, objectivity and authenticity in nineteenth century Bach interpretation, *Canadian University Music Review* 12 (1992) pp. 95-112.

¹⁴ P. ALDRICH, *Ornamentation*, pp. 3-4.

¹⁵ Jacques HANDSCHIN, *Musica aeterna*, 1950, p. 126, quoted in Marc PINCHERLE, *L'exécution aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles: Instruments à archet*, *Kongressbericht New York 1961*, p. 221.

¹⁶ Thurston DART, *The Interpretation of Music*, London: Novello, 1953 pp. 161-2. Compare the quote with the title (and content) of R. TARUSKIN's article: The Pastness of the Present and the Presence of the Past (in N. KENYON [ed.]: *Authenticity*, pp. 137-207).

¹⁷ The original German paper (*Bach gegen seine Liebhaber verteidigt*) first appeared in 1951, later collected in a volume entitled *Prismen* (Berlin, 1955). However, it gained wider exposure only when reprinted in the 1960s and translated in to English by Samuel and Sherry Weber as *Prisms*, London, 1967. The edition used here is a reprint of this (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1981 p. 133-146).

tions. For instance, Adorno's opinion accords with Harmoncourt's above cited statements:

The musical score is never identical with the work; devotion to the text means the constant effort to grasp that which it hides... an interpretation which does not bother about the music's meaning on the assumption that it will reveal itself of its own accord will inevitably be false since it fails to see that the meaning is always constituting itself anew (*Prism*: p. 144).¹⁸

Despite these objections the assumption prevailed that an Urtext score reflected the composer's 'definitive version' of the piece. Furthermore, it was implied that the notation of a definitive version expressed everything the composer wanted in a performance. Both the concern for the composer's intention as well as the preoccupation with providing 'definitive' texts has been fuelled by a false sense of priorities. For the belief that historical styles (or 'authenticity') can be guaranteed by reconstructing factual details (such as instruments and texts) relegates questions of aesthetic value and regards subjectivity and expression in interpretation as irrelevant and unknowable. Yet, what is thus achieved is a *pseudo*-historical sound for the historical condition is only partially recreated.¹⁹

The second half of the 1950s saw many further publications about 'authenticity' and 'Werktreue'. For instance, in 1957 at least four articles can be cited which discuss the meaning of authenticity or historical performance.²⁰ Harald Heckmann theorises about the relationship of musicology to performance and suggests that questions should not be asked in terms of what is correct but in terms of what is good or bad, for there must be more than one correct manner of performance. What is most noteworthy, however, is that he too alludes to T. S. Eliot's premise when he writes that whatever we do, the sound will come from the present, therefore it cannot be 'original', only a 'transposition' to the present. Two other articles are more commonly known for they appeared in English, in a collected volume of Essays honoring Archibald Davison. Donald Grout's paper²¹ is used as a 'benchmark' by Taruskin in 1988 'by which to measure the subsequent progress of the field';²² while Aldrich's article²³ has been quoted less often. Grout's definition of authenticity according to which 'An ideal performance is one that perfectly realizes the composer's intentions' (p. 341) gives considerable scope for those advocating the 'letting the composer speak for himself' attitude. Nevertheless, Grout fol-

¹⁸ For further discussion of Adorno's views see L. DREYFUS, *Early Music defended*.

¹⁹ In this paper evaluative adjectives and terms such as 'pseudo-historical' are used according to how Adorno and Dreyfus defined them in their respective cited articles. (See fn. 1, 17).

²⁰ See HECKMANN and FISCHER in fn. 2 as well as GROUT and ALDRICH in fn. 21 and 23, respectively.

²¹ Donald Jay GROUT, On historical authenticity, *Essays on music in honour of Archibald Thompson Davison*, Harvard Univ. Music Dept. (ed.) Cambridge, Mass.: HUP, 1957, pp. 341-347.

²² R. TARUSKIN, *The Pastness of the Present*, p. 140.

²³ P. ALDRICH, The 'Authentic' Performance of Baroque Music, *Essays on Music in Honour of Archibald Thompson Davison*, Harvard Univ. Music Dept. (ed.) Cambridge, Mass.: HUP, 1957, pp. 161-171.

lows this up with an argument that discusses the negative impact of the ‘obsession with *Werktreue*’ and of the fear to ‘interpret the notation in accordance with the wrong tradition’ (p. 342–343). Grout concludes that ‘perfect historical authenticity in the performance of old music is unattainable’ (p. 346). He also warns of the danger that striving for the ideal of historical authenticity ‘could mislead one into regarding knowledge of the past as a substitute for imagination in the present’ (p. 347). The warning was not without basis: as recordings from the period and beyond demonstrate knowledge of historical detail has indeed been used not only to suppress earnest interpretive creativity but also to promote commercial enterprises.

The ideas put forward by Aldrich are not less significant. He made many points that recurred in earlier as well as later discussions. The most ‘visionary’ is perhaps his claim (p. 161) that ‘the whole quest for authenticity in musical revivals is a *strictly twentieth-century phenomenon*’ (emphasis added) — something that Taruskin will argue for at length some 30 years later! Aldrich’s strong emphasis on interpretation as opposed to text or performing media is similarly significant. He points out that ‘Strict adherence to the composers’ texts by no means assures authentic performances’ (p. 162), and draws attention to the fact that although period instruments can aid the reconstruction of Baroque sound ideals, playing and singing techniques have perhaps an even more significant role. ‘The performer must ... think of himself in the role of creator, collaborating with the composer’ (p. 166). Before concluding that ‘true authenticity is obviously a chimera’ (p.170), he too notes the problem of time: ‘The performer of Baroque music ... finds that what he needs most in his struggle towards authenticity is the ability to equip his audience with Baroque ears’ (p. 169).

During the second half of the 1960s the debate about authenticity started to move on to centre stage gaining particular importance in the 1970s. Reviewing recordings provided forum for populist discussion while the reprint and subsequent dissemination of Adorno’s criticism gave new impetus for arguments on a more philosophical level. This was also the period when the early music movement was subject to take over by philistines and commercial propaganda as Dreyfus and Taruskin have noted,²⁴ for recording companies realised that the label of ‘authenticity’ could be a lucrative possibility for expansion in an otherwise somewhat saturated market. The more regular and rather indiscriminate use of the word ‘authentic’ contributed to the general confusion about the different status of artistic activities and goals represented by the various performances, blurring boundaries and the criteria for aesthetic value judgment. Before the most important scholarly discussions of the period are looked at a brief overview of some of these more journalistic publications is warranted.

In the press the word ‘authentic’ began to be used more regularly from the 1960s onward indicating that the concern with performance style reached a more

²⁴ L. DREYFUS, *Early music defended*, p. 314; R. TARUSKIN, *The Pastness of the Present*, p. 137.

public level of awareness. Critics felt necessary to educate their readers about the issues and to express their opinion on the matter. In sampling reviews published in *The Gramophone*, several quotations can be used to illustrate the point. In November 1961, for instance, Edward Greenfeld wrote about Klemperer's Brandenburg set: 'By the standards of only 20 years ago this is a highly 'authentic' performance... [It has] extra clarity over most versions using fewer players...' (p. 249). In March 1966 Stanley Sadie criticised Faerber's set of the same works because the group of performers, although small, was not small enough (p. 441). Two months later, in May 1966 Lionel Salter wrote the following of Casals's Brandenburg recordings:

His conception of Bach is frankly one which does not find much favour today: turning his back on scholarship and totally unconcerned with all problems of style and textural interpretation he not only unabashedly uses modern instruments ... but pursues an aim of playing Bach as expressively 'as if it were Chopin'... (p. 552)

A more elaborate exposition, one that touches upon both the issue of marketing as well as musical qualities, can be found in the review by Greenfeld of Harnoncourt's first recording of the *Brandenburg Concertos*:²⁵

The point on which ... Decca will want to sell the set is the use of original instruments. ... I cannot honestly say that all this attention to authenticity makes very much difference to the resulting sound in comparison with other conscientiously authentic performances listed above [Menuhin, Luzerne Festival, Newstone]. What matters, as I see it, once you achieve a high standard of authenticity, is not so much whether you can out-do your rivals on this or that point of historic detail, as whether the performances come to life or not. ... Menuhin and Newstone are more enjoyable, have more imagination and greater rhythmic life. ... Two oddities to note about the new set: the pitch is set lower than usual ... to accommodate the authentic wind instruments. Also, Harnoncourt gives a curious reading of the slow movement of the fourth concerto, phrasing to give the impression of a rocking compound-time rhythm...

Greenfeld is of course right in the essence of his judgement. Nevertheless it is striking to see how loosely the term 'authentic' is applied in this review. First it denotes the use of period instruments, then something unspecific ('conscientiously authentic' and 'high standard of authenticity') which is then explained as 'more enjoyable, have more imagination and greater rhythmic life'. The 'this or that point of historic detail' is again not specified, but it seems to refer to performance size, balance, choice of instruments and perhaps rhythmic vitality because the lowering of pitch and the introduction of *notes inégales* are only two 'oddities'. This second remains an unexplained 'curiosity', probably the artistic fancy of Harnoncourt.

A few months earlier, in his review of Harnoncourt's *St John Passion* recording on the Telefunken label Trevor Harvey outlined in more specific terms the

²⁵ *The Gramophone*, June 1967, p. 468.

limits of historical reconstruction in creating a performance similar to those directed by Bach.²⁶ Acknowledging that the use of small forces, historical instruments and boys voices undoubtedly bring the interpretation closest among available recordings to ‘the sort of performance Bach produced in the Thomaskirche’, Harvey immediately questions whether we would ever know the *style* of these performances. Then he ponders the possibility ‘that with the romantic nineteenth-century behind us (which influences us absolutely basically) and the emotional feeling that stems from that, we now perform this music in a way that would have astonished Bach utterly — even the Archiv version varies its chorales from the emotional to the dramatic’. This last statement is not only another allusion to T. S. Eliot’s idea of ‘the pastness of the present and the presence of the past’ but also seems to imply that the Archiv label’s recording strives for similar historical exactitude as Harnoncourt’s. This is a rather misleading comment for Karl Richter’s version (on Archiv) uses not only mixed voices (both choral and solo) and twentieth-century instruments but performs the organ continuo in a sustained style and is generally lacking in many features of eighteenth-century performance practice. In other words, Harvey’s linking of Harnoncourt’s recording with Richter’s is a typical example of the attitude which took publicly stated objectives of record companies or performers at face value and thus blurred significant differences between attempts at resurrecting historical performance style on the one hand, and the broader context of the revival of Baroque *repertoire* or specific historical details (such as period instruments, size of ensembles, and so on).²⁷ This attitude of commentators was not only common during the formative years of the early music movement; it is also reflected in many writings since the 1980s as well, causing confusion and misrepresentation that fosters simplistic generalisations.²⁸

A new stage of reviewing and understanding the issues involved is heralded by Stanley Sadie’s report of Harnoncourt’s *St Matthew Passion* recording.²⁹ The

²⁶ *The Gramophone*, March 1967, pp. 481–482.

²⁷ Deutsche Gramophone’s Archiv label was the first to be dedicated to recording early music. At its launch in 1947 the promotional material promised musicological-historical accuracy and documentation (see Andreas HOLSCHNEIDER, 25 Jahre Archiv Produktion — Interview *HiFi Stereophonie* 11 [1972] pp. 1092–1100). However, as noted by Georg von Dadelsen as well, during the 1960s and 1970s Archiv became the centre of traditional Bach playing aiming for a kind of conservative perfectionism rather than historical reconstruction. (see G. v. DADELSEN, *Aufführungspraxis und originales Klangbild*).

²⁸ One of the current, fairly indiscriminately used words that blur important differences is the label ‘neo-romantic’. Practically all interpretations that are expressive are labeled as such by every writer I came across, ignoring the crucial difference between an historical (i.e. Baroque) way of being expressive and one that uses 19th century performance practice to create an expressive effect. I addressed this problem initially in my doctoral dissertation (*J. S. Bach Recordings 1945–1975: St Matthew and St John Passions, Brandenburg Concertos and Goldberg Variations — A Study of performance practice in the context of the early music movement*, PhD diss., The University of New South Wales, 1998 to be published by Ashgate sometime after 2002). Currently I am engaged in further developing the theory and supporting it with experimental testing. A preliminary report was presented at the 9th Biennial Conference on Baroque Music in Dublin, July 2000 (*Bach Performance Practice in the 20th Century: Recordings, Reviews and Reception*), which will be published in Volume 8 of *Irish Music Studies*.

²⁹ *The Gramophone*, April 1971, pp. 1644–49.

reader is given a detailed account of where the differences lie when Bach's music is played on period instruments. He describes the tone of these instruments at length; how they differ from their modern version and, importantly, how these differences influence phrasing, timbre, texture and tempo. He also notes the softness of the accents and what affect that has on articulation and rhythm. In other words, he addresses issues of *style* as much as the historical-physical facts of performance. Sadie feels that the exclusive use of male voices provides the most crucial difference from other recordings for this has enormous consequences on the emotional content of the interpretation. Sadie later voices his surprise that certain historical practices are not followed by the conductors (e.g. not adding appoggiaturas in the vocal parts to match the instrumental lines). This is one of the first signs of the realisation that these historical reconstructions are not always entirely accurate or follow scholarly consensus in every respect, as the accompanying material would have you believe. The conclusion of this review is worth quoting for it reveals that the preoccupation with 'the intentions of the composer' as a measure of authenticity is still on the agenda: 'Comparisons with existing sets ... are irrelevant. This is a more authentic Matthew Passion than any other, by far, much the nearest approach to what Bach expected and wanted. ... [None] comes as close to Bach's own vision of the work as Willcocks and Harnoncourt do on this new set.' (p. 1649).

What these samples of reviews show regarding the popular meaning of 'authenticity' during the 1960s is an emphasis on the physical parameters of historical performance, especially size of ensemble and choice of instruments and voices. The mentioning of performance style created by playing technique, articulation and phrasing began to surface only from the 1970s onward, and only sporadically. In fact British reviewers kept favouring 'sportive' Bach interpretations to expressive and detailed ones, which were often deemed 'mannered'.³⁰ This situation enabled the simplistic view to thrive that reconstructing the physical aspects of a Baroque performance secures historically authentic interpretations. This in turn prepared the ground for the attack on authenticity, for it is quite obvious that a successful musical performance needs to comprise of much more than 'playing the right notes on the right instrument'. Ironically, when discussing the possible meaning of an 'authentic performance' neither the representatives of the early music movement nor its critics seem to call on the basic paradigm of 18th century aesthetics, namely its emphasis on eliciting emotion in the audience.³¹ Yet an interpretation striving for historical authenticity would surely have to abide by the aesthetic requirements of the historical period the artworks of which it aims to revive. Eighteenth century aesthetics focuses not on the artwork but on its beholder. There-

³⁰ See for instance *The Gramophone* 7/1967, p. 73; 4/1976, pp. 1587-88; 2/1980, p. 1281.

³¹ Although the 'doctrine of affection' is often mentioned, its implications that underlie the pragmatically oriented aesthetics of the Pre-Romantic period is nowhere as explicitly discussed as in a book on analysis rather than performance or authenticity. See Mark BONDS, *Wordless Rhetoric: Musical Form and the Metaphor of the Oration*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1991.

fore a preoccupation with 'Werktreue' and the 'composer's intentions' leads to false directions; the minds of the listeners need to be engaged, which requires more than the reconstruction of the historical-physical circumstances of Baroque performances.

Returning to the scholarly works published at the end of the 1960s, the book *Alte Musik in unserer Zeit* (see fn 2 for reference) deserves to be discussed in detail because its breadth and scope remained unrivalled in English language until the 1980s. Moreover, apart from H. M. Brown who refers to the book in a footnote of his 1988 article³² *nobody* writing about the meaning of authenticity in English ever mentions this publication (despite the fact that Brown clearly states that the book discloses important differences between the orientation of English and American versus German musicologists towards questions of authenticity).

Out of the six formal papers delivered at the 1967 conference in Kassel and included in this book Ludwig Finscher's contribution focuses on the issue of authenticity.³³ Asking fundamental questions such as 'what does the word interpretation mean?' and 'what does 'historically true' mean?' (p. 25); he proposes that the basic problem we face is that the work we wish to interpret is both a piece of composition worth interpreting, and, at the same time, an 'objectification' of a moment of music history that we must reconstruct in order to comprehend it. Yet knowledge of the historical circumstances of the work holds little potential for finding a solution to the work's interpretation. The differing opinions of today, argues Finscher, show that a systematic attitude leads back to the fundamental problem: whether our aim is to find the character of the work or its historical characteristics. According to the answer, the concept 'historically true' must have very different meaning. Finscher criticises the fixation on the written forms whether scores or documents, for these cannot be our exclusive guides when we deal with works of art. If this were not the case, 'historically true' interpretations would mean the reconstruction of actual concert programs (with arias and various other pieces — often only extracts — performed between symphonic movements), or Protestant services (for a performance of the *St Matthew Passion*), while a performance of the *B minor Mass* as a whole would not be possible. These are points that later scholars will also use in their arguments questioning the meaning and value of such terms as 'authenticity'. Finscher acknowledges the absurdity of such a scenario but wants to clarify that the real aim is the reconstruction of an 'ideal' historical circumstance. He argues that this 'ideal' sound can only be reconstructed through the resources of the given historical period and considers instruments, voice-types, playing and singing techniques, proportions, acoustics, improvisation, tempo, dynamics, agogic and phrasing *all* to belong to these resources. Finally he claims that the character of Bach's keyboard works can easily be lost through the reconstruction of historical sound unless it is recreated by ways of analysis and intimate knowledge of the work itself (rather than by mechanical imitation of tone qualities).

³² H. M. BROWN, *Pedantry or liberation?*, p. 51, fn. 55.

³³ Ludwig FINSCHER, *Historisch getreue Interpretation — Möglichkeiten und Probleme*, W. WIORA (ed.), *Alte Musik in unserer Zeit*, pp. 25-34.

August Wenzinger does not use any of the terms related to authenticity.³⁴ Yet his paper is very relevant for it discusses performance issues and emphasises the importance of expression. He is critical of both the ‘purist’ for playing in a colourless manner and the ‘only-instinct-musicians’ for their arrogant attitude towards the sources. Quoting Leopold Mozart, CPE Bach and Geminiani, Wenzinger shows that the production of the musical structure is not enough; the *Affekt* must be (re)produced and everything else must flow from that. In support of his view he refers to the fact that the Baroque era was obsessed with theatre and the theatrical and laments the lack of a proper discussion of expression. He believes that even in Donington’s *Interpretation of Early Music* it is dealt with far too briefly, while available recordings indicate that performers have not yet grasped fully its importance either. Being one of the first 20th century musicians specialising in playing the *viola da gamba*, and the first to record Bach’s *Brandenburg Concertos* with an ensemble playing on period instruments,³⁵ it is noteworthy that in 1967 Wenzinger considers the current general Baroque performance style to be far from adequate.

Wolfgang Gönnerwein’s article is also noteworthy.³⁶ He argues that because music is an art expressed in time (‘Zeitkunst’), the artwork exists in the numerous possibilities of interpretation; the fascination of interpretation lies in its uniqueness (‘Einmaligkeit’), for no interpretation can be repeated and, therefore, not one single interpretation may be regarded as the final, complete product. This also means that there is no such thing as an authentic interpretation, each is only a realisation possibility. This view conforms to Leonhardt’s who said in a 1986 interview that there was no such thing as an authentic performance for each and every subsequent performance of a composition was a different one.³⁷

The material of the roundtable discussion that concluded the conference was published as well. The participants included Karl Grebe (chair), Kurt Blaukopf, Carl Dahlhaus, Rudolf Ewerhart, Ludwig Finscher, Wolfgang Gönnerwein, Nikolaus Harnoncourt, Joachim von Hecker, Alfred Krings, Hans-Martin Linde, Eduard Melkus, Wolfgang Rehm, August Wenzinger and members of the audience.³⁸ Theoretical and practical topics covered issues like the usefulness of historical knowledge in interpretation, old instruments and voices, the role of the record industry, and what the concept *early music* entailed. Alfred Krings, the key facilitator of historical performance practice at German Radio Cologne evoked Ezra Pound (another ‘favourite’ of Taruskin), and Carl Dahlhaus cautioned that it might be time to make greater differentiation and to discard the anti-romantic habits. Grebe

³⁴ August WENZINGER, *Der Ausdruck in der Barockmusik und seine Interpretation*, *Alte Musik in unserer Zeit*, pp. 35–46.

³⁵ Schola Cantorum Basiliensis directed by August Wenzinger. DGG Archiv APM 14011–12 Recorded in 1950–53.

³⁶ Wolfgang GÖNNERWEIN, *Historisch-getreue oder gegenwartsnahe Interpretation — das Dilemma der Alten Musik in unserer Zeit*, *Alte Musik in unserer Zeit ...*, 1968, pp. 73–80.

³⁷ *Ich fordere nichts vom Publikum — an interview by Arnd Richter*, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 147 (1986), pp. 34–36.

³⁸ *Diskussionsbeiträge zu verschiedenen Problemen*, *Alte Musik in unserer Zeit*, pp. 81–96.

took up the issue of authenticity when he mentioned that while we do not expect to see modernised paintings in museums, we do not mind listening to modernised Baroque music in concert halls. Then he posed the rhetorical question: Why do we worry about not being able to hear with the ears of Bach's contemporaries if we do not have a problem with not being able to see with the eyes of Rembrandt's contemporaries?

Konrad Ameln, a contributor from the floor, brought back the contradiction between the nature of sound recordings and their role in promoting early music when he noted: records are bought with the intention of multiple listening and broadcasting corporations also frequently repeat performances. This possibility of fixing the sound is against the nature of music, which, as discussed by Gönnerwein, lives through the unrepeatability of interpretations. I might add that the notion and possibility of fixing the sound seems to be a likely contributor to the 20th century striving for 'authenticity' in performance — signifying the attempt to place musical compositions in the 'imaginary museum'.

The book shows that this conference provided opportunity for an exhaustive debate of the issues involved. It demonstrates that the participants had a sensitive as well as all encompassing attitude towards the questions of authenticity, interpretation and the role of historical research, and that renowned performers of the movement were in agreement with leading scholars. It also testifies to a Continental awareness of most problems debated in British-American circles some fifteen years later.

In 1970 Karl Gustav Fellerer offered further theoretical considerations for the discussion and performance of early music in the twentieth-century (see fn. 2). His article provides one of the earliest sources which refer to Ortega y Gasset's essays much used by Taruskin in 1988.³⁹ It also ponders on questions such as: 'With which type of sound can contemporary man experience the historical art work in the way the person of that time experienced it?' Or: 'How can the historical art work be made to react on contemporaries in the same manner as it did then?' (pp. 219-220).

Several other writers could be mentioned whose contribution makes it clear that in the later 1970s the utopian nature of striving for authenticity became a more frequently recurring theme in publications and public debates. Vera Schwartz, for instance, emphasised the importance of those aspects of scores that hide crucial elements of style in order to highlight that believing in the possibility of an authentic performance is nonsensical.⁴⁰ Dadelsen also visited the topic at considerable length in 1976 and in 1979 (see fn. 2). He too, alluded to T. S. Eliot's idea of 'the pastness of the present and the presence of the past' when he claimed that even if we could fully reconstruct every aspect of the past, we remain different, hear dif-

³⁹ José ORTEGA Y GASSET, *The expulsion of man from art*, *Gesammelte Werke II*, Stuttgart, 1955. Fellerer, 1970, p. 218 and fn. 49 on p. 223. Taruskin's reference will be *The dehumanization of art and other essays on art, culture and literature*, Princeton, 1968 (R. TARUSKIN, *The Pastness of the Present*, p. 184).

⁴⁰ Vera SCHWARZ, *Aufführungspraxis als Forschungsgegenstand*, *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 27 (1972) pp. 314-322.

ferently, and our listening habits and expectations are different from those of the historical period.

The first sign of a non-Continental initiative to foster dialogue between scholars and performers was the publication of a series of commissioned articles in Nos. 14 and 15 of *Current Musicology*.⁴¹ The contributions of American, British and Continental scholars and artists show that they share common concerns and a genuine interest in communication. Although few later writers refer to this set of articles their discussion is omitted from here as well for they are readily available in English. One could note however the lack of specifically new viewpoints expressed in them and the overall sense that time has come to draw up the guiding principles of a new consensus.

Instead of continuing with the review of a growing number of relevant publications one final item should be looked at: the roundtable discussions of another German conference which brought musicologists and performers together in 1978 (see fn. 7). Harnoncourt's opinion on authenticity expressed on that occasion has already been cited at the beginning of this paper. Some of Dadelsen's views have also been summarised. On this occasion, Dadelsen further postulated that the term 'authenticity' might come merely from the record companies. Pointing out an antagonism between the ideal and the truth, he listed headings from record covers to illustrate how these contradicted Harnoncourt's much more subtle personal claims. Moreover, he noted that historical reconstruction as an aesthetic ideal was quite relative for such performances were mostly heard on records or in broadcast programs, that is through completely modern media which may alter the sound more significantly than a production on non-period instruments.

Summarising the positions outlined in this paper, it can be said that Continental scholars investigated the meaning of authenticity in the revival of Baroque music several decades earlier than their English-American counterparts. While clarifying its various implications and their possible contribution towards the creation of a successful 20th century performance of a Baroque composition they too concluded that the concept was untenable. The public dialogue between scholars and performers also occurred earlier in German language publications and these indicate that Harnoncourt, the most uncompromisingly dedicated artist of the movement at the time was in clear agreement with theorists in refuting the possibility and value of historical authenticity. On the other hand 'authenticity' became a haphazardly used slogan in the hands (and pens) of journalists, critics, publicists and entrepreneurs. This fostered confusion and misrepresentation and prepared the field for the thorough criticism of the movement and its practitioners during the 1980s and 1990s. However, this criticism needs to be re-evaluated in the light of the findings presented here in order to obtain a more accurate view of the history and standing of the early music movement of the 1950-1980s and also to clearly distinguish between the various goals and achievements of different performers.

⁴¹ The spheres of music: Harmony and discord, Part 1, *Current Musicology* 14 (1972), pp. 81-172; 'Part 2' *Current Musicology* 15 (1973), pp. 81-100.

Many issues and concepts that gained publicity in the 1980s were simply reiterations of ideas which, by that time, had already been discussed and absorbed by the leading Continental musicians of the movement. For them the issue of 'authenticity' has always been a complex matter that implied far more than the much-cited 'Werktreue' principle or the re-introduction of period instruments. Contrary to some British performers, the views and claims of whom are represented by Hogwood at the beginning of this paper, musicians from Landowska to Harnoncourt or from Dolmetsch and Dart to Leonhardt kept repeating that their focus of interest was to recreate works of art for the present, and in an as musically effective a manner as possible.

Sazetak

ZNAČENJE AUTENTIČNOSTI I POKRET RANE GLAZBE — POVIJESNI PREGLED

Ovaj se članak bavi pregledom rane literature o uporabi i značenju »autentičnosti« u glazbenoj izvedbi unutar konteksta pokreta rane glazbe. Kako je pojam bio isprva povezan s raspravama o izvodenju rane glazbe, literatura o njemu govori i o samom pokretu i njegovim pripadnicima. No, unatoč tome, brojne publikacije u britansko-američkom muzikološkom tisku iz 1980ih i 1990ih otkrivaju iznenađujuće zanemarivanje pogledâ i prakse s europskog kontinenta. Stoga je sveobuhvatni pregled te literature pretežno na njemačkom jeziku iz razdoblja 1950-1970ih znatno zakasnio. On pokazuje da je najveći dio postavljenih primjedbi i pruženih dokaza za vrijeme 1980ih već bio iscrpno raspravljen desetljećima prije od strane znanstvenika i izvoditelja s njemačkog govornog područja. Štoviše, on pokazuje da je prilično nekritička uporaba riječi »autentičan« u popularnom tisku vjerojatno izazvala više razloga za kritiku nego tvrdnje nekih praktičara. Jer, glazbenici od W. Landowske do N. Harnoncourta ili G. Leonhardta trajno su ponavljali da je žarište njihova interesa ponovno stvaranje umjetničkih djela za sadašnjicu, i to na glazbeno najdjelotvorniji način. Ipak, recenzije ploča i promotivni materijali zamaglili su temeljne razlike između umjetničkih projekata i ciljeva svojim površnim stilom pisanja ili tržišnim prioritetima.

Dokazuje se da su znanstvenici i izvoditelji bili svjesni problema koji je T. S. Eliot formulirao kao »prošlost sadašnjosti i sadašnjost prošlosti«, da su brigu za povijesne prakse smatrali tipičnom preokupacijom 20. stoljeća i da su rabili ideje Ezre Pounda i Ortege y Gasseta već 1950ih, tridesetak godina prije objavljivanja Taruskinova utjecajnog članka u Kenyonovoj knjizi *Authenticity and Early Music* (Autentičnost i rana glazba). Pažljivo čitanje izvora također upućuje na potrebu za revizijom opće prihvaćenog stava u kritici izvoditeljske prakse 20. stoljeća, prema kojoj je »objektivni« stil sviranja poseban moderni fenomen koji proizlazi iz doktrina Toscaninija i Stravinskoga. S druge strane, čak i danas postoji manjak referenci o središnjem problemu estetike 18. stoljeća, koncentriranosti na slušateljevu percepciju više nego na umjetničko djelo. Stoga se raspravlja o tome kako bi pristup u izvoditeljskoj praksi, koji bi bio znatnije orijentiran na slušateljstvo, otvorio nove horizonte u diskusiji o autentičnosti u izvodenju.