

A PLACE FOR AUTHENTICITY IN EDUCATION:

Taking a Musical Debate One Step Further

There has been, within the past thirty years, a somewhat controversial phenomenon in the performance of certain kinds of music by professionals that has gained popular interest among both musicians and enthusiasts of classical music. This phenomenon encapsulates a “recent” trend in performing music authentically, or as some prefer, in a historically informed manner. The fruits of these endeavors have been an ever growing repertoire of recordings which today wear labels such as “on original instruments,” “on authentic instruments,” or in series which profess to “Offer the listener an opportunity to hear music as it was originally intended.” Neumann sees this movement as one that signifies

an interpreter’s attempt to reconstruct a performance that would have met with the composer’s approval. Such speculative reconstruction involves not only every detail of interpreting the score but also such matters as the numbers and distribution of the performers, the voice production of the singers, the sound and technique of the instruments used, and their pitch and tuning.<sup>1</sup>

The desire to hear “ancient” music in authentic form is actually an old phenomenon, for societies performing “ancient” music were established around the turn of the century, while pioneers such as Wanda Landowska made history by performing on “ancient” instruments. This first-generation of performance never became a staple of mainstream musical culture, but remained in the background as an especial pursuit by so-interested parties. Early attempts at reducing Romantically-enlarged forces were aimed at better suiting the nature of the music. Albert Schweitzer said, in regards to Bach’s *B minor Mass*: “Even with a choir of a hundred and fifty voices there is a danger of lines of the choral polyphony coming out too thickly and heavily in a way directly opposed to the nature of Bach’s music.”<sup>2</sup> In the 1960s, enthusiasm for this idea once again gained momentum, and helped establish a number of so-called early music ensembles which were to specialize in the performance of pre-classical music using instruments and

performance-techniques which belonged to the periods of history from which the music itself was born.

An attempt to perform music in the “historically informed” manner, in terms of instruments and performance practices, was not always popular.

Although the seeds of a historical approach began during the Romantic period of music history, Nineteenth-century musicians evinced little desire to return to Baroque performance practices. Instead, they wished to bring Bach back to life as a born-again Beethoven, as a Romantic colleague taking direct part in the music-making.<sup>3</sup>

“Most musicians believed that they could serve works and composers best by using the latest instruments,” throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The shift to authenticity has been linked with more than one cause, including

the rise of modern attitudes in hermeneutics and historiography, which could cast doubt on the assumption that modern playing styles and instruments are improvements, since one’s preference for them is considered to be historically contingent rather than neutral and objective.<sup>4</sup>

Although the commercialism of the early-music, historically-authentic movement promises, in many guises, unfair claims,<sup>5</sup> the result, with many second-generation ensembles is considerably closer to the “original sound” than modern-day, mainstream performance could create.<sup>6</sup> The research into early performance practices (medieval-romantic) not only changes the sound of the music, but has helped some musicians attempt better understanding of a composer’s art: “[Some performers are] concerned as [performers] with historical issues to the degree that they help [them] understand the composer’s creative process.”<sup>7</sup>

One of the reasons the term “authentic,” when applied to musical performance is controversial, is because:

‘Authentic’ implies a monopoly on the truth and inside information on the composer’s wishes... the claim of authenticity implies that everyone who does not strive for the same ideals is perversely striving for inauthentic and inappropriate performances.<sup>8</sup>

Aside from the so-called “early music,” and “historically-informed” manners of performing so-called “ancient” music, the concept of authenticity as it applies to musical performance is, I feel, an important one. For if we value music for any of its profound qualities, the performance of music will need to maximize authenticity.

What precisely is authenticity; does this concept apply to music education? Thus far, the issue of authenticity has not spurred much debate or show of concern from the educational community, however I believe it has important implications for education. This article will strive to make authenticity’s link to the educational sphere apparent, and in so doing, will attempt to illuminate the responsibility of the educator in making authentic musical choices. This issue of authenticity affects music education in epistemological, ethical, and in logical capacities.

### Understanding Authenticity

First, I would like to establish what authenticity means and how it precisely applies to musical performance. Peter Kivy, in his book *Authenticities*, too approaches the complex task of advocating authenticity and establishing what precisely authenticity is. He begins his quest for authenticity using a five-part definition from the *OED*, as I have quoted below. Authenticity is defined:

1. Of authority, authoritative.
2. Original, firsthand, prototypical.
3. Really proceeding from its reputed source or author: ....genuine.
4. Belonging to himself, own, proper.
5. Acting of itself, self-originated, automatic.<sup>9</sup>

In short, Kivy establishes two basic means by which a performer of music approaches “authenticity”: (1) by sonically reproducing the sound of the musical composition’s performance as either the composer, or the composer’s contemporaries did, and (2) by instilling a personal authenticity through performance that emanates from the performer alone. These two means Kivy conveniently labels (1) “historical” and (2) “personal” authenticity.<sup>10</sup> Kivy’s first method

is a difficult (imperfect) one to achieve<sup>11</sup> for to be fully firsthand, one would need to not only perform music, but also hear it, in that firsthand regard: “—it is distinctly not authentic listening, in the sense of sensible authenticity—of restoring the contemporary intentional object of appreciation.”<sup>12</sup> Both David Hume and Edward Said have recognized in their own writings that in appreciating music, it is difficult to remove the audience from the performance equation.<sup>13</sup> As I hope to demonstrate, the truth authenticity may proffer us is valuable even though, in most strict terms, any form of ultimate, 100% authenticity is either difficult to achieve or measure, and even though “we find that achieving ‘authenticity’ is always a trade-off.”<sup>14</sup> Conductor Max Rudolf nevertheless advocates authenticity: “While a truly authentic performance is out of our reach, the quest for authenticity, despite its utopian nature, remains a worthwhile challenge.” He continues, “utilizing information about a composer’s intentions need not lead to impersonal music making, as little as identifying with another person need deprive us of human warmth and understanding.”<sup>15</sup>

I would now like to formulate what I consider two modes of being authentic, based in part on the ideas put forth by Peter Kivy. Mode 1 authenticity is one in which we can approach music performance as authentic “mouthpieces” of the composer, to borrow Susanne Langer’s terminology.<sup>16</sup> For me this entails musicological research on the composer, and on the work’s history or the period in which the work was written. With this “historically-informed” brand of authenticity, regardless of the time-period concerned, the performer aims at bringing some notated musical work into an expressive, “living” realm through various parameters: “sound, situation, pitch, tuning, and temperament, articulation, ornamentation, improvisation, tempo, notation, and dynamics.”<sup>17</sup> The piece then may share its meaning (expressive or otherwise) with an audience and rightly be called a product of that composer, for the performer(s) involved has set out to interpret the musical text by using a filter of authenticity which, to the best of our knowledge, represents the instrumentation, the sound-world, the expressive vocabulary, etc., that the composer has attached to the text. This brand of authenticity is what many (but not all) involved in the historically-informed camp of authenticity strive for. This first mode

qualifies for authenticity by demanding a genuine quality. An ultimate form of authenticity, a so-called reproduction of Vivaldi performing Vivaldi for instance, is impossible. Nevertheless we know today so much about how music was *not* performed by Vivaldi (or Mozart, Bach, Beethoven, etc.) that picking up a violin and using a heavy, wide vibrato for a Vivaldi sonata boldly ignores what we *do* know.

Mode 2 authenticity is about making the musical result of performance solely our very own. This may in fact ignore the body of knowledge associated with the historical-performance movement. Kivy makes this point more clear:

For any artwork, whether it is a statement or some other kind of artifact, can be personally authentic in the sense of truly emanating from the artist, as a direct ‘extension’ (so to say) of the artist’s own personality, rather than a derivative imitation of some other artist’s work... only through such personal authenticity can the artist achieve two of the most admired qualities of works of art: *style* and *originality*.<sup>18</sup>

By saying a performance is in the second mode of authenticity, “we are making it out as the unique product of a unique individual, something with an individual style of its own— ‘an original.’”<sup>19</sup> This notion especially satisfies the *OED*’s second and fourth definitions for authenticity. Authentic meaning, in the second mode, likewise emanates from the performer’s contribution. Dewey believed “The subject-matter of education,” not only “consists of bodies of information and of skills that have been worked out in the past,” but, the “experiences of students,” for “education is a constant reorganizing or reconstructing of experience.”<sup>20</sup> Being authentic in the second mode augments the quality of those experiences by endorsing self-motivated, automatic experiences. Each mode 2 authentic performance or experience can become part of a continuous process of interpretation by the performer.

Understanding is one of the first steps towards the process of developing meaning from musical experiences. Some see the historically-informed variety of authenticity as a way of approaching meaning through re-examination:

I would like to suggest that historically informed performance is a valuable way of thinking about music—virtually all music—whether it comes from earlier centuries or not. It doesn't hurt to re-examine evolved manners of playing any music for which the composer is no longer around to ask his or her preferences.<sup>21</sup>

The expressionist would suggest that the artwork has its very own musical type of meaning:

(1)...the sense of meaning in art comes from the *artistic qualities* of art, whether or not these include some nonartistic meanings, and (2) that the artistic meaning perceived in art is meaningful for human life, even as it retains its intrinsic artistic quality.<sup>22</sup>

Understanding the music we hear or perform, I feel, is better achieved through an authentic means. If as educators we aim to “penetrate” the meaning of music, and pass this meaning onto our students, we cannot do so by presenting inauthentic examples which are not truthful representations of the art we showcase. My justification for authenticity is not for performers to coruscate as Romantic libertines, or to be socially moderated towards a new modern conformity, but towards a presentation that is transparent and automatic. I will next attempt to distinguish the two modes of authenticity as they relate not to intention in performance, but as they relate to the performance-product.

### The Two Authenticities in Class

I recall a situation from the time I was in high school. I was fortunate to take-part in a music history class. I brought in a recording of Scarlatti keyboard sonatas to share with the class, and my teacher took the recording from me, and returned it to me the next day. He said he enjoyed some of the performances. I asked him why he did not want to share it with the class, and his response, confusing to me then, was: “Well, it’s performed on piano. I’d rather share one that used a harpsichord with the class.”

Unknown to me at the time, my teacher wanted to provide us with authentic examples of the music within the music’s historical framework. Did the piano version lack authenticity? No, I would not necessarily say that. I recently shared a recording of Bach’s *Tocatta and Fugue in D minor* (BWV 565) with a middle-school general music class, performed by Vanessa-Mae

and her colleagues, creating an electric-pop sensation built around amplified violin within a jungle of drums and electric guitars. This is an example of what I would call an inauthentic presentation of Bach. However, it has authentic value as a piece of musical art for representing the performers, specifically Vanessa-Mae. On a similar, less overt level, it describes the appeal of Glenn Gould's 1955 recording of Bach's *Goldberg Variations*. If I want to authentically represent the variations, I would use a historically-informed approach using a harpsichord. If I want to authentically represent Mr. Gould (or more precisely his performance), then his example of Bach's *Goldberg Variations* fits the requirement. This dichotomy is what I call the performer versus composer authenticity. It asks us, as educators, to think about what we are authentically representing when we choose our examples. It also allows me to freely appreciate performances of Bach on the piano, Mozart on the "modern-violin," or even Lloyd-Webber arranged for winds. We must determine essentially what a performance authentically presents: the work of the composer, the performance of the musician, or perhaps both?

### The Need for Authenticity

Imagine for a moment the following situation: A high school art class, which focuses on drawing and painting, is in the fourth week of study. In between individual projects in drawing and painting, the class takes time out, about five times in the semester, to spend a class period examining works of art. Modes of critique and analysis are applied to well-known works of art, from a variety of domains. This level of study fulfills the teacher's desire to include artistic reflection and historical study into her curriculum. On this particular day, the class will look at two paintings from antiquity, the first being DaVinci's *Mona Lisa*. The teacher cannot find a large color reprint of the work, nor a color slide, so she uses a 3-inch wide reproduction of the work, clipped from a black and white newspaper. The students then pass around the small *Mona Lisa*, and discussion commences. By the time the last student in this seventh period class gets the picture to hold, it already has two small tears in it, in addition to a penciled-in mustache. The class discusses the importance and significance of this piece of art, its salient features, each student's reaction to the artwork, and some aspects of the work's history.

Imagine another situation, an eighth grade music class, at a private, co-educational school. This semester's history study is on music of the Baroque period. Every week, students devote 25 minutes in an end-of-the-week class to read about Baroque music and composers, and then listen to some examples the teacher plays on the stereo. In today's class, the teacher selects Bach's *Brandenburg Concerto #2*, performed on modern instruments (and using the piccolo trumpet for Bach's *tromba*). After the first movement is played, the teacher then tells the class an interesting story about the trumpet used in this concerto. He says, "This concerto grosso uses a special trumpet Bach invented for this very concerto, today called the 'Bach Trumpet.' Listen for it in the last movement, where it plays a part in the fugue you'll hear. I don't have a picture of this trumpet, but it's very small, like a miniature of the regular trumpet." Students, as encouraged, take notes, and try to remember the details of the music as it is played.

Although these two examples from classrooms may seem extreme, they are real and demonstrate the need for authenticity in the classroom. An artwork primarily will be considered an object or product of a special process. The work is special too by being separate from the usual realm of objects; it requires (for music) an affective medium of sound (or paint, or a pencil, for visual art). The artwork is created (usually) for human experience, with the capacity to please, or offer us aesthetic enlightenment. A poor reproduction of the *Mona Lisa*, even if it is very familiar already, gives way to somewhat irrelevant discussion, if the artistic meanings for which it is being studied are part of that work. Students are only given a fraction of the reality that the painting can aesthetically deliver, thereby reducing to grave degree the aesthetic "truth" which the artwork possesses.

In the second example not only is the historical information about the instrument used not true, but the true information is not allowed to surface by use of a modern performance (Bach's trumpet part was for a long valveless "natural" trumpet, not the more modern "piccolo" trumpet used in "modern" performances for its high tessitura). In this second example the object being studied was the work by Bach, it therefore deserved an authentically produced example that reflected the efforts of the composer. By reduction, inauthentic presentation (1)

limits the capacity to please us (at least by a truthful or intended means), (2) may exclude the artwork from the realm of the special and separate in our world,<sup>23</sup> and (3) may prohibit a necessary level of understanding which in turn denies us “authentic” appreciation or recognition of the profound.

Although an ultimate form of authenticity in regards to studying the *Mona Lisa* might entail a field trip to the Louvre, my illustration nevertheless suggests that more can be done in delivering authentic examples in the classroom. That newsprint reproduction is very far removed from DaVinci’s work. This makes possible a condition whereby students’ understanding of DaVinci’s work is far-removed from what meaning the original provides. Even more unobtainable than a field trip to Paris, we cannot expect our students learning something of musical history to travel back in time to hear Bach himself take part in the performance of his *Brandenburg Concertos* (ultimate authenticity). However, we can expect that students can enter into Bach’s sound world, they can be provided with information which is as truthful as possible, and they can come to associate that “Bach” sound with the composer named “Bach.” The essence of what is being studied has a great opportunity of being missed when it is inauthentically produced.

Looking is not enough; the art in the art must be looked for. One sees the cow in the painting, but misses how its brindled browns echo the patchy mountains; one sees the tree, but misses how its moddy branches clutch at the sky; or, in an abstract, one sees the colours, but misses their dynamics, how they romp along left and right across the canvas.<sup>24</sup>

For educational reasons especially, authenticity is a required component and part of a required aesthetic towards learning about the arts. If in fact “the most important role of music education is to help students become progressively more sensitive to the elements of music which contain the conditions which can yield experiences of feeling,” quality conditions must be available.<sup>25</sup> Morally, authenticity assures that at least the “art” in the art is not misrepresented, missing, or distorted beyond original intention.<sup>26</sup> By this means, authentic examples (especially when presented as such) become appropriate examples.

### Controversy in ‘Authentic’ Performance

I warned readers that this issue was controversial. Not all performers today strive for “authentic” performances, especially when the word “authentic” refers to the notion of “historically informed.” Whether some see it as an issue of authentic music making, or of taste, others within the community of “historically-informed” authenticity feel opposition is due to fear of the unknown. Pinchas Zukerman, on the other hand—a “mainstream” performer—contributes this viewpoint:

...all this Norrington/Hogwood nonsense. That is absolute and complete asinine STUFF. I mean it has nothing to do with music, it has nothing to do with historical performance. Zero. It’s nothing, it means nothing....It’s made for people who have no sound and no ability to make sound....It is a complete and absolute farce....It is DISGUSTING....There’s no question that there are players who have gone way out with all kinds of portamentos and vibratos and slides, but, you know what? It still sounds better than what they [historically-informed players] do!<sup>27</sup>

When asked about his attitude on historically-informed performance practice, especially with regard to string playing on so-called period instruments, the violinist Itzhak Perlman said the following:

I’m no great fan of it. Actually, it bothers me because nowadays the whole movement has exploded into a sort of epidemic. I don’t know whether it’s on its way out or still going strong, but in my view a lot of its success has to do with the recording industry.... Kids in music appreciation classes are given this as an example of ‘what music sounds like,’ and I think that’s really depressing—because music doesn’t sound like that: it used to, maybe; but it doesn’t anymore. Let me give you an example. My daughter is a pianist. When she studied at the university, she had a teacher who introduced her to Mozart symphonies played ‘in the old way’—although, let’s be honest, who really knows what the old way of playing is? Without vibrato, they tell us; a rather sterile, cold, cool kind of sound. And do you know what she said to me? ‘Well, I know better. And yet there were a lot of kids in my class whose first and in many ways most important experience of music was via this style of playing.’ And that’s

precisely what they're getting. It's not fair. It seems to me that Mozart was an extremely passionate person who wanted his music to be performed with great feeling.<sup>28</sup>

He continues, from another interview:

I think [historical performance is] very nice for the classroom, but it really is a cult—and it gets to me.

I hear all this non-vibrato phrasing and it makes me very impatient. It's just so sterile.<sup>29</sup>

Perlman's and Zukerman's attitudes towards performance are problematic in approaching music authentically in the educational realm. First, Perlman seems to want to ignore some of the historical principles involved in a historically informed performance because his gut-feelings tell him Mozart wanted his music performed in a certain way. Because he does so, he is not a candidate for being a first mode authentic performer of music. Second, he seems intent on wanting the music he plays (of Mozart, as the example in his quotation) to convey the emotional content the composer contributed through the musical text. Preserving the "intent" of the composer, as problematic as this may be, is aligned as the desire of mode 1 authenticity. Third, Zukerman rejects some of the historically-informed manners of playing, seemingly not because of any authentic reasoning, but because he personally objects to its aesthetic merits. In order for us to consider Mr. Perlman or Mr. Zukerman as authentic performers, according to what I have labeled the second mode, we would need to establish the fact that their performances offer us something that is either prototypical or very personal.

If I may for a moment make a personal observation. I said beforehand that Mr. Gould's Bach was authentic, in the second mode. I used Mr. Gould as an example because his style of performance (one could say very fast, among other descriptive phrases) was of a genuine "original, firsthand" quality, it was also self-originated. He is also frequently used as an example with which to compare other performances. In short, he is known for contributing something special to the performance that stood apart from other performances. Not only did his performances have unique qualities, their uniqueness helped attribute the qualities "original, firsthand" to what he recorded. I would also wager that his unique qualities as a performer would warrant the desire for someone to study him specifically.<sup>30</sup>

Contrariwise, I would say that both Mr. Perlman and Mr. Zukerman, although players capable of very aesthetically pleasing musical performances, do not stand out as being especially original or self-originated. By considering second mode authenticity, I would then conclude that although there is some measure of authentic quality within their typical performances, they generally possess less mode 2 authenticity than Glenn Gould. Likewise, they may also perform in such a way that matches some qualities of performance known to be historically-authentic (execution of a trill, tempo choice, etc.) but even so may not be considered for being strongly planted in the camp of mode 1 authenticity. If my observations here, although perhaps somewhat subjective, strike a chord with any of my readers, it should become apparent that authenticity, although defined in two modes, is not a binary construction (off/on).

### The Continuum Model

Pragmatically, one may wonder as to how one discriminates the authentic from the inauthentic. Rather than thinking of authenticity as a binary construction, it is best, for the purposes concerned here, to realize it in the form of a continuum. This paradigm makes two assumptions: (1) complete (i.e., ultimate) authenticity, in the first mode, is impossible, and (2) complete inauthenticity in the second mode, is impossible. Historical performance, especially as it relates to the music of past composers, has the shortcoming of not being empirically verifiable. Likewise, by denying complete inauthentic performance in the second mode, I assume no performer can completely separate himself from the performance. I suspect that there is no reason why a musical performance cannot, as well, be reasonably authentic in *both* modes, and Kivy I believe, agrees:

...there is no reason why strands of historical authenticity [mode 1] should not be woven together with strands of personal authenticity [mode 2] to make a seamless and beautiful fabric.<sup>31</sup>

Thus there are two continuums of authenticity, one for each of the two modes. So the reader is certain, I would say that a historically informed performance of Handel at the harpsichord is more authentic in the first mode than a performance on a Steinway. However, this takes no issue in regards to the second mode of authenticity: a student who performs a Bach

invention on the piano following only his teacher's suggestions is less authentic in the second mode than a student who has grafted from his own experiences to interpret the music on his own accord.

Although conductors, CD recordings, etc. will sometimes report being "authentic" in one way or another, it is the educated musician who must assay authentic quality. We cannot reasonably audition all recordings for the one with the most authenticity (I doubt such a concept can be assessed with empirical precision), nor interview each musician we hear perform, to test their own authentic awareness. Nevertheless, the complexity of the issue at hand is no excuse for ignoring the importance authenticity, in the realm of musical performance, proffers us.

The benefits of authenticity, namely a closer association to either an art object's meaning, or the meaning produced through the performance of an art work, are maximized when the level of authenticity is maximized. Thus far, I have advocated that authentic representations of artwork, and specifically music, naturally lead to more understanding by way of not altering the meaning which these artworks possess, or offer through performance. This is illustrated in a model of musical meaning,<sup>32</sup> as a sentence:

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Verb</u>	<u>Object</u>
Music	expresses	a thing
	evokes	a type of motion
	resembles	a mood
	means	a process
	points to	an image

The "things", "moods," or "images" that music "expresses," or "points to" are likely to be altered beyond their original intent if not authentically represented. If this is the case, this model suggests that the meaning too will change while losing its authority.

Although educators cannot promise that students will automatically appreciate the works of art they study, the appreciation they may hopefully achieve needs to be considered. Davies advocates that

...there are features of performance practice of which the listener must be aware in appreciating some works. If Bach's fugues are 'about' the contrapuntal possibilities inherent in his materials, then other

works are 'about' the techniques required of the performer or 'about' musical properties depending on the manner of sound production.<sup>33</sup>

Again, maximizing the authenticity in musical performance, along the continuum in either of the two modes, has a positive effect on students approaching appreciation of works of musical art. Appreciation requires understanding: But can understanding take place amid a factitiously spawned conceit?

### Performing Music: On Interpretation

A transformation of a musical document into one's own aligns itself with what many might label "interpretation." Johann Joachim Quantz (1697-1773) suggested the following:

Musical performance can be likened to an orator's delivery.... The orator should have a clear and pure voice, a distinct and proper pronunciation; his voice and speech should be well modulated to avoid monotony;... [he should] adjust the tone to the changing sentiments, and in general take into account the locale, the content of the speech, and the character of the audience.<sup>34</sup>

At least for works of the late Baroque and Galant periods of musical history, to approach authenticity in the first mode one needs to inject some "personality" into the performance.

Rousseau echoed Mr. Quantz's idea when he said:

Nothing is as rare as a good performance. It means little to read the music exactly note by note; one must penetrate all the ideas of the composer, feel and render the fire of expression...do what you would do if you were at the same time the poet, the composer, the actor, and the singer, and you will have found all the expression that you are capable of giving to the work you are to perform.<sup>35</sup>

Both Quantz and Rousseau suggest that they include a fair amount of the performer's own feeling and ability into making the music affective. Although the relationship between personal input and maintaining the musical text so ever faithfully may change between composers and musical stylistic periods, can we imagine any aesthetic that would fully divorce the performer's own feeling in the art of interpretation? I suggest defining interpretation as a four-part equation. Interpretation is elegantly part expression, part read-notation (i.e., reading the notes off of the page), part intellect, and authenticity. By expression, I mean the performer's

feelings about the music brought about from her past experience and her own emotive qualities and capacities. By read-notation, I refer to the music as it is represented by a notation system on paper (some may call this “score study”). By intellect, I refer to an intellectual approach to understanding the musical work, including the work’s aesthetic, its emotive ranges, and research on the composer and his intent. Lastly, by authenticity, I speak of what I have been mostly concerned with here: making the musical result something representative of either the composer (first mode of authenticity) or of the performer(s) (second mode of authenticity), or possibly both. Depending upon our initial concept of the musical work, the filter of authenticity may very well affect our interpretation. The educator and likewise the student, in addition to the professional musician, should concern herself with these qualifications for interpretation, which tote the truth of authenticity’s authority.

Many involved in the field of music education are involved not only with music as an object that is either studied, appreciated, or listened to, but through the actual medium of performance. Why? Although it may seem obvious, Neumann qualifies the importance in the concept of performance:

A composition remains for most of us a dead letter until performance transforms it into living sound. Certainly, trained musicians can, to varying degrees, read a score and hear the music in their minds. But for the overwhelming mass of music lovers, performance is indispensable for getting to know, enjoy, and appreciate the artistic values of a musical work.<sup>36, 37</sup>

Band directors, orchestra conductors, and choir leaders all need to carefully consider how they approach authenticity in the performances of the literature they choose. Is the arrangement you have chosen of a Mozart symphony really still Mozart? Are the interpretive decisions being made in the performance of Haydn’s *Creation* authentic ones? In this case, are they authoritative? Are they original? Are they decisions each performer owns, in one way, or another? When you are taking your bands to contests, are you modeling your performances after Fennell, or your own interpretation?

In performances, regardless of the precise make-up of the group or the repertoire, not only do conductors need to approach the music authentically, but also each person involved in the performance needs to be included, in an authentic manner. “Musical meaning, in contrast to linguistic meaning, is only to a slight extent, if at all, detachable from the sounding phenomena. To become musically real, a composition needs interpretation in sound.”<sup>38</sup> What is needed, I feel, is music that is steeped in reality, and that this reality is realized through truthful meaning. Enabling students to be making interpretive decisions, while making the music genuine for themselves, to some degree, approaches truthful meaning. Reimer stresses this importance in a different way, when he contrasts the artisan from the artist. The artisan is a follower: he does what he is told to do, he is not creatively involved. Conversely, the artist is creating through performance.<sup>39</sup> Between art and artists Reimer sees a transference, an interaction; from this interaction and contact comes enlightenment to the artist. The artist reacts to the art in such a way that he is able to personalize it. “The basic thing an artist does is to make artistic decisions in the act of creation.”<sup>40</sup> I would suggest that the meaning or enlightenment students derive from the compositions they perform, then, is somewhat dependent on their approach to interpretation. By encouraging our student performers to be artists, we encourage my second mode of authenticity. By route of the filter of authenticity, we encourage a more truthful meaning derived from the experience since for many music is a performance art. Reimer adds,

Authenticity as a requirement for quality in art, along with craftsmanship, sensitivity, and imagination, calls attention to the inner integrity of the expressive core in a piece of music. No piece can be good as music without such internal cohesion, or “truth to feeling.”<sup>41</sup>

Both modes of authenticity, through interpretations by students of music, are no less important than when applied to professional recordings and concert performances. Abbs, I feel, supports the need for mode 1 authenticity in education when he says:

...in teaching the arts we need, with the right sense of tact and timing, to introduce the artistic grammar or expression, the tools, techniques, and traditions of the art forms, and a vast range of

achieved work which, taken together, represent the variety of truths the art form can ‘tell’ through aesthetic response.<sup>42</sup>

Through performance in the classroom, then, the educator should again consult the dichotomy between composer and/or performer authenticity. Whether a student performs a work in a historically-informed manner to gain insight into the artful quality in that particular work, or in a manner that is personal and original, both have merits in education because both are authentic. Authenticity can even be seen as a current within our modern society: quests for “authentic” Italian cuisine, the superiority of an “authentic” designer watch, or an “authentic” oil painting. The quest for authentic meaning is not only a contemporary one, for others have approached works (especially those of the past) with the desire to extract their truth:

It took clear, steady, and courageous thinkers like Valla, Erasmus, Scaliger, and Casaubon to apply the critical knife to revered Antiquity and to winnow out the authentic from the fake, to cast aside forever Dionysius and the Areopagite and the Egyptian sage Hermes. Such humanists were rare, but they were the great ones.<sup>43</sup>

We too today have an obligation—not following a cultural band-wagon but rather—a type of humanist quest, to continue truth-directed paths in the arts, and pass this type of humanist endeavor to the students who will in turn come to appreciate these arts and their histories.

### Towards Profundity

The essence of music is not alone captured in a “notation,” for this symbolic representation lacks the emotional and essential components that distinguish music from mere sound. By recognizing associations in music that are expressive of the emotions, I believe we place value in music as an artform. This value is at risk, essentially, when we are not connected with music that is authentically presented. I assume, of course, that the value we do place upon music is at least partially due to aesthetic value. Although it is possible to appreciate an artwork, even when it is not authentically presented, our value is then placed upon something less genuine. As an example: although I may enjoy a performance of Beethoven’s *Fifth Symphony* because of the trombone solos in the third movement (which, let us assume here, the

conductor added in place of the horn parts, unknown to my naive self) what I know as Beethoven's *Fifth Symphony* and what the omnipotent purveyor of truth knows as Beethoven's *Fifth Symphony* differ. I had an enjoyable experience, but tangents of what I understand from the experience are flawed. To be precise, I do not emotionally value Beethoven's work, but an altered or a less genuine form of it. Even if I knew who the arranger was, and credited his genius (as I experienced it), I may then approach value within the framework of authenticity, but no longer is Beethoven alone what I value. Within the educational sphere, I make the judgment that knowing what I enjoy (even if I do not yet know why) is morally sound. The truth-value of the musical experience is at risk when it is not authentically maximized.

“Profound experiences of music are most likely to occur when they approach the boundaries of musical fullness—perceptually and emotionally—capable of being internalized by an individual.”<sup>44</sup> If our students are fortunate enough to approach the profound nature of music, they should have the educational right to experience that profundity. The “profundity of music” includes the intensity of emotive feeling music proffers the listener and performer, and meaning gleaned from music through the intellectual depth of music study. The path to profundity begins with experience, understanding, then appreciation. Authenticity is efficacious in extending the vector of understanding towards a profound end. Moreover, less authentic experiences are likely to have qualities that include being unoriginal, unauthoritative, and ingenuine.

The first mode of authenticity aids a student's realization of a musical work's profound meaning because the nature of what makes the work “profound” is maintained. Second mode authenticity rewards the student of any possible profound meaning that the performance act offers (in the “first hand” or “authoritative” vein) either the performer or the listener. Especially when the student is the “artist,” or the performer, mode 2 authenticity helps internalize the music—one of Reimer's requirements for profound experiences. An understanding of music's history, its nature, and the how-tos—performing, creating, and thinking about—are equally at risk when authenticity is not maximized.

While authenticity does not guarantee the realization of profound meaning in musical experiences, less-authentic experiences are more jejune; such mendacious experiences summon us to consider the morality of serving education. Understanding something has little value if what we have come to understand, profound or not, is not truthful. Moreover, the unique frissons which the profound nature of musical experiences can offer students should be more accessible through authentic practice.

### Conclusion

In this article I have wanted to demonstrate the need for following two modes of authenticity for (1) choosing musical examples for students, and (2) performing music with students. For the creator of music, authenticity carries-forth the work that belongs to that creator. For the performer of music, authenticity allows him to interact with music by amplifying into time and space the composer's creation or the artist's own interpretation on that creation. Upon reflection, we may realize that even more rare than a good performance are maximized authentic performances. This should matter for everyone, for we culturally embrace music, if not the effects it provides us. We are born with a means to be responsive to the music of our culture—it is part of our genetic make-up, and may in fact have survival value.<sup>45</sup>

“The performer's artistry, taste, and musical intelligence must always supplement the scaffolding of historical information in order to bring an ‘early’ work to life.”<sup>46</sup> This sentiment, however, eloquently applies to the most modern music as well. Music education, therefore, should strive, like all other education in the arts and beyond, for that which demonstrates good taste and intelligence combined with the opportunities to be artistic. For “to perceive” art, “a beholder must *create* his own experience. And his creation must include relations comparable to those which the original producer underwent.”<sup>47</sup> In the epistemological sense, authenticity promotes truth in experiencing reality. Ethically, we get an original form of the product. Logically, the benefit of such a pursuit is happily the evolution and humanistically maintained life of a beloved artform.

Notes and References

1. Frederick Neumann, *Performance Practices of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1993), xi.
2. George B. Stauffer, "Changing Issues of Performance Practice," *The Cambridge Companion to Bach*, ed. John Butt (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 212.
3. *ibid.*, 210.
4. Bernard Sherman, "Authenticity in Musical Performance," *The Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. Michael J. Kelly (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).
5. e.g. the sound of Handel's first performance of the *Royal Fireworks Musick*, which was supposedly performed outdoors originally, but is recorded indoors; should your quest for authenticity be so strong and protean, however, you might move the hi-fi outdoors to legitimize these claims anew.
6. I consider those ensembles, who specifically specialize in the performance of so-called "early music" on period instruments, in the historically-informed manner "second generation," examples being Musica Antiqua Köln, The London Classical Players, London Baroque, Musica Pacifica, among others.
7. Sherman, "Authenticity in Musical Performance," *The Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*.
8. Ross W. Duffin, "Performance Practice: Que me Veux-tu?" *Early Music America* 1 (1) [journal on-line]; available from <http://www.cwru.edu/affil/ema/emag/emag11art.htm>; Internet; accessed 1 Nov. 1998.
9. Peter Kivy, *Authenticities: Philosophic Reflections on Musical Performance* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), 3.
10. *ibid.*, 108.
11. Kivy specifically states: "...a present-day performance of any composition you like is historically authentic, in the sense of sonic authenticity, if it is close to or identical with the physical sound sequence of some past performance that, for whatever reason, we have chosen as our measure of historical authenticity." (Kivy, *Authenticities*, 48.) The tradeoff of such an experience is hearing it "in a historically inauthentic manner in getting us to hear historically." (Kivy, 72.) The paradox is a multiplicity of different authenticities, as Kivy sees it.
12. *ibid.*, 206.

13. see David Hume, *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 244-245, where he says “A critic of a different age or nation... must place himself in the same situation as the audience, in order to form a true judgment of the oration...”; and also Edward W. Said, *Musical Elaborations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991).

14. Kivy, *Authenticities*, 142.

15. Max Rudolph, *The Grammar of Conducting* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1993), 357.

16. Susanne K. Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key; a Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite and Art* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942), 215.

17. Duffin, *Performance Practice: Que Me Veux-tu?*

18. Kivy, *Authenticities*, 123.

19. *ibid.*, 123.

20. John Dewey, *Intelligence in the Modern World*, ed. Joseph Ratner (New York: Random House, 1939), 654, 615, 627.

21. Duffin, *Performance Practice: Que Me Veux-tu?*

22. Bennett Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989), 76.

23. If not, the many reproductions of the *Mona Lisa* would be aesthetically fulfilling enough to eliminate the need for the original altogether.

24. D. N. Perkins, "Art as Understanding," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 22 (1): 111-131.

25. Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education*, 54.

26. Kivy argues, at some length, about what a composer's "intent" really could be. I take a "composer's intentions" to be the physical sounds combined with a catalog of expressive performance gestures which, through performance, maintain the composer's compositional syntax. Bach, for instance, may have intended his *Prelude and Fugue in C* (BWV 846) to be performed on an imaginary instrument that is exactly like our modern concert-grand piano. This performance medium, however, is impossible in historical performance, because it does not belong, in syntax, to the catalog of possible instruments available to Bach. Intentions are only as valuable as people (in this case composers and their contemporary performers) have means to them.

27. Duffin, *Performance Practice: Que Me Veux-tu?*

28. Robert Cowan, "Never the Same Twice," *Gramophone* 73 (865): 15.

29. Duffin, *Performance Practice: Que Me Veux-tu?*

30. Here the reader is reminded of the mention of Gould as performer in Edward W. Said, *Musical Elaborations*, 23; where he speaks of the “pure performance enclave” Gould created in his later years out of the public eye. Such a case as Gould generates some worthy

questions about mode 2 authenticity. Any honest, self-originated performance is authentic in the second mode. Differences between Gould's different performances, or those between any other performer, are really not vagaries of authenticity, but variations in interpretation—as long as these performances, in theory, “belong to” the performer in question.

31. Kivy, *Authenticities*, 285.

32. Lewis Rowell, *Thinking About Music: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Music* (Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1983), 146.

33. Stephen Davies, *Musical Meaning and Expression* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994), 351.

34. Neumann, *Performance Practices of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, 6.

35. *ibid.*, 7.

36. *ibid.*, 1.

37. see Carl Dahlhaus, *Esthetics of Music*, Edited and translated by William W. Austin, original work published 1967 (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 11; where he confirms Neumann by saying, “Such an art [as music is] fulfills itself in activity.”

38. *ibid.*, 12.

39. The situation with professional orchestras, many times however, is different. The orchestra is made up of one artist (the conductor) with many artisans.

40. Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education*, 64.

41. *ibid.*, 140.

42. Peter Abbs, "Aesthetic Education: A Small Manifesto," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 23 (4): 75-85.

43. Charles Nauert Jr., *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 214

44. Bennett Reimer, “The experience of profundity in music,” *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 29 (4): 17.

45. See the article by Donald A. Hodges, "Why Are We Musical?," *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* 99: 7-22.

46. Neumann, *Performance Practices of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, xii.

47. John Dewey, *Art as Experience*, original work published 1932 (New York: Perigee Books, 1980), 54.