

Recreating early 19th- century style in a 21st-century marketplace: An orchestral violinist's perspective.

Is there a problem?

The period-instrument movement has evolved into a well-established and commercially successful branch of the music industry. Uniquely in classical music, however, demand has outpaced expertise. For several decades now recording companies, promoters and audiences have been keen to extend the repertoire boundaries tackled by period ensembles, but players and conductors have neither developed nor embraced specialist knowledge of 19th-century performance practice equivalent to their expertise in earlier repertoire.

Period-instrument orchestras have focused for some years on correcting early criticism and negative stereotypes of the Early Music movement by emulating 'modern' standards of accuracy. Whilst this focus has undoubtedly delivered benefits, the demands of ever-widening repertoire and increasingly limited rehearsal periods have resulted in a serious imbalance between historical accuracy and commercial acceptability.

We'll explore why there is a problem and what might be the way to tackle it as the session progresses but generally speaking both performers and scholars accept that there is a gulf between what is documented as 19th-century style and what is currently produced by period instrument ensembles.

Scholars have been voicing their dissatisfaction with the historically informed performance of 19th-century music for a long time. Richard Taruskin may be best known for his discrediting of the authenticity label and his more vitriolic condemnations of the 'period' movement but within his writings are several home truths which can't really be argued with. As he remarks in his *Text and Act*:

'The pioneers [of HIP] extrapolated- from very soft evidence bolstered by very firm desiderata- a style of performing Renaissance and Baroque music, and from then on it has been a matter of speculative forward encroachment.'

Richard Taruskin, *Text and Act*, p168

Whilst I can certainly imagine that the first part of his statement may offend some performers, I doubt that many, hand on heart, can disagree with his point about speculative forward encroachment.

Clive Brown to some degree backs up Taruskin's claims that whilst period groups were enjoying early success with their interpretations of Beethoven, they were creating a modern 'clean' style of performance which, while highly marketable, was far from 'authentic'.

'The commercially-motivated race to push period-instrument performance ever more rapidly into the 19th century does not offer much hope that the musicians, even if they obtain the appropriate instruments, will have the opportunity to find or consolidate appropriate styles of playing them. There is serious concern that where a search to rediscover the sounds and styles of 19th-century music conflicts with the exigencies of the recording studio and the need to obtain a neat and tidy, easily assimilable product, it is the latter that are regarded as paramount. Although the use of period instruments alone has some revealing consequences ... there is infinitely more to historically sensitive performance than merely employing the right equipment, and the public is in danger of being offered attractively packaged but unripe fruit.'

Clive Brown 'Historical Performance, Metronome Marks and Tempo in Beethoven's Symphonies', *Early Music* 19/2 (1991)

Unfortunately, the fruit has hardly ripened at all in the following 20 years. A body of research on early 19th-century string playing exists by respected scholars like Clive Brown and Robin Stowell, yet it hasn't transformed the practices of period instrument performers. Clive Brown acknowledged the lack of impact of research such as his own in a much more recent *Early Music* article from 2010 when he wrote;

'Although, during the last two decades, scholarly studies have focused increasingly on the performing practices of the 19th century, only a very limited amount of the information presented in scholarly books and articles has had a direct and significant impact on the world of professional performance.'

Clive Brown, 'Performing 19th-century chamber music: the yawning chasm between contemporary practice and historical evidence', *Early Music*, August 2010

Robert Phillip also points out how period ensembles have been able to pull the wool over audiences' eyes when it comes to early 19th-century style

'So far, period performers have got away with the unspoken assumption that late-twentieth-century neatness and cleanness are somehow authentic in Beethoven, or at least that they are what he would have wanted, even if he was unfortunate enough not to have them in the early nineteenth century. This is not far removed from the old and discredited argument that Bach would have preferred the modern piano to the harpsichord. The combined evidence of nineteenth-century documents and early twentieth-century recordings must surely mean that this assumption cannot hold for much longer.'

It isn't just scholars that are concerned about the historical fidelity of period performances of later repertoire. As a performer myself my motivation to devote five years to researching early 19th-century string playing was growing frustration that sometimes orchestras simply weren't inclined to recreate the style of the period, and at other times, where there was the will, there wasn't the way because we weren't knowledgeable enough. String playing in Beethoven's time exploited very different techniques from today and many of these have completely died out, and don't exist anymore in the skill set of either 'modern' players or 'period' instrumentalists. I know I wasn't alone in feeling this way. There are individual string players in many period orchestras who are keen to develop their expertise in 19th-century repertoire; however, the willingness of these individuals hasn't yet significantly affected the overall style of performance. A small number of interested players have an uphill struggle trying to effect stylistic change on large string sections. It is of course much easier to effect historically informed style in a chamber group than an orchestra; however, with the notable exception of the Eroica Quartet, even many period instrument quartets play in a style which reflects very little of what we know about early 19-century style.

One of the performers who has always been renowned for his observance of period techniques, especially chin off violin playing is Sigiswald Kuijken. Kuijken gave an interview to *The Strad* magazine in the year 2000 in which he makes the point that exploring later music with the same historical fidelity as the baroque and classical repertoire would require an unfeasible amount of development time for most professional performers.

'Now people get to Verdi and Wagner and Debussy on period instruments. In the end it will be Schoenberg, and why not? But of course it's a game, a competition to be the first to record something with so-called period instruments, and it's dissipating like smoke. What's the point? Unless you would do it really well, but that would mean taking ten years to study something.'

Sigiswald Kuijken, 'Lone Crusader', *The Strad*, vol 111, (2000)

In the same interview Kuijken was asked if he sometimes feared 'that the point of the reforms he fought so hard to introduce is being lost?'

'That's one of the things I regret...', he replied. 'I must confess that I also sometimes think we're going backwards in terms of compromise with instruments, technique, or even taste. Many of the developments are being abandoned for commercial reasons. It's not forbidden to do so, but it makes me personally quite sad.'

Sigiswald Kuijken, 'Lone Crusader', *The Strad*, vol 111, (2000)

Today the vast majority of players emerging into the professional period instrument scene have undertaken specialist study. This shows a willingness and enthusiasm for embracing historical awareness and developing specialist technical expertise. Generally speaking, these are not players who are happy to miss-sell so called 'historically informed' performances of nineteenth-century works through lack of stylistic awareness and technical development for financial opportunism. The question why professional performers are rarely adequately equipped for reproducing 19th-century style is something we will come back to. But first let's explore some of the things that period instrument string players currently often get wrong.

What isn't correct?

Occasionally 'period' string players may make errors in their choice of equipment such as violinists using a modern covered gut D string with a non-ferruled bow when Tourte style bows were in common usage long before metal wound D strings, but the vast majority of what 'period' string performers currently get wrong with 19th-century style is caused not by the instruments we play, but by how we play them.

The development of the bow during the last few decades of the 18th-century was in response to the new more legato, melody-led compositional style and the increasing size of concert halls, which required greater sustaining power and volume from players. The new Tourte-model bows were far better suited to the emerging aesthetic as Robin Stowell explains;

'the Tourte bow...proved to be ideal for the fulfilment of contemporary cantabile ideals'
Robin Stowell, 'Violin Bowing in Transition: A Survey of Technique as Related in Instruction Books c1760-c1830', *Early Music* (1984)

We know that in 1803 one of the very first things that Spohr's teacher Franz Eck made him do was purchase a Tourte bow, which was easily obtained from a shop in Hamburg; and it seems likely that Tourte-style bows were being widely used by violinists at Mannheim by that time. Clive Brown makes the point in *Classical & Romantic Performing Practice* that Tourte bows may well have spread throughout Europe much more quickly than is generally accepted. Certainly, given the popularity of the Rode-Viotti school of violin playing and the disparaging comments in contemporary reviews about old fashioned playing by violinists like Clement, there can be little doubt that the new grander style of powerful, full toned and more legato playing was fully and firmly established within the first two decades of the 19th century.

The increase in composers' interpretative markings means that usually in early 19th-century music, if articulation was desired by the composer, it was indicated with either dots, daggers or by shortening the written value of the note and adding a rest. As period performers we

have become accustomed to shortening notes and enjoying crisp articulation in the music of earlier periods, and for many players it is a hard habit to break when performing 19th-century music. This lack of legato style was one of the shortcomings that Clive Brown found in recent 'period' CD releases;

'In Mendelssohn's Piano Trio op.66, for example, violinist Monica Huggett often interrupts the legato slurs in the melodic passage beginning at bar 22 of the first movement; the slurred dotted crotchet-quaver figures are often broken up so that they become almost crotchet-quaver rest-quaver and the intended cantabile character is completely destroyed. Elsewhere in this movement Mendelssohn has clearly indicated articulation in similar figures, where he envisaged it, by supplying the quaver rest. There can be no doubt that when he wrote bowing slurs, or notes that were neither marked staccato nor separated by rests, he intended a seamless legato; in such cases articulation and the shaping of the phrase was expected to be achieved by accentuation and dynamic shading. This shortening of Mendelssohn's longer notes to interpolate an articulation by means of a rest is characteristic of the string playing in this recording. One must suspect that the tendency of period instrument performers to articulate in this manner, in direct contravention to the composer's notation, derives from their manner of performing earlier Baroque- and Classical-era repertory, where such practices represent an orthodoxy of modern 'period' style. Whether or not they are correct even in that repertory is questionable. This type of inapt articulation often results from string players failing to employ appropriate historically informed bowing techniques, but very few performers on period instruments have grasped this nettle as yet.'

Clive Brown, 'Performing 19th-century chamber music: the yawning chasm between contemporary practice and historical evidence' *Early Music* (Aug 2010)

It certainly does not qualify as grasping the nettle but the one thing many period string players could tell you about 19th-century bowing style, whether or not they are themselves comfortable doing it, is that you are supposed to do more playing in the upper half of the bow. This is indeed evidentially true, but we have become so hung up on this single issue that we have overlooked many other aspects of 19th-century style. Scholars such as Clive Brown have long championed the cause of upper-half, on-the-string bowing, and the case for players to have the facility to execute it effectively is extremely strong. Where other scholars, such as Nancy November, have attempted to discredit Brown's arguments, their research has been unsound and based on misunderstandings of sources (like interpreting light *détaché* as a thrown bow stroke).

It is certainly true that the vast majority of modern 'period' players are less comfortable playing in the upper half than early 19th-century players would have been. Therefore there are many occasions when period performers employ inappropriate bow strokes in 19th-century repertoire and it should be most definitely be a requirement of any HIP string player

undertaking such repertoire to master on-the-string bowing in the upper half. Ironically if you asked most period string players which part of the bow 'Grand Détaché' was to be played in, they would say the upper half when, in fact, Baillot's *L'Art du violon* clearly shows that it is a stroke to be played in the middle of the bow. I don't believe that there is any need for all the confusion that exists around this issue, but performers need to be given enough information for enough circumstances to make their own decisions. In my opinion performers are capable of understanding and retaining more information than they are often given credit for and it is my hope that, armed with sufficient knowledge, they will make more informed decisions on 19th-century bowing techniques. To that end, here are the points that as a performer I feel I need to know before I can make bowing decisions in early 19th-century repertoire.

- Spohr's basic stroke (détaché) is in the upper half with lots of bow. He states that;

'This bowing (french detaché) is made with a stiff back-arm, and with as long bowings as possible, at the upper part of the bow. The notes must be equal in duration and force, and join each other without letting an unequal stop, gap or rest, be observed at the changing of the Bow....This bowing is at all times understood, when no marks for bowing are given.'
Spohr, Violinschule, p116
- French School: Baillot's basic stroke is in the middle of the bow. *L'Art du Violon* has 12 different types of détaché. Ranging from sustained bow strokes to 'offish' strokes using the elasticity of the bow. In *L'Art du violon* he writes that:

It is 'essential for the violinist to: 1. Know the principle of the détaché in general, and of the various sorts of détaché, which give so much charm and variety to his playing. 2. Know which part or division of the bow should be used in order to give each détaché stroke its appropriate character. 3. Apply himself to various technical details in order to acquire the means of performing them more easily.'
Baillot, L'Art du violon, p171
- Thrown strokes and off the string playing were only used for special effects such as very light, fast scherzos. Spohr particularly disliked light, bouncing bow strokes which he considered flippant and not suited to the noble, German style of violin playing that he epitomized. The 1803 *Méthode* for the Paris conservatoire includes no sprung strokes although spiccato does appear in *L'Art du violon*. Baillot was known for his varied bow stokes so much so that he was criticised for being over gimmicky, but even writing in 1835 it is clear he regarded the off the string spiccato as a special effect bowing not an everyday one. The use of sprung strokes increased in the 2nd half of the 19th-century led by the Franco-Belgian School.

- Another indicator of legato style was that the treatise writers make it clear that by the early 19th century smooth bow changes had become desirable. Baillot instructs:

‘Avoid letting the change of bow or the slightest jerk be heard be heard, whether at the frog or at the tip’
Baillot, *L’Art du violon*, p228
- An ability to sustain in the upper half was also necessary. The 1803 *Méthode* advises that:

‘The sustained sound must be equally strong from one end to the other of the bow. To keep this equality the power must be increased in approaching the point of the bow, which is naturally weaker.’
Rode, Baillot, Kreutzer, *Méthode 1803*, p31
- That doesn’t mean that they no longer used the natural decay of the bow at the ends of phrases Baillot reminded players to use natural bow weight to release where appropriate;

‘Play down-bow the long notes that offer repose, especially final notes, since the bow falls by itself from strength to weakness. That is, when the bow moves from the frog to the tip, the sound diminishes by the natural movement of the arm’
Baillot, *L’Art du violon*, p28
- Bowings were much less structured around the hierarchy of the bar. Perfunctory consecutive down and up bows were discouraged. A wide variety of possible bowing combinations were recommended including ‘upside down’ bowings. Spohr points out that hierarchical bowings were considered old fashioned.

‘it is the ancient rule that every bar should commence with the down-bow, and finish with the up-bow. Modern playing has however caused frequent deviations from this rule’
Spohr, *Violinschule*, p29
- Often notes were sustained with full tone for their whole duration but not always. There were still *messa di voce* effects and other nuances. Baillot considered choosing the most appropriate note shape to be a particular skill.

‘Whether to play a note with a swell, whether to play a whole note with a nuance or to sustain it, presents one of the greatest difficulties of violin playing’
Baillot, *L’Art du violon*, p254
- It was still normal to phrase with the *tessitura*. The *Méthode* by Rode, Kreutzer and Baillot states that:

‘There is a general rule that cannot be neglected: all ascending passages must be played in increasing the power of the sound. The sound must be decreased for descending passages.’

Rode, Baillot, Kreutzer, *Méthode 1803*, p33

- Agogic accents were to be avoided. Spohr points out that this was a common fault

‘all tones must be equal power, and that it is a bad (yet frequent) style of playing every time to accent the first of [a group of] notes’
Spohr, *Violinschule*, p120
- Chords with a dot or dagger should be sounded as one note wherever possible. Where a chord is intended to be spread often it is notated with the top note or notes written with a longer note value. In such cases the lower notes should not be sustained for their full duration
- Hooking was commonplace
- Staccato does not have the same meaning as the modern use of the term. It is an on-the-string stroke where several notes are taken in one bow (usually but not always an up bow)
- Portato is not quite the same as modern players understand it. It is closer to bow vibrato in that the bow does not stop between the notes. The effect should be an undulation not a re-articulation.

The other main consideration for string players is fingering. Fingering was as personal in the early 19th-century as it remains today. Baillot includes descriptions of several key players and their different methods of fingering in *L’Art du violon*. Nevertheless some general conventions are certainly identifiable.

Notably there was more playing up the string, using higher positions to avoid string crossings within phrases. The fingering examples in both treatises and early editions suggest that early 19th-century performers were more comfortable using extensions than modern players are. Natural harmonics and open strings were exploited frequently; their pure tone quality blending better with the general timbre than they do when used against a backdrop of constant vibrato.

One of the most striking differences in early 19th-century fingering style is the use of same finger shifts. Whereas both modern players and today’s ‘period’ performers would usually avoid same finger shifts in order to keep the position change as ‘clean’ as possible, 19th-century string players sought to utilise position changes particularly in melodic passages as

an constituent of expression and phrasing. As Robin Stowell writes in 'Performing Beethoven'

'The so-called artistic shift...was known and occasionally employed by eighteenth-century violinists, but it seems to have come into its own as an essential expressive device in the early nineteenth century.'

Stowell, *Performing Beethoven*, p170

To 19th-century performers it was important at which point in the melody the shift happened and whether, and to what extent the shift was audible.

Audible shifts were a prevailing feature of early 19th-century violin playing and both Spohr and Baillot write about them. Spohr states that,

'The violin possesses among other advantages, the power of closely imitating the human voice, in the peculiar sliding from one tone to another, as well in soft as in passionate passages.'

Spohr, *Violinschule*, p112

Baillot describes audible shifts as *ports de voix* (in the sense of joining two notes in vocal like portamento, rather than the baroque style *appoggiatura*) and lists them as a type of melodic ornament.

'Included among the ports de voix are passages with a light slide from one note to the next with the same finger'

Baillot, *L'Art du violon*, p127

This stylistic feature was not only confined to violin playing as Robert Philip explains;

'Countless writers on violin and cello playing and singing make it clear that portamento was an important ingredient of legato performance throughout the nineteenth century'

Robert Philip in *Performing Beethoven*, ed Stowell, p203

Spohr advises that whilst audible shifts are desirable, the violinist must be careful to develop a shifting technique which avoids tasteless sliding. It is important to understand that early 19th-century audible shifts were not the exaggerated portamento that we associate with the playing of the early 20th century. It is also important to note that Spohr advocates shifting from the finger that has just played (the note before the shift) into the new position before placing the finger of the next note (the note after the shift). This applies for both ascending and descending shifts.

Scholars are not only united in their recognition of the role of audible shifts in the 19th century but also on their omission from modern 'period' performances, something which Clive Brown also drew attention to in his record review for *Early Music*..

'An interesting case of where important historical evidence has been ignored is Manze's Schubert. We know beyond a shadow of doubt that the violinists associated with Schubert (and surely Schubert himself) used portamento in their playing as an essential expressive resource. The edition of Schubert's sonatas by Ferdinand David, for instance, indicates an extensive use of portamento fingering to retain the A-string tone of the lyrical opening violin melody of the A major Sonata and to give it a vocal character; even in Carl Herrmann's much later Peters edition these, along with many other portamento fingerings, are retained. In Manze's performance, however, there is no hint of portamento here or elsewhere.'

Clive Brown, 'Performing 19th-century chamber music: the yawning chasm between contemporary practice and historical evidence' *Early Music*, Aug 2010

Bruce Haynes goes further and suggests that the lack of expressive shifts alongside other omissions of 19th-century style has resulted in current period performances having more in common with the style of modern symphony orchestras than to that of the early 19th-century.

'Modern style and Period style versions of Beethoven share certain features that contrast to Romantic style. Neither Modern style nor Period use portamento, phrasing is unanimously crystal clear in both, rhythm is predictable, tempo fluctuation subtle or absent, the seriousness and intense vehemence of Romantic performances replaced by a detached serenity, and ensemble and intonation are impeccable.'

Bruce Haynes, *The End of Early Music*, p221

Baillot and Spohr even give examples of entire melodies played with the same finger throughout. This idea would be alien to almost all modern 'period' performers.

'In certain melodic passages, the expression and the closeness of the notes to each other require that several notes in a row which proceed by half step [semitone] or whole step [tone] be slurred without any finger articulation. This is done by using the same finger, sliding it imperceptibly on the string. The result is a close analogy to the way the human voice renders these accents.'

Baillot, *L'Art du violon*, p275.

Another aspect of expressive early 19th-century fingering is the use of finger substitutions. Finger substitutions are when two consecutive notes are of the same pitch but are played with different fingers on the same string for no practical necessity but simply to enhance the

phrasing. The bow should be kept moving lightly and there should be no sliding effect as the finger is substituted. The change of finger should be hardly perceptible.

Both Baillot and Spohr advocate finger substitutions as a means of expression. Spohr describes the use of finger substitutions as being an embellishment (like vibrato).

'By changing finger on one tone, something similar to the effect produced by a human voice is likewise imitated, namely: by the sounding of a new syllable upon the same note, which causes its division into two parts, the latter being sung with the same breath, and having it slightly accented.'

Spohr *Violinschule* p161

The term vibrato was not widely in use in the early 19th century. Spohr describes vibrato as 'the tremolo' and Baillot calls it 'Undulation' although, unlike Spohr, he does sometimes use the term vibrato. They both agree that this is still regarded as an ornament and not as a constant effect and that it must be used circumspectly. The examples that the treatises give show clearly that even in passionate passages, vibrato was applied exclusively to single notes and never to several consecutive notes let alone an entire phrase. Spohr also makes reference to vibrato being used for left hand accents and sforzandi. The vibrato used was narrow and not pitch altering

Spohr states that the hand movement should be 'slight, and the deviation from the perfect intonation of the tone, should hardly be perceptible to the ear...it is generally left to the performer [to decide where to use vibrato]. Avoid however its frequent use or in improper places.'

Spohr, *Violinschule*, p161

Baillot says that vibrato 'can give an expression of animation, tenderness, and sometimes pathos.' Like Spohr he counsels against overuse.

'Used with discretion, vibrato gives to the sound of the instrument a similarity to a voice strongly affected by emotion. This means of expression is very powerful, but if used often, it would soon lose its power to move.'

Baillot, *L'Art du violon*, p240.

There is a wealth of evidence that tempos were flexible in the 19th century and yet we hardly ever hear that reflected in period instrument performances and recordings.

Spohr and Baillot both advocate tasteful use of tempo fluctuation in their violin treatises.

Spohr writes that;

'A fine style or delivery ... requires....The increasing of time in furious, impetuous, and passionate passages, as well as the retarding of such as have a tender, doleful, or melancholy character.'

Spohr, *Violinschule*, p179

This wasn't just a characteristic of solo playing. Even Clive Brown, who has a fairly cautious attitude to tempo fluctuation, writes that;

'It seems possible that an expectation of controlled tempo flexibility in orchestral playing, not only to follow a soloist, may have been growing during the early nineteenth century.'

Clive Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, p 390

And he goes on to cite Weber as saying;

'the beat (the tempo) should not be a tyrannical and inhibiting one, or a driving mill-hammer, it must rather be to the piece of music what the pulse beat is to the life of mankind. There is no slow tempo in which passages might not occur that encourages a quicker pace in order to combat the feeling of dragging.-There is no presto which does not also in contrast require calm performance in some passages, in order not to take away the means of expression through excessive hurrying.'

Clive Brown, *Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900*, p 390

Clearly this view was not held by all composers – Mendelssohn is often given as an example of a composer who preferred the tempo to remain constant within movements. Performers were also repeatedly warned by treatise writers to avoid overusing tempo fluctuation and to employ it with good taste. Nevertheless there is plentiful evidence that tempo fluctuation in the early 19th century was not only becoming common practice for performers but was also considered by many composers to be integral to the performance of their work.

Robert Phillip draws attention to the wide range of repertoire where tempo fluctuation could be an appropriate stylistic trait;

'There is evidence from Beethoven himself, and on through Weber and Spohr to Liszt and Brahms, that flexible tempo was an essential part of performance throughout the nineteenth century. A tradition of tempo rubato in which the melody is rhythmically free of the accompaniment can be shown to have extended from at least as early as Leopold Mozart in the 1750s through W.A. Mozart to Spohr Liszt, Chopin, and on to the early twentieth century.'

Robert Philip in *Performing Beethoven*, ed Stowell, p203

Whilst metronomes were becoming popular and were welcomed by the treatise writers, they concur that their value is in setting a basic tempo rather than being religiously followed throughout an entire movement, which they warn would lead to unmusical playing. Baillot's advice was:

'FOLLOW IT; DEVIATE FROM IT WHEN APPROPRIATE...A tempo marked at a certain point on the metronome can be considered as no more than the point of departure which

determines the character and sets the impulse to be given to the piece; it is not an obligatory sign that the performer must continue this tempo with absolute rigour....In general, the metronome can be used only to learn the first tempo given by the composer.' Baillot, L'Art du violon, p459-460

And yet despite the evidence, period performers generally demonstrate a 'modern' proclivity to stable tempi regardless of the repertoire they perform.

Why don't we do it right?

As I have already mentioned, it has become common for emerging period performers to have undertaken specialist studies; however, the study programmes of the historical performance departments of conservatoires remain focused on baroque repertoire with a token smattering of Mozart and Haydn. Illogically, these young performers who have only studied Baroque and Classical repertoire mostly start their careers by being invited to join period orchestras for patches when large string sections are required and it is quite likely that much of their early work therefore involves playing 19th-century music for which they are unprepared and unskilled.

The success and increasingly mainstream profile of period instrument artists and ensembles have led to audiences and some players having the perception that the recordings of well known 'period' conductors like Gardiner, Norrington etc are stylistically faithful. Whilst the available period recordings of Beethoven's Symphonies were a breath of fresh air at the time of their release, are well respected and certainly offer interpretative insights, their acceptance as definitive examples of historical performance in this repertoire is misguided and dangerous because they do not reflect faithfully several aspects of 19th-century style that are evidentially identifiable.

Young players who choose to specialise in HIP are generally doing so because they like the established style of existing period instrument performers. The spirit of the ground breaking pioneers has been superseded by a sense of reverent emulation. The new generation of period performers are not challenging the mistakes of the 'recording' generation; they are simply perpetuating the existing tradition, the very thing that Ton Koopman warned against in an interview for Goldberg Magazine in 2003.

'Younger players.... go off and make music, relying on what the earlier generations have taught them. I think that's dangerous because, if we are wrong, the next generation should find out our mistakes, and correct us....I'm certain we made mistakes, especially in

unresolved problems like rubato, where we have very few sources to go on. I hope the next generation will discover new sources and reveal new answers in them.'

Ton Koopman in Uri Golomb, 'Interview with Ton Koopman', Goldberg Magazine (2003)

Another issue that occurs within period instrument orchestras arises when larger sections are required for later repertoire; in order to 'fill' the section orchestras end up with a slightly uncomfortable mix of period instrument baroque specialists and modern players who drift in for an occasional break from their regular work in symphony orchestras. Neither group is skilled in the stylistic traits of the 19th-century and each group has different skills from the other. In order to make the ensemble 'work' in limited rehearsal time, the solution is the development of a default style with which both groups can cope, which prioritises the elements which seem to matter most to conductors, audiences and critics, namely tight ensemble, good intonation and pleasing tone quality.

Critics and audiences have embraced period instrument performances eagerly because of the vibrancy and clarity they often bring, especially to canonical works. This has largely been of great benefit to the period instrument movement; however, their approval has brought with it a sense of constraint. As budgets and consequently rehearsal time become ever tighter, the priorities are always, understandably, in favour of the high standards demanded by 21st-century audiences used to recording precision. Playing stylistically aware concerts with poor ensemble or intonation is simply not an option. What would the critics say? And what would audiences make of 19th-century style? Is it simply too far removed from the clean, neat playing they have grown to associate with period instrument ensembles? Robert Philip, for example, believes that these concerns are the main reason why so few features of early 19th-century style have been adopted in performances of Beethoven.

'Of all the topics discussed in this chapter - flexible tempo, rhythm, rubato, portamento and vibrato - only one has so far impinged on period performance of Beethoven, and that is restraint in vibrato.... performers on period instruments became accustomed to playing with little vibrato in music of much earlier periods, and the habit was easily (and historically appropriately) adapted to Beethoven. Modern audiences have grown used to the sound of wind and string instruments played with little vibrato; it has become acceptable, and it therefore presents no problem. But will performers of Beethoven ever start embracing old-fashioned flexibility, rubato, and portamento? To modern taste, early-twentieth-century recordings, in which these habits are still current, can sound uncontrolled, chaotic and sloppy. It is for this reason, rather than because of historical arguments, that modern performers have been so reluctant to experiment with these old conventions.'

Robert Philip in *Performing Beethoven*, ed Stowell, p203

Increasingly, period instrument orchestras are choosing to prioritise high profile, mainstream conductors and soloists. Period specialists, who regularly used to appear with the principal HIP orchestras, rarely make appearances these days because it is thought to be more marketable and prestigious to perform with a household name even if (s)he has had little, if any, experience with period instruments let alone absorbed the characteristics of historically faithful period style. Repertoire, too, is all too often chosen on what will sell. The result is that rather than being freed from the shackles of the romantic canonic repertoire, as the pioneers were, we are entrenching a new 'period' canon.

Conductors with little experience of HIP and no knowledge of period string playing are sanctioned by the management of period orchestras to inflict on HIP players the same annotated parts they use with modern orchestras when often their modern bowings are completely at odds with what we know to be appropriate for 19th-century style. Because conductors are usually ignorant about such style issues, and particularly the technical conventions of the various individual instruments, they are frequently frustrated by period orchestras' attempts to implement important features of 19th-century style. On the occasions when an orchestral leader does attempt to instigate a 19th-century bowing, it is usually either poorly realised or simply does not match the sound of the modern orchestras that those conductors imagine in their heads. Conductors faced with any 'unsatisfactory' musical effect, or poor ensemble and their own limited knowledge of period techniques, usually overrule and reinstate modern bowing.

I've already touched upon the lack of time that professional performers have to conduct scholarly research or even to read existing material and devote practice time to developing expertise in 19th-century techniques. This is exacerbated by the need to make ends meet in a profession that pays very modest fees to orchestral players. As there are no 'permanent contract' period instrument orchestras, musicians have to slot in as much extra work as possible into any free days when they aren't booked by their main group; and when they aren't performing most orchestral players have teaching work either with private pupils or in conservatoires or schools. This lack of available time leaves most performers struggling simply to keep on top of what they need to practise for immediate work commitments and doesn't permit the development of new techniques and styles of playing.

There is probably also a slight unwillingness from some players to change techniques, and a fear of experimenting with the unknown. After all, why change what you do when audiences love it, critics acclaim it and your colleagues do exactly the same? There is another more insidious factor in the equation which we'll consider in more detail after the break; but it seems to me that there are several period instrumentalists who are happy to remain in the dark about 19th-century style, not least because they are attracted to HIP on account of its cleanness and lightness and they suspect that, if they were to delve more deeply into the

characteristics of 19th-century style, they wouldn't like what they found. As Bruce Haynes has described;

'There are probably limits to how far we can go today in giving up our tastes, and they no doubt vary depending on the individual case. The most difficult examples may be the historical markers: historical techniques that have no equivalents in Modern style and are therefore unfamiliar.... These are not the subtle mannerisms that can overlay a basic modern technique: on the contrary, they negate many things musicians learn in Modern style, and they are immediately conspicuous in performance, probably even to non-musicians. To incorporate these techniques convincingly means rethinking the music because at first they seem illogical, distasteful, unmusical - at odds, in other words, with our "taste". They approach the extreme limits of what twenty-first-century ears can accept and we begin to wonder if Period style is really what we want to be doing after all'

Bruce Haynes, *The End of Early Music*, p216

We could devote a whole seminar to the role of Urtexts in HIP but both scholars and performers are starting to acknowledge that whilst Urtexts have undoubtedly been a valuable tool in HIP, the veneration of Urtexts perpetuated by many performers have also been the cause of a damaging approach to period performance. Margaret Faultless, one of the OAE leaders, described the changing attitudes within the profession towards Urtexts in her Eighteenth Century Music editorial in 2010.

'In the early days of HIP the idea of finding the 'truth' of a work in an ultimate text, the Grail of any given composition, was a strongly held conviction. It is now clear that the whole notion of what constitutes the musical work can be questioned. Does one attempt to source a composers' final thoughts, if they ever existed? How do these relate to early publications? Do new 'Urtext' editions provide a clearer guide to editorial practices?'

Margaret Faultless, *Eighteenth Century Music*, vol 7 issue 2 (2010)

In 'The End of Early Music' Bruce Haynes refers to the Urtext Imperative which is, 'If it's not commanded, it's forbidden' as being unequivocally repulsive. And certainly the idea that performers played only what was notated in their parts and nothing else is erroneous for repertoire from the 17th to the 19th centuries. Additionally the idea held by many of the early HIP practitioners that Urtexts are good and editions are bad, does not hold true for the 19th-century. In fact many of the old editions condemned by both period and modernist players reveal far more about 19th-century performance practice than any Urtext could. Yet because these editions have been overlooked performers have little feeling for the bowing and fingering conventions of that era.

As discussed at the beginning, scholars have been all too happy to criticise period performers. As we heard, some of them even acknowledge the fact that their research has failed to impact on performers but at least openly, few of them seem to have asked why that is or done much about it. Bruce Haynes and Richard Taruskin have very few points of agreement but they both started their careers as performers and both draw attention to the limitations of what musicologists have offered historically informed performers. Taruskin wrote;

‘A glance at the historical record will show that musicology has been a Johnny-come-lately to the authentic performance movement, and I will make bold to assert that musicology has been responsible for more of what has gone wrong with “authentic” performance than what has gone right with it- though there are welcome signs that this may be changing.’
Richard Taruskin, *Text and Act*, p96-7

Haynes in a typically gentler style considered that;

‘As long as musicology communicates by words and not by acts, it can only go so far in helping musicians. There are innumerable details of music too subtle to be described in words that are nevertheless of decisive importance for the character and style of a performance. These nuances can only be investigated and communicated in the context of musical performance; musicologists who are not musicians will never find them.’
Bruce Haynes, *The End of Early Music*, p129

Both the content and dissemination of most existing research have been aimed primarily at receiving acclaim from within the scholarly community rather than reaching out to practitioners. It has not either given performers what they need or presented it in a format of use to them. Where scholars have advised performers on aspects of historical style, such as for example on some of the early HIP recordings of the Beethoven symphonies, it seemed to have had surprisingly little effect on the finished product. When I questioned some of the players involved they said the advice they had received was very limited and presented only in written form. It seems that scholars have expected performers to come to their research on scholarly terms and performers have only been willing to assimilate research if it is performance led and custom delivered.

To what extent is period performance a 20th/21st century product where historical fidelity is irrelevant?

In answer to the question; ‘What are the objectives of today’s period ensembles and what do they intend to offer?’ Some insight can be gained by taking a look at the online marketing biographies of period instrument orchestras and seeing exactly how they choose to describe

themselves. Some concentrate predominately on the instruments. The underlining in each case is mine.

'The Orchestre des Champs-Élysées is devoted to the performance of music written from the mid XVIII to the early XX centuries (Haydn-Mahler) played on the instruments that existed during the composer's lifetime.'

Perhaps such an emphasis is not surprising, as more individual players seem to identify with the label of 'period instrument' performers rather than 'historically informed' ones. From my own experience in the OAE, and I'm sure it's the same in many other groups, whenever we do concerts where we interact with the audience such as our 'Nightshift' series, the presenters talk a lot about the instruments because they look different. We spend time telling audiences about baroque bows, wooden flutes, valveless horns etc but we hardly ever explain about the differences in the way we play those instruments. As symphony orchestras are increasingly demonstrating, much can be done to reproduce 'period' style on modern instruments and it is misleading to give audiences the impression that the instruments themselves are the most significant component of creating historically informed style. As Clive Brown pointed out, when bemoaning the fact that audiences were being offered attractively packaged unripe fruit, 'there is infinitely more to historically sensitive performance than merely employing the right equipment'; but all too often that is exactly the impression we give to audiences.

Other orchestras seek to represent the composer's intentions;

'Unlike most modern orchestras, the AAM gets back to the original intentions of the composer by performing baroque and classical music on old instruments and in styles appropriate to the time when the music was composed. The result: inspirational performances, filled with energy, passion and joy'

Bruce Haynes is dismissive of such claims from period groups: 'For many people, composer-intention is identical to authenticity. But in some ways, it is difficult to take musicians seriously on this issue when so many of them ignore the intentions of composers. ...And the fact that I see so many concerts in which Period performers make little attempt to reach out to move their audiences in the Rhetorical sense, or to bring to life some of the stylistic attributes that are inherent in the written parts, makes me wonder how seriously they consider the intentions of any Baroque composer.'

Bruce Haynes, *The End of Early Music*, p87

Some groups claim to represent period style with fidelity but, as we have already heard, this is frequently not borne out by the results

‘The Orchestre Révolutionnaire et Romantique was founded in 1989 by Sir John Eliot Gardiner, to bring to the music of the 19th and early 20th centuries the same intensity of expression and stylistic accuracy found with his renown period-instrument chamber ensemble, the English Baroque Soloists.’

Ironically Michelle Dulak cites this very group as misrepresenting 19th-century style.

‘Historical performance has painted itself into an ideological corner. For decades, its announced purpose has been to wipe the distortions of Romanticism from the face of the pre-Romantic repertory.

John Eliot Gardiner, for example, has recorded the Verdi Requiem, completed in 1874, with his Monteverdi Choir and Orchestre Revolutionnaire et Romantique. Yet the underlying aesthetic assumptions of the musicians venturing into this territory appear to have changed not at all: the goal is still to lighten, quicken, clarify.’

Michelle Dulak. *The Quiet Metamorphosis of "Early Music". Repercussions (1993)*

Finally one ensemble in characteristic Dutch directness still brazenly makes claim to authenticity.

Orchestra of the eighteenth century: The musicians, all specialists in eighteenth and early nineteenth century music, play on period instruments or on contemporary copies. It is their intention to try to achieve the most authentic as possible performances of the masterpieces of the late baroque and classical era.

The definition of authenticity, of course, is open to interpretation but even performers known for their strict observance of historical detail feel uncomfortable with it as an aim in itself, as Sigiswald Kuijken confirms:

‘Authenticity is a very unhappy word, because it’s ambiguous. Everybody understands it in a different way. Who can tell what you really mean by it? It’s a Greek word, and its first meaning is to be true to yourself.

Reconstructions might be interesting. But since we live in another time we don’t have the contexts any more. You cannot just make an exact copy of what they did.’

Sigiswald Kuijken, ‘Lone Crusader’, *The Strad*, vol 111,

Even if ‘period’ ensembles were able to produce performances with a strong sense of historical style which certainly for the 19th-century very few can, arguably, that still wouldn’t qualify them to claim that their performances are ‘authentic’.

Additionally the reference to ‘performances of the masterpieces of the late baroque and classical era’ in the Orchestra of the Eighteenth Century’s biography suggests that canonisation, which is a totally ‘inauthentic’ concept is also part of their aim.

The debate about whether period performance is a ‘modernist’ movement rather than an attempt at ‘authenticity’ has been running for decades now. Its primary agitator Richard Taruskin wrote;

‘I hold that “historical” performance today is not really historical; that a specious veneer of historicism clothes a performance style that is completely of our own time, and is in fact the most modern style around; and that the historical hardware has won its wide acceptance and above all its commercial viability precisely by virtue of its novelty, not its antiquity.’
Richard Taruskin, *Text and Act*, p102

In the years since Taruskin first voiced his objections to the claims of the HIP movement, period instrument ensembles have been shamed into all but abandoning the authenticity label and both scholars and performers generally agree that period performance owes as much to the late twentieth century Zeitgeist as it does to historical realism. Margaret Faultless described her own experience of this:

‘I didn't find anybody who felt he or she was part of a musical Sealed Knot. There was no sense of re-enactment. Nor were we engaged in musical time-travel. The recording companies, who funded much of the exciting work in the 1980s, inevitably needed marketing tools, but as performers we were in no doubt that this new style was from our age.’

Margaret Faultless, *Eighteenth Century Music*, vol 7 issue 2, (2010)

If then HIP is a late 20th/ early 21st century product, why does it matter whether or not we attempt to recreate historical style? What we have found with earlier repertoire is that through trying to recreate historical style performers have developed a deeper understanding of what is effective in realising and interpreting music of the past. Whether or not our aim is to represent the composer’s intentions, immersing ourselves in their musical vocabulary, using instruments from their time and exploring historically documented practices have brought us a more personal understanding of their music. As John Butt puts it,

‘Rather than leading us to impersonate the practices of a past age as if they were our own, HIP more often leads us to appreciate a difference that we would not otherwise have noticed.’

John Butt, *Playing with History*, p65

Our interpretations speak more directly to audiences and engage them in this repertoire in a way in which mainstream modern performances have lost their ability to. We become more effective interpreters, our performances have greater impact and as individuals we grow as musicians when we seek to understand the style(s) of the period of music we perform. It is all too easy to lose touch with what historically informed performance is supposed to be about- historical information. We may have a modern product but the key differentiator which will keep the product artistically worthwhile and commercially successful is that the historical knowledge we assimilate into our playing results in making the music more vital to ourselves and our audiences. Without it our HIP product conceived in the late 20th-century will soon seem as dated as 1950s recordings. After how many generations of reverent emulation will our performances cease to enlighten audiences? As Bruce Haynes points out, we need to keep re-evaluating our relationship with historical evidence.

‘When all is said and done, historical musicology is still meant to act as a foundation of verifiable history on which performance practice can be constructed. Without it, we easily drift away from Period style, as we are now drifting away from copying original instruments. Performance practice is to performing musicians what original instruments are to makers, and manuscript sources are to publishers: a fund of reliable historical information that can be periodically revisited and reconsidered as both we, and it, change with time.’

Bruce Haynes, *The End of Early Music*, p131

The issue for performers is that they know that scholarly appreciation of the historical evidence alone doesn't give them all the tools they need to produce world class performances. They need to find a way to marry the available historical evidence with their own creativity in order to arrive at the optimum outcome. Again I find it hard to disagree with Taruskin:

‘let me attempt to list the assets my musicological training has given me as a performer. At the very top of the list goes curiosity, with its implications, so far as human nature allows, of open mindedness, receptivity to new ideas, and love of experiment. It is in this spirit that I believe investigations of past performance practices should be conducted. Let us indeed try out everything we may learn about in every treatise, every archival document, every picture, every literary description, and the more adventurously the better. But let us not do it in a spirit of dutiful self-denial or with illusions that the more knowledge one garners, the fewer decisions one will have to make.’

Richard Taruskin, *Text and Act*, p62

We must neither turn our backs on historical evidence nor feel that it stifles our own creativity. Again Bruce Haynes draws attention to the limitations of musicology and points

out that as performers we should not only use historical evidence but also go beyond what scholarship can offer.

‘Performance practice and historical musicology are closely interconnected, but they differ in one fundamental way. While performance practice involves the reconstruction of past common practice, musicology is both less and more. It deals only in verifiable history -that is, evidence that is "meant to be true" (as far as can be established). What is considered verifiable history almost never offers a complete picture; in the case of music, not even recordings (if they existed) could do that. Performers have to fill in that picture and transform it into coherent music. Music historians may not, by the code of their profession, do it for them.’

Bruce Haynes, *The End of Early Music*, p128

As we’ve already touched upon, the lightness, cleanness, clear textures, pure tone and fast tempi of baroque and classical HIP appealed to the late 20th-century aesthetic. Audiences were eager to embrace this antidote to the heavy romantic style prevalent in the pre HIP era. All things tainted by Romantic heaviness were to be disparaged and discarded in the wake of the period revolution.

Nicholas Temperley summed up this attitude in *Early Music* in 1984 when discussing the use of countertenors

‘the sound increases our distance from the familiar—more specifically, from late Romantic music, which is the ultimate, unmentioned enemy of the whole movement.’

Nicholas Temperley, *Early Music*, 12/1, (1984)

And John Butt also alludes to it in his book ‘*Playing with History*’; ‘there has always been considerable cross-over – in terms of both audience and performers- between the fields of early music and contemporary music in general. Until HIP began to colonise the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the two were, after all, often united in their common aversion to the nineteenth-century ‘mainstream’.’

John Butt, *Playing with History*, p183

These attitudes raise the question; how can 19th-century practices be adopted into a movement which is fundamentally reactionary against Romantic style? As Bruce Haynes points out, this will require a dramatic about turn by HIP practitioners.

‘if we continue to love the Romantic repertoire, we may well find ourselves reviving the performing style that originally went with that music: Romantic style. The irony is that it will be the Period music movement (already at work on this project as we speak) that will

reawaken Romanticist practices, and lift its former arch-enemy from its early and undeserved grave... "Early music" will have come full circle, from a Movement devoted to find an alternative to Romantic performing style to one that revives that very style.'

Bruce Haynes, *The End of Early Music*, p219

There are without doubt professional period instrument performers who are attracted to the movement because of all the reasons that it appealed to audiences. If you choose to specialise primarily because you want to play your instrument in as light and clean a way as possible, how likely is it that you'll wish to embrace audible shifts, legato playing and other aspects of 19th-century style? I know several eminent period players for whom the answer is 'no thank you' but who, nevertheless, are more than happy to accept work performing 19th-century repertoire.

Another reason why players are attracted to baroque and classical period performance is that they have to contribute much more individual musical decision making than a modern symphony orchestra player. As little is notated in parts in earlier repertoire, players are relied upon to provide undirected musical grammar as baroque and classical performers themselves would have done. Whether it is something as mundane as reflecting the hierarchy of the bar, or as creative as ornamentation, players are constantly making musical choices, even in orchestral situations. With the more detailed markings in music from Beethoven onwards orchestral players often feel their role is more prescribed. In fact if they were able to avail themselves of 19th-century fingering conventions and use expressive shifts and had in their repertoire the full arsenal of 19th-century bow strokes so leaders could confidently use them, orchestral playing in 19th-century repertoire would be more musically rewarding than at present.

Much of course has been written about the transparent performer in the 19th- century who seeks only to transmit the composer's work to the audience without detracting from it by adding anything of himself. This theoretical notion has been dismissed by Mary Hunter as too simplistic

'Despite the abundance of evidence for the conceptual "disappearing" of the performer, however, the view that submissive obedience and self-obliterating fidelity became during this period the only, or even the principal, desirable model for interpretative performance is one-sided. It has long been accepted that performance itself was freer than the prescriptions about it; my point here is that early Romantic thinking about performance was also more complex and performer-centered than the above-described model might suggest. The too-narrow view of the subject results in part from the kinds of sources just mentioned, in part from aestheticians failing to account for the actualities of performance, which clearly included more interpretative freedom than a modernist model would allow, but also from

the continuing preoccupation of scholars with the status, meaning, and reception of works "themselves" rather than with the process of conveying them to an audience.'

Mary Hunter, "To Play as if from the Soul of the Composer": The Idea of the Performer in Early Romantic Aesthetics. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 58, No. 2 (2005)

Nor is the concept of the transparent performer confined to the 19th- century. Stravinsky's remarks on the subject are well known but more surprising are those of Gustav Leonhardt a 20th-century musician specialising in 18th-century music who John Butt quotes as saying; 'I have nothing to say, I am only a player... Not a real musician, which is a composer'
Gustav Leonhardt in John Butt's, *Playing with History*, p 45

Before I read Leonhardt's words I would have considered the notion of the transparent performer completely alien to the mentality of the Baroque and Classical period performer; but clearly it isn't to all of us. Mary Hunter continues by citing Baillot as an example of a performer feted in his day for representing the ideals of the time. He draws particular praise for playing the music of Haydn, Boccherini, Mozart and Beethoven in different styles; for not smothering the characters of the four composers with a universal blanket of his own musical personality. This ability to present diverse styles of music so that they sound different is in fact closely aligned to the spirit of HIP and it is this that we should aim for, as much in 19th- century repertoire as in earlier periods, not the subservient, taciturn disappearing performer championed by scholars and possibly even Gustav Leonhardt.

There has been for many years a divide between scholars and performers. John Butt paints a depressing picture.

'There are several other reasons for the increasing musicological antipathy to HIP. Driven by its own specialist performers from the 1960s onwards, figures within HIP started to make their own editions and interpretive theories without the help of institutionalised musicologists, thus making the latter effectively redundant in the one area of performance where they felt they could make a difference in the 'real world'. Moreover, the performing figures often had to make imaginative decisions in the face of incomplete evidence and were soon distancing themselves from the objectivism of traditional musicology through the very action of spontaneous performance. The discipline of performance practice thus became very much a suspect activity to the mainstream of musicology and composition.... trivial and soft though much HIP research may be, some of the real antipathy must live in the popularity of HIP in the main and the fact that it is embraced by so many amateurs both at the level of performance and of research.'

John Butt, *Playing with History*, p199

I found from my experience of peer reviewers responding to my AHRC research proposal that there still exists a breed of scholar who doubts that performers have the intellect to produce meaningful research and who doesn't appreciate interloping practitioners muscling in on their cosy academic world. I'm glad to say that since beginning my fellowship I haven't encountered a single such attitude and have been welcomed, supported and encouraged not only by my colleagues at Cardiff University but by scholars from numerous other institutions. I am hopeful my experience reflects a growing awareness in musicology that performers have much to offer. Certainly over the past few years funding bodies have acknowledged the benefit of research which impacts on what John Butt calls the 'real world' and with the work of organisations like the IMR and the AHRC Research Centre for Musical Performance as Creative Practice things appear to be moving in a positive direction. Perhaps we are finally accepting what Richard Taruskin explained some decades ago

'when thinking of the relationship between the musicologist and the performer we usually assume that the former teaches and the latter learns. But good performers can teach receptive scholars a great deal, and communication both ways is needed if a real symbiosis of musicology and performance is to occur.'

Richard Taruskin, *Text and Act*, p63

If scholars want to research and impact HIP then the responsibility should be theirs to aim and disseminate their work to performers in the form/s that are most useful and easily realised by them. Perhaps the increased funding obligations to demonstrate impact will encourage them to re-examine who their audiences are and how they target them. Musicology requires musicianship to make it meaningful, as Roger North said several centuries ago;

'Art and Air come seldom from under a Gown'

Roger North in Bruce Haynes', *The End of Early Music*, p128

As we've already established, HIP without solid foundations on scholarly evidence is not just a crime of trade description but a substandard artistic product, and scholarship which makes no difference to the 'real world' is a folly of self indulgence, a chocolate teapot. We both need each other not just to justify what we do but to produce art worthy of those who created it and those who consume it.

Performers, too, need to change their attitudes to HIP and accept that a stylistic knowledge of one period, e.g. the Baroque, does not automatically equip them to play music of another period, such as Romantic repertoire, in a historically informed way. They should take responsibility for gaining an understanding of the performance practices of each period of music they play and for developing the requisite techniques of all the periods they perform.

If this does not appeal then they should decide to limit their work to those periods in which they are comfortable. It sounds brutal but for the sake of the movement the choice should be 'get up to speed or lose the work' - although of course this will only happen when enough skilled players exist to fill sections - and we are currently some way off that. Players should of course be given all possible assistance to develop their knowledge and skills both by career development opportunities provided by the ensembles they play for and by the targeted dissemination of scholarly output. Hopefully future research, including the outputs of my AHRC fellowship, will produce some useful tools for performers.

Conservatoires have a role to play and should offer training in wider areas of HIP not just Baroque and Classical. They now seem to be increasingly interested in the employability of their graduates and include on their websites lists of distinguished alumni and the ensembles with which former students now work. Surely then the next step is for them to furnish their courses with the training required to make students as employable as possible. Given that 19th-century repertoire now forms a significant proportion of the performances of period instrument orchestras, for how much longer can conservatoires continue only to equip students for part of their professional function? Do they believe that mainstream 'modern' studies have provided students with detailed knowledge of 19th-century style? Do they believe that by reproducing Baroque and Classical style in 19th-century music their students will be able to 'get by' in the profession? Have they not noticed the number of HIP performances of 19th-century repertoire? Perhaps as scholarship produces relevant research materials and performers increase their expertise, conservatoires will have the tools and the teachers available to improve the balance of their programmes but students will need to be engaged and that will only happen when they begin to hear concerts and recordings which actually reflect 19th-century style so that they realise the relevance of this area to their careers.

Until HIP ensembles accept that historical fidelity is a desirable component of what they offer in all periods of music within their repertoire, little will be done to convince both student performers and current professionals that there is any point in developing their expertise in 19th-century style. It's time for orchestras to stop selling out on the inherent principles of HIP and to realise that they imperil themselves when they seek to become ever more mainstream. The commercial attractiveness of HIP groups is not how similar they are to 'modern' symphony orchestras but how different they are. It lies not in the one-style-fits-all approach but in varied and apposite approaches for different types of music. The success of HIP was not based on offering audiences what they already knew and accepted and keeping them safely in their comfort zone.

It is high time that ensembles play their corporate part in once again taking their audiences on a new adventure; introducing them to true 19th-century style. It's simply about having

faith that the style that the composers knew and intended will be compelling and revealing and therefore engaging for listeners, if well executed. The model works - we know that, the pioneers proved it; but as we became established we became lazy and as our success grew we had so much more to lose.

In summary historically informed performances do not currently reflect 19th-century style. The fault lies not with any one group but with performers, scholars, conductors, conservatoires, the management of HIP groups and even arguably audiences all making small but significant oversights. The success of the 'period' movement has caused it to lose sight of what its great strengths are. Rather like a fantastic independent shop that does so well it turns into a chain, as HIP has expanded its repertoire boundaries into the 19th-century, it has become in danger of mass producing, lower quality produce and losing touch with what its customers want. Traditionally 'period' performance was the antidote to 19th-century style but the time has come to create an aesthetic in which we move on from our phobia of all things Romantic and bring to our interpretations of 19th-century music the same astonishing renaissance that transformed the performance of earlier repertoire. If the situation is to change and we are to offer what we claim to; historically informed performance, then all of us who are stakeholders in HIP – scholars, performers and management professionals need to desire and play our role in creating a product that has greater historical fidelity. Hopefully greater historical fidelity will produce more engaging and illuminating performances that may well consequently bring increased commercial success. As the symphony orchestras get closer to what is accepted as 'period' style, HIP ensembles will have to convince promoters and consumers that they have something different to offer especially in later repertoire. What better way than by finally attempting to reproduce true 19th-century style.