### PLAYING WITH HISTORY

Why do we feel the need to perform music in an historically informed style, and is this need related to wider cultural concerns? In the most ambitious study of the topic to date, John Butt sums up recent debates on the nature of the early music movement and historically informed performance, calling upon a seemingly inexhaustible fund of ideas gleaned from historical musicology, analytic philosophy, literary theory, historiography and theories of modernism and postmodernism. He develops the critical views of both supporters and detractors of the movement, while claiming ultimately that it has more intellectual and artistic potential than its detractors may have assumed. He also asks whether the phenomenon of historically informed performance reflects changes in the culture of western music and how it, in turn, may have influenced that culture, particularly in regard to such issues as the status of the composer, the work, intentionality and notation.

JOHN BUTT is the Gardiner Professor of Music at the University of Glasgow, having previously been a lecturer in music at the University of Cambridge and Fellow of King's College, and University Organist and Associate Professor of Music at the University of California, at Berkeley. He is the author of *Bach Interpretation* (1990), *Bach: Mass in B Minor* (1991), *Music Education and the Art of Performance in the German Baroque* (1994), and editor of *The Cambridge Companion to Bach* (1997), all published by Cambridge University Press. He is also a highly acclaimed harpsichordist and organist and has recorded ten CDs for Harmonia Mundi, France. CAMBRIDGE MUSICAL TEXTS AND MONOGRAPHS General editors: John Butt and Laurence Dreyfus

This series has as its centres of interest the history of performance and the history of instruments. It includes annotated translations of authentic historical texts on music and monographs on various aspects of historical performance and instrument history.

Recent titles

John Butt Bach Interpretation: Articulation Marks in the Sources of J.S. Bach

> Nicholas Thistlethwaite The Making of the Victorian Organ

Christopher Page (trans. and ed.) Summa musice: A Thirteenth-Century Manual for Singers

Ardal Powell (trans. and ed.) The Virtuoso Flute Player by Johann George Tromlitz

Beth Bullard (trans. and ed.) **Musica getutscht: A Treatise on Musical Instruments by Sebastian Virdung** 

> David Rowland A History of Pianoforte Pedalling

John Butt Music Education and the Art of Performance in the German Baroque

Rebecca Harris Warrick and Carol Marsh Musical Theatre at the Court of Louis XIV Le Mariage de la Grosse Cathos

Julianne C. Baird (trans. and ed.) Introduction to the Art of Singing by Johann Friedrich Agricola

Valerie Walden One Hundred Years of Violoncello A History of Technique and Performance Practice, 1740–1840

> Bernard Brauchli The Clavichord

Suzanne J. Beicken (trans. and ed.) Vocal Performance and Ornamentation by Johann Adam Hiller

> Hugh Macdonald (trans. and ed.) Berlioz's Orchestration Treatise

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
0521813522 - Playing with History: The Historical Approach to Musical Performance
John Butt
Frontmatter
More information

### MUSICAL PERFORMANCE AND RECEPTION General editors: John Butt and Laurence Dreyfus

This series continues the aim of Cambridge Musical Texts and Monographs to publish books centred on the history of musical instruments and the history of performance, but broadens the focus to include musical reception in relation to performance and as a reflection of period expectations and practices.

#### Published

#### John Butt Playing with History: The Historical Approach to Musical Performance

#### Forthcoming

James Garratt

Palestrina and the German Romantic Imagination: Interpreting Historicism in Nineteenth-Century Music

Daniel Leech-Wilkinson The Modern Invention of Medieval Music: Scholarship, Ideology, Performance

Michael Musgrave and Bernard Sherman (eds) Performing Brahms: Early Evidence of Performance Style

# PLAYING WITH HISTORY

The Historical Approach to Musical Performance

JOHN BUTT



Cambridge University Press
0521813522 - Playing with History: The Historical Approach to Musical Performance
John Butt
Frontmatter
More information

#### PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK 40 West 20th Street, New York NY 10011-4211, USA 477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

© John Butt 2002

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2002

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Baskerville Monotype 11/12.5 pt. System LATEX 28 [TB]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data Butt, John. Playing with history: the historical approach to musical performance / John Butt. p. cm. Includes bibliographical references and indexes. ISBN 0 521 81352 2 (hardback) – ISBN 0 521 01358 5 (paperback) I. Performance practice (Music) 2. Music – History and criticism. I. Title. ML 457 B92 2002 781.4/311 – dc21 2001043656

ISBN 0 521 81352 2 hardback ISBN 0 521 01358 5 paperback

Cambridge University Press	
0521813522 - Playing with History: The Historical Approach to Musical Pe	erformance
John Butt	
Frontmatter	
More information	

# Contents

Prę	eface		page ix	
Acknowledgements			xiv	
List of abbreviations xv				
PA	RT I	HISTORICALLY INFORMED PERFORMANCE IN MUSIC CRITICISM		
I	Joinii	ng the historical performance debate	3	
PA	RT 2	HISTORICALLY INFORMED PERFORMANCE AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR WORK, COMPOSER AND NOTATION		
2		rical performance and 'truth to the work': history he subversion of Platonism	53	
3	3 Historical performance and 'truth to the composer': rehabilitating intention 7			
4	Negotiating between work, composer and performer: rewriting the story of notational progress 9			
PA	rt 3	HISTORICALLY INFORMED PERFORMANCE WITHIN THE CULTURE OF THE LATE TWENTIETH CENTURY		
5		rical performance at the crossroads of modernism and nodernism	125	
6 'A reactionary wolf in countercultural sheep's clothing?' – historical performance, the heritage industry and the politics				
	of rev	vival	165	
No	tes		218	
	bliograf	hy	243	
Index			253	

# Preface

We want to serve history only to the extent that history serves life. Nietzsche<sup>1</sup>

History has one great strength over the things a Waldzell tutor feels to be worthy of his interest: it deals with reality. Abstractions are fine, but I think people also have to breathe air and eat bread. Hermann Hesse, *The Glass Bead Game*<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps every work of scholarship and criticism contains a trace of autobiography, and this could hardly be truer of the present case. Much of my career has been taken up with both performance and scholarship and thus inevitably with the constant mediation between them. Moreover, much of the performance and much of the scholarship has related directly to the issue of 'historically informed performance' (henceforth HIP) and the debates about this concept have become particularly vigorous during the very course of my career.

When I began a dissertation on performance practice issues in Bach during the early 1980s at the University of Cambridge, the order of things seemed quite clear in the context of that faculty. Composition stood at the top of the hierarchy and performance (which had barely a place in the curriculum) at the bottom; scholarship in performance stood marginally above performance itself so long as it involved rigorous, scientific and historical methods. I could claw my way a rung or two higher by working on a Great Composer and by tying in some of the results with musical analysis (the most respected discipline below composition proper). What seemed obvious to me was that historical performance was fundamentally anathema to the modernist regime; it was something to be seen – more often than not – as a rather bemusing throwback to nineteenthcentury antiquarianism. If HIP did share anything with modernism it was in its counter-cultural credentials, its distance from a supposedly conservative mainstream. Particularly fascinating was the fact that a huge

х

### Preface

industry connected to the revival of early music and HIP was blossoming just down the road in London. Yet this represented the activities of surprisingly small groups of people who seemed to have enjoyed virtually no consistent or institutional training in history or historical performance. The movement was dominated by a handful of scholar–performers directing versatile vocalists and instrumentalists who learned the historical styles and techniques more or less 'on the job'.

Moving to California in 1989, many of my impressions and assumptions were completely overturned. Here many universities and conservatories did, in fact, teach historical performance on a far more institutionalised basis than in Britain, yet the professional success of the movement was considerably slimmer; indeed many of the best American artists had moved abroad. Instrument building could be of an extraordinarily high standard and there was much public enthusiasm for early music and HIP, particularly as a counter-cultural movement. Most inspiring of all was the critical work of new colleagues such as Joseph Kerman and Richard Taruskin, both of whom had been connected with the movement in one way or another and both of whom looked critically at common assumptions regarding both historical performance and historical research per se. They called into even greater question the concept of the academic composer at the head of the musical food chain. Most striking - and jarring, given my own experiences - was Taruskin's association of HIP with modernism. Had I not just moved from an environment in which modernism had seemed the very antithesis of HIP, in which members of the early music movement often placed themselves in direct opposition to the culture of progress and the relentless advance of 'technique'? Another issue was Taruskin's belief that research into performance practice is categorically distinct from performance and that good scholarship does not necessarily result in good performance. Yet I felt that my development as a performer had definitely benefited from my research as a graduate student (and beyond); indeed it would be impossible for me to perform the way I do now without the benefit of that experience. But, taking his view on board, it was clear that the relationship was not direct - with each new discovery neatly paralleling a new way of performing - but that the very action of historical thinking, 'playing with history' as it were, informed my entire attitude towards performance.

This experience of crossing cultures, crossing disciplines of performance and scholarship and, increasingly, experiencing the critical turn in musicology itself, has led directly to the questions formulated in this book. Given the diversity of impressions and opinions, what actually

### Preface

is Historically Informed Performance? Or rather, what conceptions of western music does it seem to confirm, alter or develop? How, in turn, might it reflect changes in our cultural conceptions of music? Why has it happened on such a scale during the last few decades and how does it fit into contemporary culture? Here there is no room for a comprehensive history of the movement or advice on how to 'do' historical performance - there is plenty of that elsewhere - rather I write from a position of bafflement in the face of the cross-currents I have experienced, and by examining my own motives and preferences. It clearly follows from the ongoing debate about HIP, as the first chapter shows, and could hardly have been written without the precedents set by previous writers. I endeavour to adopt and develop the critical stances of such writings although, perhaps inevitably, my ultimate goal is to provide a defence for the movement; it has been debunked enough already. Much of what I write is done in the - perhaps erroneous - belief that HIP is an essential part of contemporary culture and that, however great its shortcomings, it contributes to the continued survival and flourishing of western music.

The study begins with a review of important stages in the HIP debate as a way of drawing out threads and topics that inform the remainder of the study. The debate is traced from the seminal work of Adorno in 1950 through to important articles by Laurence Dreyfus and Robert Morgan in the 1980s. A large part of the discussion is dedicated to the books by Richard Taruskin and Peter Kivy: Taruskin's study represents a fascinating critique of the movement from within the increasingly rich and polyglot discipline of critical musicology while Kivy's represents the supremely abstract discourse of analytical philosophy. The two could hardly be more different although some of their resulting opinions are strikingly similar. They perhaps represent the two poles of the discourse on HIP, the one rich in its rhetorical flair and diverse cultural perspectives, the other seemingly logical and precise. Such is the success and sheer force of Taruskin's writing (published as a whole in 1995) that many within musicology and music criticism in general have perceived that the debate over HIP is effectively closed, that there is nothing more to say, and, indeed, that the movement as a whole is running out of steam (like modernism itself).<sup>3</sup> I attempt here to show that Taruskin's work – far from closing the debate – is really the work that has most made future debate possible and has entirely reformulated the issues concerned with the discussion of HIP.

xii

### Preface

The next three chapters examine how HIP relates to three important parameters in our traditional conception of western music: the work, the composer and the intermediary role of notation. How does HIP relate to the view of musical works as somehow universal and portable from one historical context to another? Does it actually effect a change in our preconceptions of works? I suggest that HIP gained much of its prestige by capitalising on existing attitudes to the integrity of musical works, yet - in its admission of history and the concept of contingency it has actually served to loosen the concept of the essential musical work. The relation of HIP to the concept of a composer and his intentions has endured particular critical approbation within the early music debate. Chapter 3 puts the question in a new way: instead of inquiring into the composer's intentions in order to discern a correct performance, this study suggests that HIP can actually enable us to form a different concept of the composer and his intentions, namely, how his encounter with the media and practices of performance fed into the very act of composition in the first place. In other words, performance might be a useful parameter in understanding how a piece of music came to be created and notated. Performance could then be seen as much a part of the past, as of the future, of a newly finished piece. As chapter 2 also suggests, the boundary between work and performance thus becomes much looser when the issue of historical performance is raised. The last chapter in this sequence examines the idea of notation as a recipe for performance, one we commonly presume to have developed progressively over the years. Consideration of HIP allows us to reformulate this function of notation by suggesting many other ways in which notation may relate (or not) to performance, the composer and the 'work', however these are to be understood. This study thus consolidates some of the points about work and author formulated in the previous two chapters.

Having discussed what I consider to be the significance of HIP in refining or developing our conceptions of music, the final part of the book attempts to place the movement within the wider cultural context. Chapter 5 examines HIP from the perspective of modernism and post-modernism. Clearly there is hardly the room here to define either of these concepts in any way that can begin to be adequate. I try to isolate those aspects that might relate most closely to musical performance and history, in the belief that HIP has to fit somewhere within the debate on modernity, that there is no such thing as a purely isolated cultural phenomenon and that even the most naive antiquarianism must relate – if only by negation – to larger cultural movements over the last century or so.

### Preface

The final chapter takes a closer look at a particular phenomenon related to the modernism/postmodernism debate, namely the culture of 'Heritage' and preservationism that has so characterised the final decades of the twentieth century. Perhaps the coincidence of this with the overwhelming commercial success of HIP is too obvious to have deserved much comment in the recent debates. Or, more likely, Heritage has generally been considered an amateurish and populist form of history and thus not serious enough to be part of the academic discourse on musical performance. But the connection between the two seems unmistakable and the Heritage industry must surely provide much of the context in which it has become fashionable to invest considerable financial resources in performances 'on original instruments' just as one does in 'period' furnishings, houses and drama.

I cannot claim to be able to explain all that happens, or might happen, within the world of HIP. Rather I try to present a more theoretical conception of HIP by standing back from the immediate day-to-day concerns of the movement. In this way I hope at least to show how the movement has more intellectual and artistic potential than its detractors might have assumed. I make liberal use of various philosophical and cultural forms of 'theory', but in a relatively practical, ad hoc, way that, I suppose, betrays both my English empirical disposition and my untutored status in so many of the disciplines I co-opt. But, hopefully, the combination of approaches and the peculiarities of my experience will shed some new light on what Lydia Goehr describes as HIP's potential to help 'us overcome that deep-rooted desire to hold the most dangerous of beliefs, that we have at any time got our practices absolutely right'.<sup>4</sup>

### Acknowledgements

Some portions of the following chapters have already been published in earlier versions. Chapter 1 (and small sections of chapter 3) draw on reviews I have written of Richard Taruskin's *Text and Act* and Peter Kivy's *Authenticities*. I am grateful to Oxford University Press for permission to reprint material from 'Acting up a Text: The Scholarship of Performance and the Performance of Scholarship', *EM*, 24 (1996), pp. 323–32, and to the *American Musicological Society* for permission to reprint material from my review of Kivy's *Authenticities*, in *JAMS*, 53 (2000), pp. 402–11.<sup>5</sup> Chapter 4 is an expanded and revised version of my article 'Performance on Paper: Rewriting the Story of Notational Progress', *Actualizing Absence: The Pastness of Performance*, ed. Mark Franko and Annette Richards (Hanover, NH, 2000), pp. 137–55.

This study would have been impossible without tremendous help from a large variety of scholars and performers. I am particularly grateful to the following who have given me a wide range of information, responses, cautions and hints over the last six years or so: Wye J. Allenbrook, Suzanne Aspden, Katherine Bergeron, Anna Maria Busse-Berger, Dorottya Fabian, Fabrice Fitch, Lydia Goehr, Thomas Gray, Joseph Kerman, Richard Luckett, Anthony Newcomb, Max Paddison, Andrew Parrott, Joshua Rifkin, David Sherman, Mary Ann Smart, Reinhard Strohm, Richard Taruskin and Abbi Wood. I owe particular thanks to those who have read (or claim to have read) an entire draft of the book: Karol Berger, Georgina Born, my father, Wilfrid Butt, Laurence Dreyfus, Iain Fenlon, Christopher Hogwood, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson and Roger Parker. All errors are, I suppose, still mine, although it is comforting to have such a large and distinguished group of people with whom to share at least some of the blame.

My thanks also go to the two institutions that have employed me during the course of writing this book: to the University of California at Berkeley, which enabled me to begin the project with a sabbatical in the

#### Acknowledgements

XV

first half of 1995, and to the University of Cambridge, which enabled me to draw the project closer to completion with a sabbatical in the first half of 2000.

Last, but not least, my loving thanks go to my family: to Sally and sons Christopher and James; to Victoria, who was born after two chapters were drafted, in 1996; and to Angus, who arrived, somewhat unexpectedly, in 1999, at least in time for the composition of the last chapter and most of the first. I could not claim that this extensive and expressive group of people has sped up the project in any way whatsoever, but they have rendered the work infinitely more pleasant.

## Abbreviations

BJA	The British Journal of Aesthetics
CM	Current Musicology
COJ	Cambridge Opera Journal
EM	Early Music
JAAC	The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism
JAMS	The Journal of the American Musicological Society
ĴМ	The Journal of Musicology
MQ	The Musical Quarterly