

Thomas Hochradner

University of Music and Dramatic Arts Mozarteum
Univerza za glasbo in dramske umetnosti Mozarteum

Looking for coordinates. A challenge for research in reception and interpretation of music

Iskanje koordinat. Izziv za raziskovanje recepcije in interpretacije glasbe

Prejeto: 12. september 2013
Sprejeto: 7. oktober 2013

Received: 12th September 2013
Accepted: 7th October 2013

Ključne besede: izhodišča za raziskovanje zgodovine recepcije in interpretacije glasbe – sistem koordinat kot začetna točka – problem avtentičnosti kot študijski primer

Keywords: starting points for research into the history of reception and interpretation of music – a system of coordinates as a point of departure – the problem of authenticity as a case study

IZVLEČEK

Raziskave na področju recepcije glasbe običajno težijo k študijskim primerom ali tabulaturam, pri čemer se študije interpretacije glasbe sprašujejo po nepreračunljivosti tehničnih pogojev in izbirnih predelavah glasbenih posnetkov. Ker je videti, da je pomanjkanje zavedanja v zvezi z referenčnimi sistemi izhodišče problema, ta razprava predlaga osnovni model, s katerim se lahko ukvarjamo z glasbo v vseh njenih pisnih in zvočnih pojavnostih.

ABSTRACT

Research in reception of music usually tends to case studies or tabular forms, whereas studies in interpretation of music often are questioned with regard to the imponderabilities of technical conditions and optional revisions of sound recordings. As a lack of consciousness in respect to referential systems seems to be the starting point of the problem, the following paper suggests a basic model which is able to deal with music in all its written and sonorous manifestations.

“Fast alle inhaltlichen, methodischen und organisatorischen Ausweitungen, die sie [die Musikwissenschaft] seit ihrer Installierung als universitäre Disziplin erfahren hat, sind wenn nicht durchaus angemessene, so doch sehr berechnete Reaktionen auf die Enge der Gegenstandsdefinition, von der das Fach seinen Ausgang genommen hat: die Konzentration der Methodik auf die Historiographie, der ‘Geschichte’ wiederum auf das Kunstverstehen und der ‘Kunst’ schließlich auf das musikalische ‘Werk’.”¹

“Wie fang ich nach der Regel an?” – “Ihr stellt sie selbst und folgt ihr dann.”²

“How shall I start according to the rules?” – “Just state them and follow then.” The task of creating an impressive, as well as useful song is not as harmless as the dialogue of Walther and Sachs makes us firstly assume. Of course there are rules to be obeyed, and though it is not communicated, there are rules for the rules, too. They will have to respect certain socio-economic circumstances, aesthetic categories, historically determined accesses. Universality and its limitations arise, and like any multidimensional problem a division of the whole is encouraged, making the debate on special aspects possible.³

Similarly, research in reception of music usually tends to focus on case studies or registration in tabular form, whereas studies in interpretation of music – even the prosperous activities within the CHARM project in the United Kingdom (CHARM = Centre for the History and Analysis of Recorded Music) – in fact are still questioned as soon as the possibilities of technical conditions and optional revisions of sound recordings are taken into account.⁴ An essential divergence comes to light: Measured either by its notation or by performance practice, the concept of work oscillates. Between the positions, and the various intermediate stages existing, some methodological gaps become apparent resulting from a lack of consciousness with respect to referential systems. An efficient attempt to bridge these openings has been made by musical hermeneutics, disconnecting the former brace to semantic heurism and reviewing the capacity of experience and realization.⁵ Different conceptions were reconsidered or provided, based

¹ Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen, “Musikwissenschaft: Musik – Interpretation – Wissenschaft”, in *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, vol. 57, 2000, 78–90, p. 78.

² Richard Wagner, *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg*, quoted from *Richard Wagner: Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg: Texte, Materialien, Kommentare*, ed. by Attila Csampai, Dietmar Holland (Reinbek bei Hamburg Rowohlt, 1981), 110.

³ Hermann Danuser “Interpretation”, in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2nd ed., Sachteil vol. 4, (Kassel et al., Bärenreiter, 1996), clms. 1053–1069, clms. 1054f, distinguishes three accesses to a hermeneutic interpretation of a work: intrinsic, i.e. related to internal phenomena; extrinsic, i.e. bound to historical and sociological insights; and referential, based on semiotic and aesthetic considerations. In this paper, however, the term ‘referential’ is set broadly, implying all three modalities of hermeneutic understanding.

⁴ Cf. in this regard José Antonio Bowen, “Can a Symphony Change? Establishing Methodology for the Historical Study of Performance Styles”, in *Musik als Text. Bericht über den Internationalen Kongress der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung, Freiburg im Breisgau 1993*, ed. by Hermann Danuser, Tobias Plebuch (Kassel Bärenreiter, 1998), vol. 2, 160–172. Certainly, Bowen’s analysis of the exposition in the First Movement of Wolfgang Amadé Mozart’s Symphony in G minor K 550 in different sound recordings, one of the first well-considered studies made by means of computer technology, also reveals that applying virtual methods tends towards studies on tempo and dynamic amplitude, absolute, arithmetically measurable facts. Within, results depend on the length of an investigated passage, as charts lose their precision as soon as too long extracts are chosen. To cover specific details of a sound recording it will be indispensable to listen to the music on the basis of the chart, as Daniel Leech-Wilkinson pointed at as crucial in his keynote to the conference *Sound recording. Musikalische Interpretationen im Vergleich*, held by the Institute for the History of Reception and Interpretation of Music at University Mozarteum together with Österreichische Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft in October 2010.

⁵ Cf. Siegfried Mauser, Gernot Gruber, eds., *Musikalische Hermeneutik im Entwurf. Thesen und Diskussionen* (Laaber: Laaber Verlag, 1994), (Schriften zur Musikalischen Hermeneutik 1); Wolfgang Gratzer, Siegfried Mauser, eds., *Hermeneutik im musikwissenschaftlichen Kontext. Internationales Symposium Salzburg 1992* (Laaber: Laaber Verlag, 1995), (Schriften zur Musikalischen Hermeneutik 4); Siegfried Mauser, “Hermeneutik”, in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2nd ed., Sachteil vol. 4 (Kassel et al.: Bärenreiter, 1996), clms. 261–270.

on Gadamer's 'horizon of understanding' that tries to secure validity of the situative reference. The coordinates of looking at as well as listening to a work are subject to the course of the times⁶, even when performances often defy this certainty by following an ideal of classicism, or modernism, or keeping some kinds of authenticity as characteristic outlines. Albeit, each time a multiform impact nearly collapses at the moment of realization – when momentary experience amalgamates with conventions, gifts, mechanisms and, not to forget, imponderabilities.

Contrary to the comparatively easy task of pointing at methodological problems within and throughout musicological fields, it turns out as very difficult to close the gaps between different positions, theories, or just tendencies. Of course a certain awareness of referential guidelines, specifying the hermeneutic approach, would help to avoid getting lost in special studies, even to redress common misunderstandings whilst speaking about general structures and outlines of a subject. On the other hand everybody who is trying to support a comprehensive dialogue will be endangered to walk into the trap of specific circumstances. Accordingly the following thoughts do not claim unassailability, nor impartiality or finality. They just seek to sketch a prosperous space for further discourses, starting with a short insight into the tasks of the Institute for the History of Reception and Interpretation of Music at University Mozarteum, Salzburg.

The members of the Institute, the colleagues Joachim Brügge (now head of the Institute), Wolfgang Gratzner (now Vice President of University Mozarteum), me and some student assistants, are engaged in teaching, research, the organisation of symposia and the publication of their results. Due to the manifold other activities of the members and due to a lowered budget in economizing times the Institute – compared with its first years, after the foundation in 2006 – has to face new challenges nowadays. Themes must be of immediate interest, publicity has to be considered, cooperations – like this one with the Institute for Musicology of Ljubljana University – will raise the external spheres of corporate identity. Within this scope some principal methodological questions are likely to slip from the field of attention, and thus some first accesses to a theory of reception and interpretation of music have not been continued broadly.⁷ Nevertheless, within the conferences organized and conference reports published, gradually the entanglement of phenomena belonging either to reception or to interpretation of music, but in fact belonging to both in a distinguished meaning flashed up. Questions of terminology turned out to be a problem, as well as a specific value in this field. Settling and sharpening criteria Wolfgang Gratzner distinguishes between the history of musical interpretation which is devoted to all circumstances concerning the action of performance itself, and the history of musical reception which deals with all circumstances and contexts

⁶ Peter Gülke, "Die Verjährung der Meisterwerke: Überlegungen zu einer Theorie der musikalischen Interpretation", in *Aufstake – Nachspiele: Studien zur musikalischen Interpretation* (Stuttgart/Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2006), 181–192. Gülke (ibid., 190) enlightens "[dass] die Mittel der Interpretation sich aus Kompromiß von Stiltreue und Sinnreue bestimmen, der anhand jeden Werkes neu gefunden werden muß": the means of interpretation result from a co-action of stylistic and sensual faithfulness which has to be balanced anew on the basis of every work.

⁷ This has to be separated from attempts to clear and differentiate the history and meaning of the 'term' interpretation in its various time-dependent implications, which in a critical access started with Rudolf Flotzinger, "Zur Geschichte und Bestimmung des Begriffs 'Musikalische Interpretation'", in *Musikerziehung* 31 (1977): 51–59, reprinted in *Alte Musik in Österreich. Forschung und Praxis seit 1980*, ed. by Barbara Boisis, Ingeborg Harer (Wien: Mille Tre Verlag, 2009), 343–358.

that go with and frame the action of performance.⁸ This is usefully clarifying in so far, as Gratzner confines the wide-spread terminological ambiguity of 'interpretation' as either an act of artistic realization or an assessment in favour of the first.⁹ However, the idealistic difference between the historical-receptive and the artistic-productive in reality is mingled with a transparent net; influences on interpretation can grow out of reception, as well as vice versa reception may be stimulated by interpretation.¹⁰ In effect the mutual conditionality is widely ramified and it is not even prospective to speak about two sides of a single coin. Rather a picture-puzzle arises, sometimes making interpretation, then reception come into the foreground¹¹ – coincidentally depending on the way you are looking at it.¹²

A starting point for further discourse can be won by means of an axiomatic hypothesis: Any action of either interpretation or reception preserves and amalgamates exegesis and performance, resulting in a new reading of materials. Any attempt of reconstruction is superimposed by a process of creation and reunites theoretical, e.g. historical, sociological and aesthetic views with components of performance, such as physical conditions, technical realization, and artistic touch. Strikingly, the bundle can be regarded as plasticine, referring to certain structures which constitute a musical work and which are represented by a convention (e.g. manners, oral traditions) or a text (e.g. notations). The question in how far these structures can or must be read as an author's will, is an accompanying one, and the performer is free in his decision whether to obey them. Persuasive artificial power does not necessarily result from faithful rendition.

For a long time academic musicology was unable to accept this 'network of accesses'. A text-bound orientation, once – when the discipline came alive in the 19th century – the only way to rely on, was still kept when other media during the 20th century would already have allowed references to sound recordings. The primacy of the written text

⁸ Wolfgang Gratzner, "Aufführung – Interpretation – Rezeption. Versuch einer Entwirrung", in *Mozarts letzte drei Sinfonien. Stationen ihrer Interpretationsgeschichte*, ed. by Joachim Brüggel, Wolfgang Gratzner, Thomas Hochradner (Freiburg i Br.: Rombach Verlag, 2008), (Klang-reden. Schriften zur Musikalischen Rezeptions- und Interpretationsgeschichte 1), 27–40, p. 37. Cf. for an insight into the course of discussion the previously published article Hermann Danuser, "Zur Interdependenz von Interpretation und Rezeption in der Musik", in *Rezeptionsästhetik und Rezeptionsgeschichte in der Musikwissenschaft*, ed. by Hermann Danuser, Friedhelm Krummacher (Laaber: Laaber Verlag, 1991), (Publikationen der Hochschule für Musik und Theater Hannover 3), 165–177.

⁹ Cf. Hinrichsen, "Musikwissenschaft: Musik ...", 79, with further references, 89f., and Hinrichsen's request (*ibid.*, 81): "Die konstitutive Differenz zwischen der Lektüre (und damit dem *modus interpretandi*) musikalischer und sprachlicher Texte muß also methodische Konsequenzen haben: Die Interpretation steht jenseits der Polarität von Historik und Systematik selbst zur Analyse an." Moreover, Hinrichsen (*ibid.*, p. 86f.) comes back to a common methodological starting basis for all sorts of interpretation: a preliminary decision how to start a reading before entering the hermeneutic circle which as an individual one ("Interpretation") in my opinion (full particulars see below) is not sufficiently seizable for a closer differentiation. Cf., embodying this access in the history of German philosophy, Hinrichsen, "Musikwissenschaft als musikalisches Kunstwerk: Zum schwierigen Gegenstand der Musikgeschichtsschreibung", in *Musikwissenschaft: Eine Positionsbestimmung*, ed. by Laurenz Lütken (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2007), 67–87, pp. 72–74.

¹⁰ As outlined in manifold writings. The variety of hitherto offered decoding is referred to in Hermann Danuser, Friedhelm Krummacher, eds., *Rezeptionsästhetik und Rezeptionsgeschichte in der Musikwissenschaft* (Laaber: Laaber Verlag, 1991), (Publikationen der Hochschule für Musik und Theater Hannover 3).

¹¹ It would also be possible, based on Michel Foucault, to distinguish between discourse and recourse. Cf. Foucault, *Die Ordnung des Diskurses* (1974) (Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer, 1991), revised ¹²2012.

¹² Cf. Hans Robert Jauss, "Rückschau auf die Rezeptionstheorie: Ad usum Musicae Scientiae", in Danuser, Krummacher, "Zur Interdependenz ...", 13–36, p. 14, though narrowed on the category of experience: "Gehört doch das Ineinandergreifen von Text (oder: Partitur), Interpretation (oder: Aufführung) und Aufnahme (oder: Rezeption) zum Erstgegebenen in der Erfahrung von Musik".

was maintained as the very proof of tradition, and musical philology concentrated on a self-referential programme that – strictly spoken – prevented the investigation of works as sound phenomena, and what is more: of all reception indications, whereas research on any circumstance related to the works’ origin was facilitated by this restriction.¹³ Georg Feder, the late German musicologist, paradigmatically pleads for an emphatic concept of ‘work’, in which any alien variant is of no relevance whatsoever for the original version.¹⁴ As a result “the history of reception and the bibliography of secondary literature on music” are merely considered as outlying areas of philological activities.¹⁵ Unquestionably this access in its concentration brings about advantages, for instance a security of basic principles and a point of departure commonly agreed upon. As notation is interpreted as a construction of meaning, surpassing the creative act¹⁶, it facilitates a trusted conversation, watches over subjectivity of performers, and by and large the history of composition enforces this quality by gaining textual control over performances – though, as mentioned above, a timeless validity of a text is totally out of range. Emphatic insistence on an upraised status of the text rather prevents further questioning.¹⁷ As Daniel Leech-Wilkinson outlines, “[...] performances are much more the work than we have traditionally supposed, [...] performance traditions influence the ways we think about works over long periods of time, and [...] performers have things to teach us about pieces of music that are every bit as interesting and true as the most subtle analyses and commentaries”.¹⁸

This, of course, has to be applied to musical editions, too.¹⁹ For example, Mozart-editions of the 19th century reflect as well as modify traditions, and for that very reason include specific information with regard to reception and interpretation. This is – to some extent – even the case in the (Old) Mozart-Ausgabe, because the various editors often did not respect the appeal to base their editions on a careful comparison of autographs

¹³ At this juncture, as Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen pointed out in various writings, a heritage of 19th century musicology continued to have its effect, as e.g. already Eduard Hanslick and later Hugo Riemann, although from different aesthetic points of view, preferred the stability of a written text to the fugacity of the sound-set event. Cf. Hans Joachim Hinrichsen, “Zwei Buchstaben mehr”. Komposition als Produktion, Interpretation als Reproduktion?, in *Musikalische Produktion und Interpretation. Zur historischen Unaufhebbarkeit einer ästhetischen Konstellation*, ed. by Otto Kolleritsch (Wien/Graz: Universal Edition, 2003), (Studien zur Wertungsforschung 43), 15–31, p. 16; Hinrichsen, “Musikwissenschaft: Musik ...”, 82; Hinrichsen: “Musikwissenschaft und ...”, 75f.

¹⁴ Georg Feder, *Musikphilologie. Eine Einführung in die musikalische Textkritik, Hermeneutik und Editionstechnik* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1987), 21. Cf. Hinrichsen, “Musikwissenschaft: Musik ...”, who on p. 84 points at the relation of musicological approach and idealistic aesthetics which favoured the dominance of a perception of the work hypostatized in a text.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹⁶ “Das Notat (also bereits die Nachschrift eines musikalischen Prozesses, aber auch das, was Toningenieur und Aufnahmeleiter tun) ist eine Sinnkonstruktion. Es geht über die Konzeptualität des künstlerischen Akts hinaus.” Gernot Gruber, “Gattungsverständnis: eine Konkretisierung des Verhältnisses von Produktion und Interpretation (am Beispiel der Symphonie des 18. Jahrhunderts)”, in Kolleritsch, *Musikalische Produktion ...*, 122–129, p. 123.

¹⁷ Cf. “Fatal erscheint die Kategorie ‘Urtext’ vor allem, weil sie in der Illusion eines definitiv authentischen, allen weiteren Befragungen und Bezweiflungen überhobenen Textzustandes die Möglichkeiten solchen Zustandekommens vorgaukelt.” Peter Gülke, “Nachruf auf den Urtext?“, in *Auftakte – Nachspiele. Studien zur musikalischen Interpretation* (Laaber: Laaber Verlag, 1995), 14–20, p. 16.

¹⁸ Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, *The Changing Sound of Music: Approaches to Studying Recorded Musical Performance*, chapter 1: “Introduction”, 1.1: “Musicology and performances” (<http://www.charm.rhul.ac.uk/studies/chapters/intro.html>, accessed May 15, 2012).

¹⁹ Cf. for the following Thomas Hochradner, “Image Sharpness versus Loss of the Internes. Readings of Textual Criticism in Mozart’s Church Music”, in *Philomusica on-line*, vol. 9, nr. 2, 2010: *Atti del VI Seminario Internazionale di Filologia Musicale “La Filologia Musicale oggi: il retaggio storico e le nuove prospettive”*, Sezione 1, 66–87, p. 68–70.

and early editions as promised in the subscription announcement.²⁰ Indeed, the ideal of a valid scientific character for the first time emerges in editions published in the beginning 20th century, when e.g. Heinrich Schenker in 1908 requested as “allererste Pflicht” of editors “den musikalischen Originaltext so stehen zu lassen, wie sie ihn vorgefunden haben”, hence he claimed the maintenance of the original as the very first duty of an editor.²¹ In the same year the Berlin musicologist Max Friedlaender published an extensive contribution on editing music, ‘Über die Herausgabe musikalischer Kunstwerke’, in *Jahrbuch Peters* complaining about the negligence of editors. He states “die ersten großen Gesamtausgaben der Werke Bachs, Beethovens, Mozarts usw. [...] waren] zum großen Teil nicht ‘kritisch durchgesehen’ [...]”: that the First complete editions had not been revised critically, as promised on the title pages, but had been revised superficially and carelessly, and that the frequently prominent names of editors did not guarantee a correct or useful work.²²

Friedlaender modifies the value of autographs and First editions, placing them as a last will of the author (“letzte Willensmeinung”)²³, and encloses a catalogue of phenomena that should be observed when working on an edition of music.²⁴ Observing these standards paves the way to demand what before had not been done consistently: the marking of editorial additions in phrasing, dynamics, accidentals, the unification of clefs (in the elder form), a retention in adding ornaments, caution with an assimilation of similar passages, the maintenance of original keys, and a careful revision of the verbal text. In other words: Friedlaender reports on the tremendous store of additions, modifications and supplementations, on the basis of which music editions of the 19th century guided the contemporary performance practice. Compared to Mozart’s autographs they brought about a radical loss of marks on articulation, and a flood of dynamic signs instead.²⁵ Erasing these led to a rise of valid authenticity, respecting them, on the contrary, would open the view for reception contexts and sensibilize for the social framework of music. Both efforts, however, have to deal with an economic background, because sale figures controlled (and still control, of course) the activities of the publishing houses.²⁶

As the doors to the study of interpretation remained closed until sound recording came into being, some fields of music transmission firstly could not be foreseen, but afterwards were not welcome any more, because they would have impeded a pragmatic use of specific accomplishments within the discipline musicology.²⁷ Even Carl Dahlhaus,

²⁰ Cliff Eisen, “The Old and New Mozart Editions”, in *Early Music*, vol 19, 1991, 513–529, p. 527.

²¹ Heinrich Schenker, *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik als Einführung zu Philipp Emanuel Bachs Klavierwerken* (Wien: Universal Edition, 1908), quoted from Feder, *Musikphilologie* ..., 56.

²² Max Friedlaender, “Über die Herausgabe musikalischer Kunstwerke”, in *Jahrbuch Peters* vol. 14, 1908, 13–33, p. 14.

²³ *Ibid.*, 18f.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 23–33.

²⁵ George Barth, “Mozart Performance in the 19th Century”, in *Early Music*, vol. 9, 1991, 538–555, pp. 538–540.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 542, George Barth has shown that already the earliest editions of Mozart’s keyboard music within ‘Complete editions’ differed in their strategy: Breitkopf & Härtel’s tended to remove additional remarks, Simrock’s on the contrary added a lot to Mozart’s notation.

²⁷ Cf. Jürg Stenzl, “In Search of a History of Musical Interpretation”, in *The Musical Quarterly*, vol. 79, 1995, 683–699, who mentions three reasons that had been an impediment to deal with the history of musical interpretation so far: the upcoming of a continuously re-acted canon of works – starting with Handel and the Viennese classicism – of which performances have always been considered as contemporary ones, moreover the notion of music as a transitory art which was understood as an evidence not further debatable, and the existence of various stylistic approaches at the same time since about the 1960ies that has been mastered by big labels looking for profit by promoting new products mainly. Stenzl’s text is also available in German

whose strategies of research have opened new horizons in many cases, strives to 'defend' the primacy of the ideal work by nominating a 'configuration' which in his conception represents the identity of the work and forms the focus of readings.²⁸ However, an abstract idea avoiding, not integrating specificity cannot serve as an appropriate means to investigate musical performance. And – though the situation has changed in favour of sound recordings – there is still reason to complain about other barriers of a prospective dialogue. For instance, no English correspondent to the German word 'performativ' exists, and an effective danger signal for any further discourse comes across: discussion of reception and interpretation might be limited by terminology, at least on a multilingual level. Indeed, the German 'Performanz', borrowed from linguistics, is – with regard to stage actions – bound to a concretization of self-action and memorized gestures. Only a pinch of the English term 'performance' flashes up. 'Performance', namely, collects on the whole what in German notion is divided into 'Aufführung' (production²⁹) and 'Ausführung' (effectuation)³⁰, all the while acts of interpretation.³¹

Summarizing, studies on the history of reception and interpretation of music face an ambivalent starting position: On the one hand they can be settled in fairly, sometimes entirely established accesses:³² well-tried methods of investigation and analysis; on the other hand they lack a widely agreed terminological and methodological superstructure, which could help to incite their systematization. Of course, a retreat into postmodernist 'anything goes' could solve the problem, as far as common scientific treatment would secure neutrality and traceability of the procedure. However, such a kind of retreat bears aspects of resignation and coincides with the observation that plenty of convincing

meanwhile: "Auf dem Weg zu einer Geschichte der musikalischen Interpretation", in Stenzl, *Auf der Suche nach Geschichte(n) der musikalischen Interpretation* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2012), (Salzburger Stier. Veröffentlichungen aus der Abteilung Musik- und Tanzwissenschaft der Universität Salzburg 7), 15–31.

²⁸ "Text- oder Rezeptionsvarianten als Stufen aufzufassen, die man aneinander fügt, um das Bild einer kontinuierlichen Entwicklung zu erhalten, ist nicht anders als eine Interpretationsmöglichkeit neben anderen, eine Möglichkeit, zu der es Alternativen gibt, die manchmal den Vorzug verdienen. Statt die wechselnden Fassungen und Auslegungen zu einer Geschichte zu ordnen, die sich, mit größerer oder geringerer Gewaltsamkeit, zusammenhängend erzählen läßt, kann man die Varianten auch als Material benutzen, aus dessen Konfiguration das Problem erschließbar ist, dessen Lösung das Werk, das sie umkreisen, darstellt. Besteht demnach das Ziel, auf das sich die Bemühungen richten, in der Rekonstruktion und der immer genaueren Bestimmung eines Problems, an dem sich die Interpretation eines Werkes orientieren kann, so bildet umgekehrt – in einem Prozeß der Wechselwirkung – das dadurch eingekreiste Problem die Mitte, von der aus sich die Rezeptionsdokumente überhaupt erst zu einer Konfiguration ordnen, die von innen heraus verstehbar ist. Und es könnte sein, daß die Werkidentität, die als Bezugspunkt der Rezeptionsgeschichte ins Zwielicht von Kontroversen geraten ist, in denen sich die Umrisse des Begriffs auflösen, weniger in einem greifbaren Sachverhalt als in einem Problem besteht, um das sich, wie um eine dunkle Mitte, die Fassungen und Auslegungen versammeln." – Carl Dahlhaus, "Textgeschichte und Rezeptionsgeschichte", in Danuser, Krummacher, eds., *Rezeptionsästhetik und ...*, 105–114, pp. 113f.

²⁹ Account books from the 18th century prove that at that time the verb 'to produce' had been in use when invoicing a recital – according to this practice, 'production' should be understood as the factual part of a performance and, furthermore, 'reproduction' used for its repetition, especially in playing a sound recording.

³⁰ Cf. Hermann Danuser, *Musikalische Interpretation* (Laaber: Laaber Verlag, 1992), (Neues Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft 11); Hermann Danuser, "Interpretation", in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2nd ed., Sachteil vol. 4 (Kassel et al.: Bärenreiter, 1996), clms. 1053–1069. Danuser distinguishes between "Aufführungssinn" (signification of production) and "Ausführungssinn" (signification for effectuation), by these means re-constituting the customary paradigm of 'work' in musicology. However, as Richard Klein argues, a well informed performer or listener cannot be categorically implied and some, perhaps most of the audience will not be capable to differentiate or pursue analytically. Cf. Richard Klein, "Das musikalische Werk und seine Interpretation", in Kolleritsch, *Musikalische Produktion ...*, 101–120, p. 114.

³¹ Of course, effectuation may be trivial, marginal or even omitted. Such a performance approximates what in German is called 'Vortrag' – which is difficult to translate into English, but might be expressed with 'execution'.

³² As an example cf. the discussion on Carl Dahlhaus' concept of continuity and historical facts in Hinrichsen, "Musikwissenschaft als ...", 70, 78.

details do not principally suffice to reveal the general lines. Although being caught in abundant material, the history of reception and interpretation of music has to look for meaningful guidelines, even if a reset of wide-spread thinking is required. Evidently a transparent pattern has to be assumed, and evidently its effectiveness cannot be shown in a two-dimensional figure. Visualization rather resembles a corpus, and at the same time a mass that constantly expands, like the World Wide Web or the universe. Moreover a multitude of axes crosses this corpse, binding, brushing against, touching various phenomena by their notional direction. Within this context, focussing a single object should not be the only goal, as such approaches tend to renounce (or at least pass by) coordinates and will keep distance to an organized, perhaps even regulated spacious access – a manifold access that also allows to drive in curves or to read ‘between the lines’.

Considering inter-textual relations (this expression is chosen, because ‘intertextuality’ again does not appear in English dictionaries...) what has been explicated can be followed paradigmatically: ‘Einzeltextreferenz’, the reference of one text to another, is distinguished from ‘Systemtextreferenz’, the reference of one text to a system of texts, e.g. a genre. Furthermore the term ‘inter-textual relation’ is widely subdivided into para-, meta-, etc., which leads to reproaches of arbitrary use and blur.³³ However, in the case of the history of reception and interpretation of music, a certain indeterminacy belongs to the operative constants of observation and experience and must be incorporated in a model. As a consequence the universal model sketched before has to be modified: What can be fastened as an axis in theoretical discourse in fact appears like a jet but at the same time represents a rope of related elements, and in such a way guides coordinates in dealing with the research field both from an aesthetic and historical perspective proceed.

What can be achieved by this train of thoughts? Isn’t the very general view suspicious, appearing as a self-evident concept without firm angles and, finally, too mobile to give way to a better understanding? I want to hold against. In my opinion this background can be really helpful when developing special studies, when treating specific subjects. Possibilities of weighing different positions and of taxing them in a larger context are set free. This shall be exemplified by a critical review on the use of the term ‘authenticity’. A RILM search provided 4002 results³⁴, a search with German ‘Authentizität’ all the same 194 results. Taking this as a point of reference, a closer inspection yielded four domains of deployment:

- Source Research / Music Philology;
- Historically Informed Performance Practice;
- Music Pedagogics;
- Ethnomusicology / Research on Popular Music.

Reading various abstracts to some entries quickly makes clear that in the nominated sub-disciplines the term ‘authenticity’ is used from different points of view each and the particular positions miss a corporate line. Generally speaking, two models of authen-

³³ Joachim Brügge, “Zwischen Einzeltext- und Systemtextreferenz? Intertextualität als formale Dramaturgie in Franz Schuberts *Fantasie in C für Violine und Klavier D 934*”, in *Schubert: Perspektiven*, vol. 9, nr. 1, 2009, 43–59, pp. 43, 45.

³⁴ RILM Abstracts of Music Literature, accessed 16 May, 2012.

ticity compete: one is historically anchored via phenomena such as faithful rendition and faithful interpretation (to be found in Source Research, Music Philology; Historically Informed Performance Practice), the other one is established as an anthropological constant by qualities like presence and persuasiveness (as applied in Music Pedagogics; Ethnomusicology; Research on Popular Music). A comparison with neighbouring sciences, especially philosophy and literary studies, does not supply a red thread, but nevertheless leads to a certain clarification on the basis of which the discussion within musicology may be reconsidered.

In a scholarly discourse ‘authenticity’ has been shown a broader attention only after 1945. Then, however, the term rapidly turned into a “widely used *catchword*” with multilayered positioning. “The concept of authenticity does not only combine empirical, interpretative, evaluative and normative elements, it may also – in somehow another order – attach aesthetic, moral and cognitive moments”.³⁵ This disparateness is reflected in diverse theories of authenticity which at times remark upon an empiric procedure (e.g. Jürgen Habermas), at times upon an aesthetic one (Theodor W. Adorno). Musicology, though the discipline has often been a little late in its theoretical standing³⁶, in this case yet again did not follow suit, but kept its own, established philological access. That is why in German publications respectively, the term ‘authenticity’ at first was avoided in favour of ‘Werktreue’, faithful rendition. Even Adorno was in favour of this, as it allows any kind of subjectivity only by means of a deep insight into the structure and meaning of the object – the work. Musicology, notwithstanding, usually preferred other concepts of ‘authenticity’ in music, bound to a re-creation of a work either in the sense of the style of the period it was composed or in the sense of the author.³⁷ However, whatsoever exceeds a mere philological exegesis of the work requires interpretation. Though it is quite common sense that the will of the composer shall be observed, the submitted text on which this reference has to rely will never be unambiguous to an interpreter, and his contribution, his ‘colour’ is expected by the public.³⁸

When in 1984 a small inquiry on “Werktreue und Authentizität” was presented in *Musicologica Austriaca*, the term ‘authenticity’ only occurred in the title, and – surprisingly – the demand on faithful rendition was criticized several times³⁹, most explicitly by Nikolaus Harnoncourt who could not win anything positive or even desirable from this endeavour and at most conceded that one should try to understand a work itself

³⁵ “Der Authentizitätsbegriff vermag [...] nicht nur empirische, interpretative, evaluative und normative Elemente miteinander zu verbinden, er kann auch – nach einer etwas anders gelagerten Sortierung – ästhetische, moralische und kognitive Momente miteinander verknüpfen”; Susanne Knaller, Harro Müller “Einleitung: Authentizität und kein Ende”, in *Authentizität. Diskussion eines ästhetischen Begriffs*, ed. by Knaller, Müller (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2006), 7–16, pp. 7f.

³⁶ Cf. Anselm Gerhard, ed., *Musikwissenschaft – eine verspätete Disziplin. Die akademische Musikwissenschaft zwischen Fortschrittsglauben und Modernitätsverweigerung* (Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler, 2000), with regard to the history of reception and interpretation of music Hinrichsen, “Musikwissenschaft und ...”, 68.

³⁷ Cf. Martin Elste, *Meilensteine der Bach-Interpretation 1750–2000: Eine Werkgeschichte im Wandel* (Stuttgart/Weimar/Kassel: Metzler/Bärenreiter, 2000), 21f.

³⁸ Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen, “Werk und Wille, Text und Treue. Über Freiheit und Grenzen der musikalischen Interpretation”, in *Werktreue. Was ist Werk, was Treue?*, ed. by Gerhard Brunner/Sarah Zalfen (München – Wien/Köln/Weimar: Oldenbourg – Böhlau, 2011), 25–36, pp. 25f., 28. Ibid., p. 30, on the still detectable diversity of approaches in understanding music.

³⁹ Cf. as a recent comment Anselm Gerhard: “Was ist Werktreue? Ein Phantombegriff und die Sehnsucht nach “Authentischem””, in Brunner, Zalfen, *Werktreue ...*, 17–23, p. 18, on ‘Werktreue’: “Wir tun gut dran, auf ein Wort zu verzichten, das weit mehr vernebelt als erhellt.”

and to make it apprehensible for today's audience⁴⁰ – obviously aiming at a realization comparable to the work's former presence in public.⁴¹

In this respect the perspective of the observer comes to the fore – and by the way intimates why realizing authenticity is not practicable for performance practice. For Niklas Luhmann the perception of authenticity is a perception by means of observation which suggests necessities that turn out to be casualties from an overridden attitude.⁴² It is the observer who by chance realizes that a phrase “I am authentic” is contradictory, only belongs to self perception. ‘Authenticity’ is not a category of being, but of impact. Japanese tourists who book a Salzburg evening will most probably not become aware that the music they are offered eventually does not belong to Salzburg's traditional music, and visitors of a Mozart Dinner Concert may not know that all the works of Mozart performed there in effect stem from his Viennese period.

As a consequence a performer is at no time authentic when claiming authenticity for his interpretation. Alike, ‘authenticity’ cannot be a positive value as long as some presentations are accepted, and others excluded: To believe in authenticity as a token coin for classical or traditional music restricts its meaning to a distinct style which is prepared as a norm but will never come to full validity, as any kind of performance may be felt authentic.⁴³ And authenticity only processes a temporary result, as Richard Taruskin exemplarily described in respect to the process of transferring past strategies into present times: “What we call historical performance is the sound of now, not then. It derives its authenticity not from its historical verisimilitude, but from its being for better or worse a true mirror of late-twentieth century taste.”⁴⁴ Notwithstanding we are often tempted to use ‘authentic’ in an ambiguous sense, we should be aware that this term is much more open than commonly assumed. Neither is authenticity bound to stylistic paradigms nor should it serve to claim a priority of music philology. James Grier clearly distinguishes between “the work, which depends equally on the score and performance for its existence, and a text, either written (a score) or sounding (a performance) that defines the particular score of the work”. The editor's task is described, resp. relativized as “to establish and present a text that most fully represents the editor's conception of the work”.⁴⁵ This idea opposes a practice that has shaped understanding in musicology: the emphatic philological concept of work mentioned above. Instead, Grier's alternative concept of critical editing can be applied to all stages of reception, it does thoroughly

⁴⁰ Roswitha Vera Karpf, “Werktreue und Authentizität? Gedanken zur Situation der Aufführungspraxis Alter Musik in Österreich als Ergebnis einer Umfrage”, in *Musicologica Austriaca*, vol. 4, 1984, 131–140, p. 136.

⁴¹ Cf. Gerhard, “Was ist Werktreue? Ein Phantombegriff ...”, 23.

⁴² “[Niklas Luhmann sieht] den Authentizitätsbegriff als Beobachtungsbegriff erster Ordnung, der Notwendigkeiten suggeriert, die sich von der Beobachtungsebene zweiter Ordnung aus als Kontingenzen [Zufälligkeiten, im Gegensatz zu Notwendigkeiten, d. Verf.] erweisen”; Knaller, Müller, “Einleitung: Authentizität ...”, 9; quoted from Niklas Luhmann, *Die Kunst der Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1995), 152f.

⁴³ With regard to Austrian traditional Music different positions are encountered; cf. Gerlinde Haid, “Zum Begriff des authentischen Volksliedes”, in *Der authentische Volkslied in den Alpen. Überlegungen und Beispiele*, ed. by Gerlinde Haid, Josef Sulz, Thomas Nußbaumer (Anif/Salzburg: Verlag Müller Speiser, 2000), (Innsbrucker Hochschulschriften. Serie B: Musikalische Volkskunde, vol. 1), 7–14; Konrad Köstlin, “Tradition und andere Mischungen”, in *Sänger- und Musikantenzeitung*, vol. 48, 2005, 12–15.

⁴⁴ Richard Taruskin, “The Modern Sound of Early Music (1990)”, in *Text and Act: Essays on Music and Performance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 164–172, p. 166. Quoted from and cf. Wolfgang Fuhrmann, “Historisierende Aufführungspraxis. Plädoyer für eine Begriffsmodifikation”, in *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift*, vol. 67, nr. 2, 2012, 14–21, p. 16f.

⁴⁵ James Grier, *The critical editing of music: History, method, and practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 22f.

include the possibility that various editors will come to different editions of a certain musical work – though by no means disregarding scientific principles.⁴⁶

Evidently there is a tremendous distance to the philological attempt that leaves any specific, casual situation behind and tries to arrive at a higher-ranking, historically valid text.⁴⁷ Furthermore, how can ‘authenticity’ be claimed, when no notation is able to display a musical work in its entirety? This, I think, explains Harnoncourt’s turn to the observer’s position:⁴⁸ for him “interpretation happens in the head of the beholder”, interpretation is bound to the audience, and, to gather, for the musician such a category more or less flows into effectuation. Harnoncourt also urges “when interpreting, only the understanding of the work can be authentic” – e.g. neither the work itself nor its play⁴⁹, which neglects authenticity as an action and indicates another feature: the feature of a function.⁵⁰

All this is remote from the understanding of ‘authentic’ in a meaning of ‘warranted’, as a matter of records, emphatically unfolded in music philology. Following the German rules and standards maintained in *Duden-Fremdwörterbuch* ‘authentic’ means veritable, reliable, warranted (echt, zuverlässig, verbürgt), and ‘authenticity’ veritableness, reliability, credibility (Echtheit, Zuverlässigkeit, Glaubwürdigkeit). To be credible needs a believer. Again a swinging between fact and function can be stated. According to an etymologic dictionary, *Kluge. Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, ‘authentic’ stands for definitive, true, from Greek ‘authentikós’ which means reliable and derives from ‘authéntēs’, author, with a meaning of self-accomplisher or rather suicide in its background. Might it be read as a hint on self-surrender? Anyway, as a concept that impulses various constructions of authorship and which at the same time releases a normative and a qualitative tendency, authenticity is decisively revealed as a potential function. With regard to music, authenticity as a coordinate of reception and interpretation comprises approaches how to deal with work-bound structures and insights, and modifies the ideal of a self-contained work.⁵¹ Everyone, in her/his own understanding, creates anew what ‘authentic’ stands for. Yet it should be conceded, that within a coherent base in which casual problems can be settled, relevance, references and complexity of any approach become apparent.

⁴⁶ Ibid., esp. 4f., 12f., 36, 180.

⁴⁷ Cf. Helga Lühning, “Komponist, Notentext und Klangwirklichkeit: Über die Autorisation des musikwissenschaftlichen Editors”, in *Autor – Autorisation – Authentizität*, ed. by Thomas Bein, Rüdiger Nutt-Kofoth, Bodo Plachta (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2004). (Beihefte zu edition 21), 25–30, p. 30.

⁴⁸ Nikolaus Harnoncourt, “Über Authentizität und Werktreue”, in *Was ist Wahrheit? Zwei Reden* (Salzburg/Wien: Residenz-Verlag, 1995), 28.

⁴⁹ Cf. “der Begriff ‘Authentizität’ als Chiffre für Historisch orientierte Aufführungspraxis stellt eine denkbar unglückliche Wortwahl dar”; Dagmar Hoffmann-Axthelm, “‘Aus der Seele’ oder ‘Wie ein abgerichteter Vogel’? Versuch über künstlerische Authentizität”, in *Basler Jahrbuch für Historische Musikpraxis*, vol. 27, 2003: *Alte Musik zwischen Geschichte und Geschäft*, 35–44, p. 44.

⁵⁰ This seamlessly corresponds to the fact that a discussion about authenticity has started in the Age of Enlightenment and since then continuously been upset in different ways of thinking.

⁵¹ Cf. Klaus Kropfinger, “Überlegungen zum Werkbegriff”, in Danuser, Krummacher, *Rezeptionsästhetik und ...*, 115–131, esp. p. 127; Hinrichsen, “Musikwissenschaft und ...”, 84f.

POVZETEK

Glede na to, ali ga merimo z notnim zapisom ali prakso izvajanja, koncept dela niha. Takoj ko se pojavijo metodološke razpoke med temi različnimi vidiki in različnim vmesnimi stopnjami obstoja, postane očitno pomanjkanje zavedanja v zvezi z referenčnimi sistemi. Vendar pa se pokaže, da je te razpoke glede interpretacije in recepcije glasbe zelo težko zapolniti. Začetno točko za nadaljnjo razpravo lahko dobimo z aksiomsko hipotezo: vsako dejanje interpretacije ali recepcije ohranja in združuje tolmačenje in izvajanje, posledica tega pa je novo branje materialov; nad vsakim poskusom rekonstrukcije stoji postopek ustvarjanja in ponovno združuje teoretske, npr. zgodovinske, sociološke in estetske vidike s komponentami izvedbe, kot so fizični pogoji, tehnična realizacija in umetniški dotik. Presenetljivo lahko skupek opazujemo kot snov, ki se nanaša na določene strukture, ki sestavljajo glasbeno delo in ki jih predstavljajo konvencije (npr. običaji, ustna tradicija) ali besedila (npr. notni zapis). Vprašanje, v kolikšni meri lahko ali moramo te strukture brati kot avtorjevo oporoko, je spremljevalno in izvajalec ima prosto izbiro pri odločanju, ali jih bo upošteval ali ne, saj prepričljiva umetniška moč ne izvira nujno iz zveste predaje.

Muzikologija se je dolgo posvečala k natančnemu branju »glasbenega dela«. Max Friedlaender je na primer rokopise in prve izdaje cenil kot oporoke avtorjev (»letzte Willensmeinung«) in objavil katalog pojavov, ki jih je treba upoštevati pri delu na izdaji glasbe. Upoštevanje teh standardov je muzikologe napeljalo k ignoriranju kasnejših uredniških dodatkov pri fraziranju, dinamiki, nebitvenih potezah, poenotenju ključev (v starejši obliki), k pazljivosti pri dodajanju okraskov, z asimilacijo podobnih odlomkov, k vztrajanju pri ohranjanju izvirnih ključev in pozornem pregledu besedila. Do sedaj je bila orjaška zakladnica dodatkov, sprememb in dopolnil na podlagi tega, katere glasbene izdaje 19. stoletja so vodile sodobno

glasbeno prakso, zanemarjena. Brisanje teh dejstev je pripeljalo do veljavnega koncepta avtentičnosti, medtem ko kontekst interpretacije in recepcije ter družbeni okvir glasbe nista bila v ospredju in sta bila označena kot drugorazredni temi.

Današnja muzikologija mora stremeti k ponovnemu ocenjevanju metodološkega repertoarja, prevrednotenju tega koncepta avtentičnosti. Vendar pa se študije o zgodovini recepcije in interpretacije glasbe, ki jih je treba vključiti v ta koncept, soočajo z različnim začetnim položajem: po eni strani jih lahko umestimo med jasno, včasih popolnoma uveljavljene pristope, preizkušene metode preučevanja in analize, po drugi strani pa jim manjka široko sprejeta terminološka in metodološka nadstruktura, ki bi pomagala pospešiti njihovo sistematizacijo. Čeprav je ujeta v obilici materiala, pa mora zgodovina recepcije in interpretacije glasbe iskati pomembne smernice, tudi če to zahteva ponastavitev razširjenega razmišljanja. Očitno je treba domnevati pregleden vzorec in njegove učinkovitosti očitno ne moremo prikazati v dvodimenzionalnem prikazu. Vizualizacija je bolj podobna telesu in hkrati masi, ki se neprestano širi, tako kot splet ali vesolje. Poleg tega to telo prečkajo številne osi, ki se povezujejo, zadevajo in dotikajo različnih fenomenov s svojo fiktivno usmerjenostjo. Znotraj tega konteksta ne bi smel biti edini cilj osredotočanje na en sam objekt, saj se takšni pristopi običajno odrekajo (ali vsaj spregledajo) koordinate in se držijo stran od organiziranega, morda celo reguliranega prostornega dostopa - mnogovrsten pristop, ki dopušča vožnjo po ovinkih ali »branje med vrsticami«.

Znotraj takšnega prostora dobijo mehanizmi recepcije uveljavljeno mesto v znanstvenem diskurzu, saj vse, kar kakor koli presega zgolj filološko tolmačenje dela, zahteva interpretacijo. Čeprav zdrava pamet zahteva, da se upošteva volja skladatelja, ni tekst, na katerega se mora opirati referenca, za interpretira nikoli enoumen in občinstvo pričakuje interpretov lasten prispevek, njegovo »barvo«.