



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Moving early music: Improvisation and the work-concept in seventeenth-century French keyboard performance

Edwards, M.T.C.

Citation

Edwards, M. T. C. (2021, January 7). *Moving early music: Improvisation and the work-concept in seventeenth-century French keyboard performance*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/138943>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/138943>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/138943> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Edwards, M.T.C.

Title: Moving early music: Improvisation and the work-concept in seventeenth-century French keyboard performance

Issue Date: 2021-01-07

Chapter Six: Conclusion

Recapitulation

This study has been organized into several discrete portions, corresponding to different stages of working with a problem. In Chapter One, I detailed some of the larger issues—and possibilities—that come out of taking HIP seriously not only as an established tradition of musical performance, but also as a method of inquiry. I divided the larger field of HIP into two independent practices: HIP-as-method and HIP-as-tradition. HIP-as-method was described as an approach for developing new styles of performance, inspired by the past. By working with various kinds of historical evidence—treatises, sound recordings, instruments, etc.—performers are confronted with techniques and practices radically different from their own, leading to a defamiliarization of the performer's own musical practice; once familiar repertoire now also appears radically unfamiliar. Through creative engagement with historical evidence, the performer has the possibility of developing a new, refamiliarized style of performance that takes this evidence into account. I described HIP-as-tradition, meanwhile, in line with Taruskin (1995) and Butt (2002) as an oral musical tradition that now exists independently of HIP-as-method. Using Bourdieu's (2010) concepts of doxa, orthodoxy, and heterodoxy, I explained the mechanisms by which HIP-as-tradition continually influences and constrains the practice of HIP-as-method. I also proposed a number of concrete means by which performers might look to confront the doxa of tradition with their own heterodox practices, including the discovery of new historical evidence, new conceptual frames used to evaluate and understand existing historical evidence, and newly critical approaches to the performer's creative engagement with that evidence. While the first of these options remains perfectly suited to the still burgeoning field of nineteenth-century performance practice, I argued

that my own concern with music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries would be better served by the latter two.

I singled out the work-concept as one of the key limiting factors of HIP's critical frame. In line with Goehr (2007), I described the work-concept as regulative, exerting a powerful influence on the various practices that come under its purview, as well as on the performer's habitus. At the same time, I drew attention to the work-concept's historical contingency. Whether we accept Goehr's rough dating of 1800 or not, the fact remains that the work-concept did come into its regulative force at some point *in the past*. I argued that recognition of this fact would allow historically-informed performers to imagine alternative conceptualizations of music and music-making, including older practices, predating the work-concept, as well as newer practices, created in our own time. Furthermore, given the work-concept's powerful influence on musical practice, I stipulated that a simple bracketing of the concept would not be enough for performers to escape its continual pull. Rather, performers would also need to effect change in their habitus, in their unconscious ways of thinking, perceiving, and doing. I proposed that the best way to accomplish this would be through adopting new and unfamiliar practices to problematize and replace habitual ones.

I next considered some of the ways in which historically-informed performers work with historical evidence in order to cultivate new practices and styles of performance. By analogy with Hans-Jörg Rheinberger's (1997) theory of experimental systems, I described HIP-as-method as an experimental practice. According to this theory, the performer relies upon comparatively well-understood elements of the practice, called *technical objects*, in order to better understand the practice's unknown, vaguely-defined *epistemic things*. The distinction between the technical and the epistemic is thus a matter of function, and the same object, technique, or concept could therefore be understood in either capacity depending on the organization of the particular experimental system. I argued that in experimental practices like HIP, the boundaries between the technical and the epistemic can be

especially fluid, particularly since such practices involve the employment not only of declarative knowledge (“knowing-that”), but also of procedural knowledge (“knowing-how”). Understanding HIP as an experimental practice—or enacting it as a player—entails attending to the “dialectics between epistemicity and technicity” as it unfolds and develops in the player’s habitus (Rheinberger 2004, 4).

If a part of the function of HIP-as-method is to gain insight into the unknown, epistemic elements of one’s artistic practice, then HIP, I reasoned, must also be considered a form of artistic research. After weighing other scholars’ appraisal of HIP as artistic research, I argued that HIP’s acts of “re-creation” should also be understood as creative in their own right, and that engaging in HIP-as-method thus entails the generation of new knowledge, obtained through a process of artistic experimentation.

With these elements in place, I proposed the plan for my own study. This would first entail choosing a particular repertoire as a case study, and attempting to understand it—in its full historical specificity—apart from the work-concept. Without the work-concept, I argued, I would more easily be able to discern the concepts and practices that shaped and influenced the repertoire. After having identified these concepts and practices, I would then seek to understand them both intellectually and practically, subsequently internalizing them through practice and reshaping my own habitus as a performer. After having done this work, I would return to the repertoire with fresh eyes, ears, and hands, looking to understand and perform this music by engaging with it through my own experimental practice.

In Chapter Two, I documented as my chosen case study the music of seventeenth-century French harpsichordist and composer Jacques Champion de Chambonnières. I described some of the seemingly contradictory sources of evidence surrounding Chambonnières’s music. These included: contemporaneous accounts of his performing style, particularly his penchant for varying his pieces

each time he played them; his “authoritative” print of 1670; and the wide discrepancies—encompassing changes in rhythm, melodic contour, texture, and many other musical features—observed between the extant sources of Chambonnières’s music. I argued, in line with David Fuller (1993), that these conflicting sources of evidence could only be explained by a set of concepts, ideals, and practices removed from the work-concept. To that end, I examined several of the competing imperatives at play in the performance culture of the *clavecinistes*. Among these might have been something like *Stiltreue*, a fidelity to musical style. Such a notion, I argued, explains far better than *Werktreue* the function of an exemplary text like Chambonnières’s 1670 print amidst the wider “heterotextual” corpus of sources for Chambonnières’s music. Exemplary texts seek to capture a particular style of performance through notation, and they enjoin other performers to re-create their general style of performance, if not their specific readings. I argued, however, that if *Stiltreue* were indeed at work in seventeenth-century France, its importance within professional life would have been greatly eclipsed by other ideals, particularly *bienséance* and personal authenticity. These ideals better explain practices like those observed in D’Anglebert’s autograph manuscript Rés-89ter, in which D’Anglebert appropriates a variety of musical sources, including many keyboard pieces by Chambonnières, into his own style of performance.

I then argued that the practice of the *clavecinistes* would have also held strong implications for their understanding of the identity of a piece of music. The temptation as contemporary observers might be to try to define a minimal set of compositional features of any given piece, defined as a kind of skeletal score, such that this minimally defined score could be varied in performance. The problem, however, is that the variance observed in the sources for Chambonnières’s music encompasses nearly every conceivable musical parameter, such that it becomes impossible to distinguish rigidly between the composition’s essential and non-essential elements. Just as the practice of the *clavecinistes* relied on loose, porous boundaries between composerly and performerly

personas, so too was the boundary between a piece's composition and its subsequent performances a flexible one. Pursuing a line of reasoning by Nicholas Cook (1999), I put forward that each performance entailed a unique *seeing and hearing through* the score, with each individual performer deciding on the piece's essential and contingent features. Moreover, this *seeing and hearing through* operated within a heterotextual field, wherein a given piece could be represented by many different texts at once. Without the work-concept, I argued, it becomes much more challenging to adjudicate the kinds of activity that secure a piece's identity through the vagaries of performance.

Ultimately, I proposed that a better model for this complexity of practice could be borrowed from the study of orality. In particular, I relied upon Paul Zumthor's (1972) concept of *mouvance* for understanding the ways in which a piece's identity could shift, change, and evolve in performance. Following a discussion of *mouvance* by Gregory Nagy (1996), I then explored the ways in which a piece's "moving" identity could be valued and appreciated by cultural participants—performers, composers, audience members, and other tastemakers. I also highlighted the flexible boundaries of *mouvance*. A piece's "movement" might be valued positively if it operated according to accepted standards of practice and took place within an authorized setting; it might potentially be "broken," however, if moved by an unauthorized performer, or otherwise moved in a negatively-valued way. Finally, I argued that all of the evidence encountered thus far pointed to the centrality within Chambonnières's artistic practice of improvisation, which I defined provisionally as *composition-in-performance*. His practice of "oral composition," without the aid of notation, could therefore be seen as the exercise of his improvisational skill, as could the subsequent *mouvance* of his music. In this light, the heterotextual corpus of Chambonnières's music could also be read productively as an *entextualization* of improvisational practice, removed from its original living context and frozen in notation. I proposed therefore an archaeological engagement with these texts, working to re-embodiment the improvisational techniques contained within them.

In Chapter Three, then, I turned towards developing a conceptual understanding of improvisation as practiced during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Western Europe, a field often termed *historical improvisation studies*. I began by developing a more complete (if still provisional) definition of improvisation. I focused particularly on Benson's (2003) understanding of improvisation, which he defines in a broad way as the reworking of something that already exists. The specific nature of any improvisational practice thus depends on what is being reworked, and how that reworking takes place. I continued by reviewing two of the most significant music-theoretical paradigms for explaining improvisational skill during the Baroque, the schema and the *Satzmodell*. I understood both of these paradigms to represent the "something" that might be reworked through improvisation, albeit each with its own particular emphasis. While the *Satzmodell* could best be described as a compositional model, the schema also implies a kind of communication between performer and audience, sharing a common musical language. Both of these paradigms effectively explain the plausibility of the improvisation of complex music, each providing the structural basis for the improvisation of a sounding musical surface. I then discussed some of the pedagogical materials used by eighteenth-century students to learn improvisation. In particular, I highlighted the extraordinary effectiveness of instruction via *partimento*, a bass line with or without figures used to represent and encapsulate a composition. I discussed the ways that *partimento* was used in Neapolitan conservatories to teach students a useful collection of schemata, as well as techniques—like diminution strategies—for working with these schemata to create music. This method of instruction also created powerful and lasting links for those students between composition, improvisation, and the practice of thoroughbass. Admittedly, the musical world of eighteenth-century Naples is far removed from that of seventeenth-century France. The detailed research into *partimento* undertaken by Gjerdingen, Sanguinetti, and others serves, nevertheless, as an essential starting point in approaching the hitherto less clearly understood practice of performer-

composer-improvisers like Chambonnières.

Pivoting to contemporary practice, I examined a number of recent studies of historical improvisation technique. I drew particular attention here to Callahan's (2010) hierarchical conception of improvisational practice, consisting of three discrete tiers: at the top, the *dispositio*, or form of the piece, conceived as a series of cadential waypoints; in the middle, the *elaboratio*, consisting of a collection of voice-leading frameworks rather like schemata or *Satzmodelle*; and at the bottom, the *decoratio*, or the musical surface, created through the skillful application of diminution technique to the *elaboratio*. I also drew attention to the model proposed by the *Compendium Improvisation* (Schwenkreis 2018), in which musical repertoire and improvisational technique work in constant dialogue; repertoire may be analyzed and schematized, and this schematization may itself be reworked into a new repertoire. In this way, budding improvisers are encouraged to develop their own musical language, a personal collection of improvisational techniques and models. Taken together, these accounts paint a detailed picture of the materials and methods that performers might use to re-create historical, improvised practices. I then explored how these more general pedagogical methods, primarily geared towards German and Italian styles, might be adapted for re-creating highly specific improvisational practices from the French Baroque. To that end, I relied significantly on Grazzini's (2014) work on the improvisation of *préludes non mesurés*. I argued that, even if there is only very little historical evidence from seventeenth-century France for the role of thoroughbass and partimento in the pedagogy of composition and improvisation, it would be reasonable to imagine that the *clavecinistes* might have employed similar—and similarly effective—methods.

In Chapter Four, I moved from a theoretical understanding of improvisation to a practical one. I documented and analyzed my own efforts in learning to improvise in an historically-informed style, modeled after the style of Chambonnières. I focused my efforts on the twenty-seven courantes from Chambonnières's two published books of harpsichord pieces, using them as a corpus of exemplars

to play, analyze, and rework. I described this approach as “inductive,” moving from specific exemplars, via analysis and experimentation, to a set of techniques, principles, and methods that could guide my improvisational activity. Lacking any contemporaneous “how-to” manuals that might otherwise enable a “deductive” approach to improvisation, I argued that this inductive path would be one of the only ways of re-creating Chambonnières’s improvisational style in its full historical specificity.

I introduced a method of working with the corpus that would not only transform its compositional materials into improvisational procedures, but also “move” my own aesthetic sensibility as a performer and improviser. I began by describing my initial analytic frame, including a wide variety of models, schemata, and techniques gathered in Chapter Three. I then showed how this frame could be brought into contact with the corpus through performance, analysis, reflection, and experimentation. I described a number of exercises I developed for fostering a practical engagement with the corpus. Apart from playing through the pieces as written to “soak up their style,” I transposed and transformed them into a variety of partimento exercises, represented either by simple unfigured bass lines or as “rhythmic” partimenti. Throughout, I relied upon a working method borrowed from my own lessons with Rudolf Lutz, in which my improvisational work would be divided into a variety of discrete phases. Each of these phases was marked by differing degrees of premeditation or reflection, but they all depended upon some kind of pre-existing material to be reworked through improvisation. I also designed a number of exercises to isolate specific schemata I had identified within the corpus. Taken together, these exercises were intended to cultivate my intuition as an improviser, an “informed intuition” based upon my embodied, artistic experience, and upon which I could rely in performance. I then showed how this informed intuition could interact with a music-theoretical analysis through the medium of performance. I described the ways in which a schematic analysis could be re-enacted, tested, and critiqued, leading to change and

development in my own method of analysis. I showed how my understanding of certain schemata, like the double cadence, could evolve when confronted with appropriate exemplars from the corpus. As I demonstrated, my analytic frame and practical work at the keyboard thus participated in a constant dialogue, each influencing the other as I moved towards deeper engagement with the materials of the corpus. This feedback loop between analysis and practice also led to new insight surrounding issues of form and modulation in Chambonnières's pieces; for example, I developed a close attention to his use of characteristic intervallic patterns above the bass to signal particular modulatory paths.

Ultimately, I relied on tools from computational musicology (music21) in order to continue to transform the corpus from its frozen, entextualized form to a living, re-embodied improvisational practice. I first designed a method of encoding my schematic analyses of the corpus. Using this system, I constructed a virtual *zibaldone*, enabling comparisons of a wide variety of different realizations of the same schemata. I also wrote several short programs to create randomized, customizable partimento exercises. Similar to the partimenti of Durante, these exercises transformed my improvisational routine into something like solving a puzzle, or playing a game. Eventually, I designed a simple computational model of improvisational decision-making. The model represented decisions improvisers might make about form and modulation, as observed in the corpus. Using the model, I was able to generate a limitless supply of novel partimento exercises. My work with these exercises—which represent, implicitly, a kind of tacit, improvisational knowledge—was yet another way of developing my informed intuition about improvisational behavior in Chambonnières's style.

Chapter Five returned to the performance culture of the *clavecinistes*, as explored in Chapter Two. Here, I sought to understand music not as a fixed and finished product, but rather as an active process. Using concepts borrowed from Deleuze and Guattari, and from DeLanda, I attempted to sketch a picture of music as an activity, as becoming rather than being. If we understand the shaping

of a piece's identity as driven not by the work-concept, but rather by *mouvance*, then, I argued, we must also understand *mouvance* as movement, as a process or activity occurring over time. I argued moreover that improvisation was an ideal setting in which to explore this process. In improvisation, the stratified relations of musical practice could be deterritorialized, creating an exciting space of potentiality for the improviser to explore and experiment with. This is the space in which a piece's unfolding identities form, shift, and move. It is also the space in which my own experimental practice as an historically-informed performer can be brought to bear. I elected then to construct a short musical suite of dance movements in which I could experiment with *mouvance* from an improvisational standpoint, each movement exploring a different facet of the possibilities of *mouvance* within the culture of the *clavicinistes*.

Beginning with the *Prélude*, I examined the improvisational practice of French baroque preluding as pure activity, prior to the formation of lasting identity. Using a prelude in F by Louis Couperin as the raw material for my improvisational reworking, I examined the extent to which the prelude could be changed or moved at a variety of levels of structure. I argued that working with this prelude encouraged a relatively deterritorialized approach, in which the improviser brings the musical surface into conversation with its structure. Ultimately, I showed how the prelude privileges the improviser's activity of reworking over the specific materials being reworked. The prelude, then, was seen as a genre in which diverse musical influences might mix and co-mingle. In such a practice, the improviser is really improvising more with the tradition of preluding itself than with any specific set of musical materials.

In the *Allemande*, I showed how the deterritorialized space of improvisation could lead to new, experiential understanding of a piece's *mouvance*, or its potential range of identities. Through a process of experimentation, I probed the extent to which a piece could be 'moved' before becoming 'broken.' I argued that this experimental practice was not just a way of uncovering potential

identities of a piece, but also of developing an understanding of what performance might be. This should be understood as HIP-as-method put into practice, wherein I sought to re-create the *clavicinistes*' practice of "performing a piece" through movement of my own aesthetic sensibility.

In the *Courante I*, I re-created the seventeenth-century French practice of playing *doubles*. I understood this as yet another kind of *mouvance*, in which the piece's "original" identity, as conceived by the composer of the piece, could be juxtaposed with its "moved" identity, created by the performer. In the *Interlude*, I examined in greater detail some of the practical constraints that limit the scope of a piece's *mouvance*. In particular, I highlighted the practice of thoroughbass as an essential component of the web of practices defining the *clavicinistes*' idea of performance. Recognizing these constraints, in the *Courante II* I examined what became possible for the piece's *mouvance* when such limits are removed. I argued that a piece's broken performance could be more positively valued as the creation of a new piece, with a new set of potential identities.

Finally, in the *Sarabande*, I examined how *mouvance* did once—and still can—function as a living, aural, oral practice. I reflected on a performance by Skip Sempé and showed how it could move a piece, as well as how Sempé's performance might figure within my own performance practice. Moreover, I drew attention to the ways in which the ephemeral, un-notateable aspects of performance—tone color, timing, touch, dynamic, etc.—also contribute vitally to the shaping of a piece's range of identities.

Discussion and Conclusions

Returning to the scene I set at the very beginning of this study, I think that I can now better articulate what so unsettled me in that violin masterclass. The work-concept—along with its related practices and ideals like *Werktreue*—enacts powerful constraints on the actions not just of performers, but of virtually all cultural participants. Composers, performers, and audience members

understand their mutual relations in a highly stratified way, wherein the composer creates or discovers the work, the performer executes or interprets the work, and the audience finally receives it. This model imagines fixed objects or products of music-making—works—and orients all of musical practice around them. As a result, it denies practices that destabilize these stratified relations. HIP, in its participation in a variety of work-concept-centered practices, is thus also complicit in enforcing the boundaries between right interpretation and wrong, good taste and poor, composer and performer, master and intellectually passive student.

What right did this master violinist have to dismiss the original, creative interpretation of the student? From the perspective of HIP-as-tradition, she had every right. She could appeal to her own authority as a master practitioner of her art. Moreover, the tradition in which she practiced was also guided by that same ideal, *Werktreue*, that informed her criticism of the student. From the perspective of HIP-as-method, however, we see that the master had very little cause to invoke the work-concept, even implicitly. HIP-as-method instead demands a questioning of those very ideals upon which the master relied, along with a deep attention to historical interpretation and experimentation to justify the method's results.

My purpose in carrying out this research has always been to expand HIP's potential as a generator of new styles and performance options. As historically-informed performers, we have powerful tools at our disposal to uncover doxa within performance culture, and subsequently, to propose heterodox alternatives. HIP enables this through its construction of new experimental practices that respond to new historical evidence, to new ways of looking at old evidence, and to new ways of imaginatively engaging with that evidence. HIP enables us to imagine and re-create radically unfamiliar modes of interacting with familiar music. By this same logic, HIP should then also reject any uncritical attempts to re-instate the authority of the work-concept. Despite the allure of HIP-as-tradition, HIP-as-method should stand independently, looking toward alternative ways of

conceptualizing and making music.

Historically-informed approaches to performance are already remarkably diverse, and I am therefore hesitant to overly generalize. Nevertheless, these approaches—pedagogical approaches, in particular—do betray the influence of the work-concept by the things they take for granted. *Why would I change these perfectly fine notes, rhythms, and ornaments when I have this autograph manuscript, this print supervised by the composer, this marvelous scholarly edition?* They prioritize the objects and products of music—the musical works and the artifacts purporting to represent them—above the processes by which these works might have—and might still—come to life in performance. In this way, the work-concept enforces a uniformity of musical practice focused upon these finished products, foreclosing alternative possibilities that might stem from active, ongoing, and embodied processes of musical and intellectual creativity.

A central contribution of this study, then, is in its application of the techniques of historical improvisation (process) to the performance of musical repertoire (product). Historical improvisation has grown into a vital musical tradition of its own, sustained by several leading institutions—most notably the Schola Cantorum in Basel—and practiced throughout the world. It has also developed its own characteristic language and set of techniques, bridging the work of music theorists and performers as they collectively seek to explain and re-create improvisational practices from the past. Despite these advancements, however, historical improvisation remains a kind of niche activity within the wider practice of HIP. Few historically-informed performers learn to improvise, and for those that do, their improvisational skill has little impact on their performance of repertoire. Improvisation has been ghettoized within ordinary concert life, restricted to a handful of particular situations such as cadenzas, varied reprises, and imaginative continuo accompaniments. And yet, improvisation should change everything! Improvisational practice has the potential to create a profound impact on how one understands a score, piece, work, or performance.

It might be tempting to boil down the results of these preceding chapters to a cliché: *play it as if you were improvising it*. Doing so, however, risks eroding one of the central aims of HIP-as-method, of searching for not a single performance alternative, but many. My goal here was to increase my sensitivity as a performer to the uniqueness of the cultures into which I seek imaginative entry. The goal was not to understand improvisation and performance in a general way, but in a *highly specific* way, at a particular time and place, and practiced by specific people in specific instrumental idioms. In my chosen case study of Chambonnières's music, I discovered a model of performance that embraced a continual flux of musical identity, a *mouvance*. By re-creating some of the practices associated with the *clavecinistes*, particularly improvisational practices, my usual understanding of performance also "moved." The activity of performance had been defamiliarized through an encounter with historical materials, and subsequently refamiliarized through experimentation. My own aesthetic sensibility had been "moved" as well, forming an altered set of intuitions, ideals, and attitudes towards performance. Like the *mouvance* of a piece by Chambonnières, though, this movement within my own artistic practice cannot ever be a fixed and finished product. Instead, it is itself an ongoing process of change and development as I continue to engage in defamiliarizing encounters with musical material. I developed this new approach by diving deeply into a very specific historical period, geographical locale, and cultural milieu, such that the cultural practice of the *clavecinistes* could be appreciated in its full, radical otherness. As such, this research could also serve as a kind of heterodox provocation to the pervasive orthodoxy of HIP-as-tradition. There are alternatives to the work-concept, and recognizing these alternatives will lead to new ways of appreciating, understanding, and performing music from the past.

There is, however, one cliché I find quite apropos: *the process is more important than the result*. More specifically, the experimental practice of HIP-as-method is more important than the specific styles of performance that come out of it. In my own study, I created one provisional style of

performance. It came about by way of a specific combination of sources of evidence and working methods, but also—critically—by way of my own aesthetic sensibility. But it could have all turned out differently! Artistic research like this cannot be divorced easily from the aesthetic sensibility from which it receives validation. My own starting point as a performer and improviser, along with my specific trajectory through the experimental practice described in this study, are inseparably entangled with the resulting style of performance. This does not, however, invalidate the research. Rather, it provides a model for other historically-informed performers to re-create on their own. New performers may draw from other sources of evidence, or interpret the evidence differently, or light upon alternative practices with which to experiment. They will also approach whatever practices they do adopt with their own set of preferences, experiences, and perspectives. All of these deviations from my own course should then also lead to new styles of performance or improvisation, new understandings of *mouvance* and musical identity. These unique, heterodox results will also be grounded in their performers' unique aesthetic sensibilities. What they will all share, though, is their common experimental practice, rooted in HIP-as-method.

But why stop at Chambonnières? Without the work-concept, how might performers, composers, and improvisers have understood the formation of musical identity at different times, and in different places? It would be very useful to extend the results of this study to other repertoires, or to other instruments. The free works of the North German organ school—the preludia of Buxtehude, for example— would be an excellent place to start. As a number of musicologists and performers have demonstrated, Buxtehude's preludia are clearly linked to contemporaneous improvisational practices.¹⁵⁷ A number of organists have also quite successfully re-created these practices for

¹⁵⁷ Dodds (2006), for example, shows the clear linkage between Buxtehude's contrapuntal technique in his free works and the improvisation pedagogy of Andreas Werckmeister.

themselves.¹⁵⁸ It would be instructive to bring this improvisational practice to bear on re-creating a seventeenth-century North German culture of performance and musical identity.

Another avenue might be to explore alternative sets of practices and concepts. In the present study, for example, my work centered on the notion of a “piece” as understood by the *clavicinistes*, and I connected this concept to related concepts of performance and improvisation. As I hinted in Chapter Two in my discussion of D’Anglebert’s reworking and appropriation of lute music, it might also be fruitful to explore the related concept and practice of transcription. What kinds of novel transcription techniques might be discovered or invented without the influence of the work-concept? And how might these techniques affect the shaping of a piece’s developing identities? Given that transcription has been understood in so many diverse ways, it would be interesting as well to compare a variety of approaches to transcription as recreated by historically-informed performers.

The vision of HIP proposed in this study should also carry strong implications for pedagogical practice. As I described it in Chapter One, the training of young historically-informed performers is often a matter of preserving tradition. Students learn by imitating their teachers, striving to re-create the sounds and techniques of their teachers’ musical practice, but not necessarily the methods by which those historically-informed sounds might have originated. If HIP is to be taught not only as a tradition but also as a method, then it is vital that students learn to go beyond simply re-creating their teachers’ example. They must also genuinely learn to *innovate*, to offer their own heterodox alternatives to the present state of performance practice. Within my own pedagogical practice as a teacher of harpsichord and basso continuo, I have learned to notice the tension playing out within lessons between tradition’s stabilizing influence and students’ desire for innovation. As I offer them

¹⁵⁸ Organist William Porter is a particularly good example, and he has also described the process of teaching improvisation in this style (Porter 2000).

guidance on their artistic and professional development, I teach them to play by tradition's rules, but also to become aware of the doxa lurking behind those rules. At the same time, I also attempt to instill in them a practical engagement with the methods of HIP, so that they may eventually propose their own innovations, updates, and alternatives. As Chapter Five particularly demonstrated, the approach developed in this study enables a dialogue between tradition and innovation, and it proposes concrete methods of effecting this dialogue. Rather than breaking wholly with tradition, such an approach encourages the deterritorialization of the boundaries of tradition, such that tradition itself might also be "moved." If HIP-as-method is to remain a vital, living part of the early music movement—and not just an historical relic that led to the musical tradition we enjoy today—then it must also be taught to new generations of historically-informed performers. In this respect, I believe this study offers a useful model for teachers wishing to foster the methods of HIP, and for students wishing to embrace them.

Finally, careful readers will have noted that I have largely skirted issues of audience reception in this study. I *have* examined in depth my own developing understanding of my role as a performer. I have not, however, gone on to ask questions that deal with how my performance relates to those who hear it. If I "move" a piece in the ways described in Chapter Five, will the audience accept and validate my efforts? Will the audience still recognize this as "the same" piece? Will the audience even understand what I am attempting to do? I have sidestepped such questions here because of the way in which I understand HIP-as-method. The experimental practice I constructed is primarily in service of performance *preparation*. Like a laboratory, the practice room provides a controlled environment for HIP-as-method, in which the performer might take risks that could never be dared in live performance. A live performance is more like a field experiment, in which the uncontrollable, unpredictable audience interacts with and influences both performer and performance. The lived experience of performance is, of course, an essential part of the informed intuition that guides

performers as they make decisions in the practice room. Nevertheless, live performance, by virtue of its unpredictable nature, will often go beyond the scope of anything the performer imagined or prepared for. Dealing with audience reception is therefore a natural next step for research such as mine. Live performance can be the space in which HIP-as-tradition comes into contact with new, heterodox practices developed through HIP-as-method. Indeed, each time I perform Chambonnières in public, this is precisely what happens. Each performance offers a unique opportunity for negotiation: between the work-concept and *mouvance*, between my own musical personality and Chambonnières's, between the audience's expectations and my desire to share something that challenges them. In this way, the study presented here will remain ongoing, so long as audiences remain willing to listen.