Continuity and Discontinuity in the Revival of Sixteenth-Century Music

William Weber

I wish here to speak in broad terms about the problem of continuity and discontinuity implicit in the performance of sixteenth-century music after 1800. The great majority of the works from the sixteenth century that came back into performance had never been done since that time. One might say either that a massive discontinuity occurred in their performing histories, or, more accurately, that a revival of old works occurred that was truly extraordinary within the Western musical tradition. Since it had not been conventional (though not unknown) for works to remain in use long after the death of the composer, the performance of music by such composers as Palestrina and Lasso must be considered as a fundamental innovation in musical culture. The exceptions to the rule – most of all, the repertory of the Sistine Chapel – served as important lines of continuity between the old and the new orders in this area of musical culture.

But did any traditions persist between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries that retained any sense of this music? Did nineteenth-century people simply pick up these works and play them as entirely new phenomena? Can we see any lines of continuity that made revival of the music happen? I will discuss three avenues of continuity: the principle of craft, the continuing performance of old works, and the practice of collecting. In doing so I am attempting to suggest an agenda of the kinds of questions we might ask, and the lines by which we might try to answer them. What notions of craft – that of the 'master composer' most of all – came out of the sixteenth century for use in the nineteenth? Did any music remain in performance during that time? And what kinds of traditions

— *La Renaissance et sa musique au XIXe siècle,* éd. Philippe Vendrix, CESR, Tours, 2004, pp. 239-252 —

did there persist among those who collected music? What I suggest here has by nature to be sketchy and preliminary – indeed, unnerving in the vast amount of ground it must cover historically – but it hopefully could contribute to the development of this field.

Perhaps the most important point of this paper is that to discuss the revival of Renaissance music during the nineteenth century we have to look deeply into the structures of canon that existed in any sense within musical culture during the intervening centuries. It is not that musicians simply decided to revive works of the 1550s in the 1850s, for they could not do that outside of long-standing structures that existed within musical culture that undergirded its relationship to the past and gave it memory. Even though prior to the early eighteenth century or more that memory was a fragmentary one, and not possessed of great canonic authority, it did exist, and it was through such traditions that figures such as Kiesewetter and Fétis did their work. To understand the revival of Palestrina's music we have to look at comparable, earlier traditions that existed for Frescobaldi, Tallis, Byrd, Purcell, Hændel, J. S. Bach, Pergolesi, and Gluck, to name but a few.

The principle of *craft* is the most important way by which we can trace a continuity from the sixteenth century to the revival of its works after 1800. During the sixteenth century a set of traditions became established that put respect for the master composer on a new plane, now as a matter of judgment that began to take historical reference-points. But such judgments did not involve repertory, the performance of music after the death of the composer, except in occasional contexts. Katherine Bergeron has laid down the theoretical basis of this principle in the introduction to *Disciplining Music*: 'It matters little whether we conceive of a canon as a scale, a body of law, or a pantheon of great authors and their works; the effect in every case is the same. The canon, always in view, promotes decorum, ensures proper conduct. The individual within a field learns, by internalizing such standards, how not to transgress.'[1] Rob C. Wegman has put that kind of approach into historical practice in his work on Obrecht and the use of the term 'composer' in legal contracts with musicians.[2] Thus by the late sixteenth century the names of composers – Josquin Desprez, Palestrina,

1 Katherine Bergeron and Philip Bohlman, *Disciplining Music: Musicology and its Canons,* Chicago, 1997, p. 5. See also *Canons,* ed. von Hallberg, especially Barbara Herrnstein Smith, "Contingencies of Value," Charles Altieri, "An Idea and Ideal of a Literary Canon," and Gerald L. Bruns, "Canon and Power in the Hebrew Scriptures."

2 Rob C. Wegman, "From Maker to Composer: Improvisation and Musical Authorship in the Low Countries, 1450-1500," *JAMS,* 59 (1996), pp. 409-79 and *The Life and Masses of Jacob Obrecht* (Oxford, 1994).

Tallis and Byrd – were revered as their predecessors had not. The problem is to establish just how far that went without exaggerating its extent.

What came out of the sixteenth century was, in Bergeron's terms, a pedagogical canon rooted in the tradition of musical craft, and based in the most prominent cathedrals and chapels. It involved the teaching of performance and composition in learned fashion, and as such brought into play in certain limited ways older musical practices, styles or works. Through this means, assumptions and practices of musical craft took on stronger historical reference-points during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Aspects of pedagogy and composition acquired a clearer sense of a musical past and a certain reverence for a number of earlier composers. One could say that the canon of craft in music became historicized, even though there was as yet very little repertory one could call music.

The notion of the master composer emerged as a pedagogical tradition, within the emulation of works by the most honored composers of a time. Though short-range in historical perspective, these practices stood at the core of the canonic sensibility that evolved in the early modern period. As Wegman's work on the late fifteenth century suggests, there developed a pride in the role of the composer to some degree separate from that of the performer. Musicians wished to honor their forebears and thereby their profession as a whole. Such canonic thinking developed most prominently within courts and cathedrals where music was of the highest esteem and priority. In such contexts musicians tended to look back to a particular extent to the great masters of a few previous generations.

Nevertheless, the direct emulation and parody of older works were not practiced in similar ways or to comparable extents everywhere. Different countries developed quite different practices by which they dealt with old works or old styles. Two contrasting tendencies emerged, a difference between an organicism and an objectivism in relating to music of earlier periods or styles. On the one hand, in Italy, Austria and most parts of Germany there developed composing traditions usually known as the *stile antico*, that incorporated older styles into new ones. On the other hand, in Britain after the sixteenth century, and in France after the arrival of Lully, works remained in performance with relatively little compositional process going on between new and old styles. Basically, we do not find the *style antico* in France and Britain as we do so significantly in Germany or Italy, indeed, central and eastern Europe generally. The fact that the French and English courts established themselves as states earliest had a lot to do with these developments. The processes by which statehood were established – by civil war, partisan politics, and intense ideological struggle – had a lot to do with the canonization of Byrd and Lully.

The *stile antico* grew out of the separation of old and new styles at the end of the sixteenth century. It was by nature canonic, since it established a right practice to which it attributed a musical and intellectual authority; indeed, it defined the relationship of new to old. But it did not involve either the study or the performance of old works; ultimately it did not dichotomize the new and the old. It involved the composition of music in formal polyphonic styles, sometimes for church music and sometimes as academic works written to be studied rather than performed. While it was often said that it followed Palestrina's style, that was usually not the case, since practitioners introduced characteristics either of the present or of intervening periods. If the rules were drawn from the music of any one composer it was Girolamo Frescobaldi, and even then they absorbed more recent techniques so that by the turn of the eighteenth century the style had only vague similarity with music of the sixteenth century.[3] In Bologna during the late seventeenth century the Accademia dei Filharmonici, a kind of guild-*cum*-learned society, schooled its members in such a style, and in fact required applicants to prove themselves in it. As such, the organization fits precisely Bergeron's idea of discipline and control as essential to canon.

Thus did the past persist in musical life in a way distinctive of the early modern period: the *stile antico* provided musical culture its strongest historical principle, its clearest enduring reference-point to the past, even though that did not involve performance of old music.[4] While the *stile antico* contained a certain historical consciousness, it was not the origin of any repertories. It was indeed the exact opposite of repertory; it was a style rather than a set of great works, and as such swallowed up its antecedents to form a set of historically amorphous practices. In fact, it was in exactly those countries where the *stile antico* did *not* become significant where performing repertories of old works developed the earliest. If the *stile antico* was found chiefly in Italy and Germany, early repertories emerged for the most part first of all in Britain and France, where composition in the antique style was unusual.

Still, the *stile antico* established a close relationship between historical awareness and the process of stylistic change among learned composers in the areas where it

3 On the persistence of learned appreciation of Frescobaldi, see Friedrich W. Riedel, "The Influence and Tradition of Frescobaldi's Works in the Transalpine Countries," *Frescobaldi Studies*, ed. Alexander Silberger, Durham, 1987, pp. 218-32.

4 Christoph Wolff, *Der stile antico in der Musik J.S.Bachs: Studien zu Bachs Spätwerk*, Wiesbaden, 1968; K.G. Fellerer, *Das Palestrinastil und seine Bedeutung in der vokalen Kirchenmusik des 18. Jts.*, Augsburg, 1929; Thomas Day, "Echoes of Palestrina's *Missa ad fugam* in the Eighteenth Century," *JAMS*, 24 (1971), pp. 462-69; Anthony Newcomb, "When the *stile antico* was Young,"*Proceedings of the International Musicological Society*, Bologna, 1987. I am indebted to Laura Callegari Hill for her advice on the Bolgonese Academy.

was practiced. Even though it did not give birth to performing repertories, it did bring about a strong consciousness of older styles as a learned instrument, and that principle was to become central to the canonic traditions in Italy, Austria and Germany. The teaching of counterpoint established by J. J. Fux in the early eighteenth century came out of this tradition. From the historical consciousness of his pedagogy grew the sense of the master composer as skilled polyphonist by which J. S. Bach was defined as the most important figure of this kind.

In England and France the musical pedagogy of the cathedrals never developed such a set of practices. In England the polyphonic style of late sixteenth century had a much more continous performing tradition, and from at least the 1730s Pepusch and his students were teaching both from 'ancient' models and the fugues of J. S. Bach. In France the relatively homophonic nature of the indigenous court style worked against the development of an academic polyphonic tradition along the lines of the Italian practice. The humanist tradition – seen best in the writings of Le Cerf de la Viéville – remained vocal in its hostility against the scholasticism its proponents saw in fugue. The music of Lully filled this gap in the country's sense of its musical past. It would seem that his trios were employed as central teaching tools during the eighteenth century.

Despite the major differences we have seen between the two parts of Europe, an idea of the master composer was basic to musical life in both regions. We can extend what Rob Wegman has argued for the late fifteenth century to a notion that constituted what French historians would call the *longue durée* within musical culture: a respect for the composer thought both learned and artful in his skills of composition. The roots of musical canon in this craft tradition bound it intimately with the polyphonic tradition, especially sacred polyphony. If one can speak of any distinctly musical principle lying behind the authority of musical canon in the last four centuries, it has been to maintain respect for the discipline in the compositional process, though not necessarily through learned counterpoint.

Pedagogic canons such as those of Fux that were established in the early modern period helped reshape musical life during the nineteenth century. Romantic thought by no means eliminated the principle of craft from musical thinking. Craft is central to the writings of Robert Schumann, who often played the pedagogue to other composers in invoking canonic models: As he said in one context, 'There is always a difference between master and disciple. The quickly tossed-off pianoforte sonatas of Beethoven, and still more those of Mozart, in their heavenly grace, exhibit the same degree of mastery that do their deeper revelations.'[5]

The respect for the master composer thus provided an important line of continuity between the epochs before and after the rise of performed, canonic repertories, and also between the musical past and present generally. That may be why, even though the rise of musical classics transformed musical taste so profoundly during the nineteenth century, nonetheless there was relatively little sense of a major contradiction between new music and old until militant avant-garde groups arose at the end of the century, and they themselves did not reject the classics categorically. At that time, just as in the sixteenth century, the notion of musical craft was inclusive rather than exclusive: it gathered together a tradition of defining what was often called the 'perfection' of music, whether it be new or old

The other two lines of continuity between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries, repertories and collections, had much more fragmented histories. These are two quite different traditions: on the one hand, bodies of works performed with some regularity, and, on the other hand, music collected by private individuals. The one was directed by performing musicians, the other by gentlemen, by *érudits*. We will, however, see that in some cases the two structures did come together – when a collector contributed music to a concert institution enabling the performance of a work that had existed in collection. And in a few cases, François Fétis most notably, a collector became a concert promoter. During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the two traditions came full circle to resemble one another in the public performance of works that had had almost no performing history.

The tradition of repertory was the basis upon which the tradition of what came to be called 'classical music' became established. Virtually all such works performed by orchestras, choruses, soloists, and chamber-music ensembles had had continuing performing histories. Rarely was a work brought back into performance after more than a generation or two of disuse. When that did happen, usually it came back as part of the *oeuvre* of a composer such as Hændel whose prominence stimulated wider exploration of his music.

A big question faces us immediately: did a 'performing canon' develop in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries? A lot more systematic research needs to be done before a firm answer is possible on this problem. One conclusion does seems solid, however: that a performed canon developed in the Sistine Chapel by the last decades of the sixteenth century. The amount and the variety of old works performed there is impressive, judging from what Anthony Cummings

5 Robert SCHUMANN, *Of Music and Musicians*, tr. Paul ROSENFELD, New York, 1946, p. 74.

and Jeffrey Dean have shown thus far.[6] Moreover, a canon must have a definition as a unity in aesthetic and ideological terms, a structure that Palestrina's music obtained, at least in people's eyes, through its association with the musical politics pronounced by the Council of Trent. Thus the first canonically-defined musical culture was distinctively Italian, to be followed early in the seventeenth-century by the rise of the *stile antico* and other uses of old-fashioned idioms, the madrigal among them.

Musicologists are aware of cases where works of sacred music remained in use inconspicuously over long periods of time. Localism was indeed the rule in such practices, for there developed idiosyncratic performing traditions where a work remained in use on a particular feast day. These conventions might have canonic implications if they came from a still renowned master composer. The *Miserere mei* by Gregorio Allegri was the best-known example; it was always done at the Sistine Chapel at *Tenebrae* in Holy Week. It did pick up stronger canonic associations as time passed: in 1734 the young Horace Walpole called the Allegri 'the greatest work ever known' in a letter to a friend.[7]

By the same token, some of the more prosperous composers left endowments for performance of their works *in perpetuum*. Francesco Cavalli, for example, left one after his death in 1676 for one of his requiem masses to be sung twice annually in his memory.[8] The recognition of such men as master composers lent a certain air of canonicity to the endowed performances. Nevertheless, it is clear that these works constituted repertory rather than canon, if we might draw upon Joseph Kerman's argument that the two must be carefully separated.[9] They remained in use for reasons specific to the occasion rather than for being part of a larger critical canon of great works.

Some scores and parts of a few composers also remained in printed editions. Interestingly enought, this occurred to secular works as well as sacred. Several chansons of Josquin remained in editions through the 1660s, as did many in that genre by Jacques Arcadelt, whose *First Book of Madrigals* was reprinted as late as 1654. almost eighty years after his death.[10] It is problematic what musicians did

6 Anthony Cummings, "Toward an Interpretation of the Sixteenth-Century Motet," *JAMS*, 34 (1981), pp. 43-59; Jeffrey Dean, "The Repertory of the Cappella Guilia in the 1560s," *ibid.*, p. 41 (1988), pp. 465-90; letter to *JAMS*, 42 (1989), pp. 671-72.

7 Walpole to Horace Mann, 14 April, 1743, *Letters of Horace Walpole*, ed. Peter Cunningham, London, 1891, vol. 1, pp. 239-40. See the *Daily Advertiser*, 19 April 1743.

8 "Cavalli," *NG*, vol. 4, pp. 24-34; I am indebted to Dr. Michael Talbot on this point.

9 Joseph Kerman, "A Few Canonic Variations," *Canons*, ed. Robert von Hallberg, Chicago, 1984, pp. 177-96.

10 "Jacob Arcadelt," *Musik in der Geschichte und der Gegenwart*, Kassel, 1949-51, vol. 1, pp. 603-07; Lorenzo Bianconi, *Music in the Seventeenth Century*, tr. David Bryant, Cambridge, Eng., 1987, pp. 4-5.

with these texts. Lorenzo Bianconi claims that Arcadelt's published works were used to teach composition, but one would doubt that the prints of Josquin's works could have been seen as anything more than curious in the time.[11] By the same token, it is not at all clear exactly why in England services and anthems of the masters from the mid- and late-sixteenth century were copied repeatedly during the seventeenth century – for study, emulation, or performance. The absence of written texts upon practices such as this one suggests the limits of what had developed but does not deny that certain kinds of canonic values had appeared. The very number of the copies made of old anthems and services suggests by definition a respect for the composers.[12]

Musicologists need to draw upon their knowledge of old works that remained in performance and begin assessing what patterns they see among these examples. Robert Stevenson, for example, has claimed that old works were done often in Spain, Portugal and Spanish America, and Dexter Edge has found repertorial notations of them in the Viennese Hofkapelle in the 1750s.[13] I am sure that many more such examples will be found. But I must make my present position clear, that a great deal more such examples must be shown, and even more significantly an articulated intellectual framework around them, if we are to identify a performing canon during the sixteenth or early seventeenth centuries. For the moment it appears that, as was generally the case with performance of old works, the Sistine tradition was local in nature. While Palestrina's reputation spread far and wide, and some of his works were reprinted fairly often, the main canonic role played by his music was pedagogical, in being recrafted for use in study and teaching.

What we can call 'canon' in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, then, was pedagogical in nature, and did not yet involve performing repertories practiced and recognized as such throughout the musical world. The one exception seems to have been England, where as I have already shown, some music of the sixteenth century seems to have remained in performance to a far greater extent than anywhere else.[14] The polyphonic style remained dominant later than in other countries, right up to the Civil War. A few cathedrals and chapels keep singing services and anthems, and after the Restoration they went back to that music out of a need for reestablishing repertory quickly. Printed editions of

---

11 Lorenzo Bianconi, *Music in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 4-5.

12 John Morehen, "Sources of English Church Music, 1617-1644," Ph.D. Thesis, University of Cambridge, 1969.

13 R. Stevenson, "Josquin in the Music of Spain and Portugal," *Proceedings of the International Josquin Festival*, eds. E. Lowinsky and B. Blackburn, Oxford, 1976. Dexter Edge has found a reference to performance of a mass of Palestrina in the Habsburg Hofkapelle in 1752. Whether that happened on a regular basis is unclear.

14 *The Rise of Musical Classics in Eighteenth-Century England: A Study in Canon, Ritual and Ideology*, Oxford, 1992.

secular vocal music clearly remain in use throughout the seventeenth century. A wide repertory of both sacred and secular works were sung at the music meetings that Henry Aldrich held regularly in his rooms in Christ Church between around 1685 and his death in 1710.

From the sixteenth century on, the notions of the master composer and the 'masterpiece' referred to contemporary rather than to historical figures. But the term began to be applied to older works. In 1641, for example, John Barnard, minor canon at St. Paul's, spoke of 'master-peeces' in the first of his projected multi-volume set of music by composers in the Chapel from the time of Tallis to his.[15] Then during the early eighteenth century the tradition of craft became focused upon old works that could be both studied and performed, at least in chamber-like circumstances – in England those by Corelli and in France by him and possibly also by Lully. Institutions sprang up during the eighteenth century of which there were no parallels elsewhere: the Academy of Ancient Music in 1726, the Madrigal Society around 1740, the Catch Club in 1761, and the Concert of Ancient Music (as it came to be spelled) in 1776. We shall see shortly how the continuity in performance in England can be also traced to the tradition of collecting.

The unusual continuity of performing traditions that sixteenth-century music possessed in England was closely related to the performance of more recent works by dead composers. In the Academy of Ancient Music most clearly of all, the singing of works by Palestrina and Byrd gave an important legitimacy to the rendition of music from the late seventeenth century, Purcell most of all. That the Academy of Ancient Music performed woks by Byrd, Purcell and Hændel together had powerful early implications for the long-range development of classical-music repertories. In other countries, where sixteenth-century music had much weaker performing traditions, the rise of canonic repertories came about in separate form. In France canonic repertories began specifically with the continuing *reprises* of works by Jean-Baptiste Lully after his death in 1687. No other repertories seem to have persisted from before that time. The theatrical term *reprise* is suggestive for our subject on a broad plane. It was used during the eighteenth century to designate a stage work brought back after a gap of anywhere from five to twenty years. As such, it meant something quite different from what the much more extreme English term *revival* now means. It suggested a continuing performing history, making clear that the work was still known within the musical community and that it was its *experience* that was revived, not

15 J. Barnard, *The First Book of Selected Church Musick*, London, 1641, preface, p. 1.

the work itself.[16] Let us remember that in no country outside France did so many works of musical theater maintain such long performing histories. The only parallel prior to the nineteenth century occurred to a much more limited extent in the Prussian court, where operas by Graun and Hasse remained on stage through the 1780s. This occurred for reasons similar to the ones that kept the operas of Lully on stage. In Paris it was the demands of a virtually year-round season in the Opéra; in Berlin it was the bad financial and political condition of the King's government after the Seven Years War. In both cases these factors made the cost of new productions demand *reprises* of old works.

We must therefore be very careful in using the term 'revival' because, in English at least, it implies a complete rebirth, the return of a piece from the dead, as it were. As we shall see, true revival was extremely unusual within the mainstream repertories of the classical-music tradition. If there is any principle which stands out from the history of musical classics, it is that works were not revived – they simply remained in use over long periods of time. Either the work itself, or other works by the same composer, or related works within a genre, had experienced at least occasional performance, and therefore were known. For a work not 'known' in this sense even to be studied was so unusual that we must ask if we have missed something.

The repertory of *la musique ancienne* performed at the Opéra and at the Concerts Spirituels disappeared completely by 1780 – a major discontinuity in performing tradition.[17] But there was established a sense of the musical past at that very time that persisted: the canonic triad of Lully, Rameau and Gluck, manifested chiefly in the production of 1779 called *Les Trois Ages de l'Opéra*, a medley of excerpts from their best-known works. The historical sensibility invested in this national tradition formed a fundamental basis upon which new tendencies of interest in old music emerged.

Philippe Vendrix has, of course, shown us so skillfully how extensive a set of texts were written upon music history in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, much more than had conventionally been imagined.[18] The task before

16 "*La musique ancienne* and the Waning of the Ancien Régime," *Journal of Modern History* 56 (1984), pp. 58-88; "Lully and the Performance of Old Music in the 18th Century," *Congress for the Tricentennial of the Death of J. B. Lully*, Heidelberg/St. Germain-en-Laye, eds. Herbert Schneider and Jérôme de la Gorce, Laaber, 1991, pp. 581-90.

17 In tabulating the programs of the Concert Spirituel found in Constant Pierre, *Le Concert Spirituel*, Paris, 1898, I have found that the choral-orchestral motets of Michel Delalande and other composers were gone from the repertory by 1770, the time when such renewal was only beginning in the Opéra, done chiefly under the leadership of Marie-Antoinette.

18 Philippe Vendrix, *Aux origines d'une discipline historique : la musique et son histoire en France aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*, Liège-Genève, 1993.

us is to think about how those texts and the new notion of a national canon in opera related with taste separately for Mozart, Beethoven, others who composed in the high classical style, and finally to the sequence of ventures into music of the sixteenth century we are studying here. The links may not be direct; they are linked by the notions of craft and learning in musical culture.

If we then turn to the structure of collecting, we need to think what are the best terms by which to define the people involved, those who interested themselves in old music. In English *scholar* is probably too laden with institutional implications, both medieval and modern; *antiquarian* is closer, but has unfortunate negative connotations for scholars such as we; *collector* has a more neutral set of connotations. The French word *érudit* likewise strikes me as a term that communicates well what we are discussing: a person with reputation for knowledge of old music, but generally not a career as a musician, or as a scholar as such. The prototypical figure was first and foremost a guardian and perhaps collector of manuscripts or editions of old music. Some simply collected these artifacts; others normally gathered around them people with common interest in the subject, not only to examine old works but usually also to perform them. Some – Raphael Kiesewetter in early nineteenth-century Vienna most prominently – put on regular performances of the music, rather as a learned salon. A few – Fétis most prominently – went even further to have public concerts of this music.

There is a major question to be asked of each national history as to what kind of long-term tradition existed among the musical *érudits* and their practices of collecting music. Even though music of the sixteenth century was performed on a continuing basis in few contexts, there probably was a sequence of collectors from generation to generation, that provided a continuity in respect for old musical manuscripts and indeed for the music itself. We presently have very limited knowledge about these collectors. This may not have existed over a long period of time in some countries, however. In some cases manuscripts lay unread for a long time, at which point, perhaps simply by chance, they were found by a new collector with no contact with the previous one.

We must not presume that collectors valued the objects they possessed for reasons comparable to our own. They came to the pursuit of collecting from a variety of different motivations that are not easily discerned, due to the frequent lack of written documentation about their work. Interest in art, science, commerce, and simple curiosity mingled here in ways that we find very foreign. During the seventeenth century a collector almost always gathered what were then calling 'curiosities,' objects that might seem to us mundane things entirely different from works of art. Monetary value might be involved along

with scholarly interests. I would recommend a book by the Polish historian Kristoph Pomian, at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, where he traces the *mentalités* of collecting back to the phenomenon of gathering royal booty in times of war.[19]

For England Philip Brett has investigated members of the Hatten family during the early seventeenth century, giving us a sense of how members of the lesser nobility interested themselves in music of the previous century in large part for reasons that mingled opinions of religion and politics.[20] The manuscripts were left at Christ Church when the King and his retinue fled in 1643. Then in the early 1690s, when the Reverend Henry Aldrich became Rector of the college he found the collection and made extensive use of it in his regular meetings with singers and laymen interested in the music. He ended up calling it his collection, and thereby misled scholars to think that he actually had collected it, when he had instead found it in a closet in Christ Church and added more to it. But that is no matter: as a don of one of England's two universities, he gave the collection of old music an important intellectual legitimacy.

Part of what contributed to this collection was an almost entirely silent set of conventions of copying works by master composers in the English cathedrals. As John Morehen has shown, from the late sixteenth through the opening of the Civil War in 1642, a remarkable number of services and anthems written between around 1550 and 1600 were copied within a few cathedrals and chapels. Why this was done is unclear, whether for performance, study or simply practice in copying. In some cases it is clear that these were in fact used as part of repertory, though the evidence is limited. The Restoration of the House of Stuart in 1660 brought music back into the major churches, and because musicians had to focus their attention upon training singers, they tended to perform a great deal of works from the previous century. In effect, Hatten and Aldrich consolidated what came out of all this. What lay behind it, too, was the new, more formalized respect for the master composer that had built up in the course of the sixteenth century all around Europe.

The traditions of collecting we see in Hatten and Aldrich took a form that impinged upon public musical life during the early eighteenth century. In 1726 was founded a private society, made up of leading cathedral singers and sympathetic amateurs, called the Academy of Ancient Music. Its programs were unique in that day for including regular performances of works by Tallis, Byrd, Palestrina,

---

19 Krzysztof Pomian, *Collectionneurs, amateurs et curieux: Paris, Venise, XVIe-XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, 1987.

20 Philip Brett, "Edward Paston (1550-1630): A Norfolk Gentleman and his Musical Collection," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 4 (1964), pp. 51-69.

and a variety of other Italian composers of the late sixteenth century, in addition to recent music, some by Hændel, that generally was written in the more conservative styles.[21] In many cases the parts must have come from collectors such as Henry Aldrich or Thomas Britton, who had held performances in his home in London until his death in 1711. Other of the parts must have come from the cathedrals or the chapels. Here we thus find an interaction of traditions of collection and performing repertory. While the Academy was privately constituted, it must have welcomed almost anyone with so unusual musical taste.

For the most part, however, collecting remained a relatively solitary pursuit. It is important to remember that in the great majority of cases prior to the middle of the nineteenth century few musical collectors involved themselves at all in public performance. The English case is quite unusual, since musical life took a public focus there far more significantly than anywhere else in Europe. In 1776 there was founded an entirely separate society, the Concert of Antient Music, that drew upon collections to a more limited though not insignificant extent. It was directed by peers and gentlemen of the highest order, a social world quite different from the musicians and middle-class amateurs in the Academy.

The main leader of the concerts, John Montague, Earl of Sandwich, did a little collecting of madrigals and catches from the sixteenth century, but not to a great extent. More important along these lines was Sir Watkins William Winn, a baronet of some prominence whose collection chiefly of Hændel's we now respect very much. Each member of the society's board directed a concert each year, in the process choosing the program, or having the music director Joah Bates advise him in that regard. It is clear that Winn drew extensively upon his collection, for his programs are rich in unusual items of Haendeliana, some of which had not been performed since the time of composition. In 1785, for example, Winn offered a rendition of the *Dixit Dominus* of 1707, a work entirely unknown in the repertories of the cathedrals and chapels.

Nevertheless, the great majority of the repertory at the Antient Concerts, as they were usually called, involved works that had had continuing performing histories since the time of composition. That was the convention in concert life; to bring in a body of works unknown to the public would have been regarded as entirely inappropriate. The quite knowledgeable public that attended the Antient Concerts knew Hændel's oratorios, odes, masses, and many arias or whole scenes from his operas. They probably had copies of many of these works at home and performed them from time to time.

21 Percy Lovell, "'Ancient' Music in Eighteenth-Century England," *ML* 60 (1979), pp. 401-15.

When all is said and done, the problem we must confront is one of authority. What kind of canonic status did polyphonic works possess within sixteenth-century culture? Did people outside the learned musical world defer to this music in any fashion?[22] How early, and with what kind of intellectual foundation, did repertories of old music acquire canonic legitimacy? Can we call the notion of *la musique ancienne* in eighteenth-century France 'canonic'? And what status did collectors play within the musical community during the early period of interest in sixteenth-century music? Where did the tastes of Aldrich, Kiesewetter, Prost or Fétis stand within the larger musical world? Did the music bear any close relationship with the repertory of great orchestral music being termed 'classical' in the nineteenth century?

These questions are essentially Foucauldian. They ask what kinds of authority were invested in cultural artifacts, and also how the people who claimed to interpret these musical texts invested themselves with intellectual legitimacy. To answer these questions we need to involve ourselves in a certain process of deconstruction. If we are going to understand the problems we face, we have to pull back from the cultural constructs through which we understand musical culture, indeed the very profession of musicology itself. That does not mean that we must denude musical monuments of their greatness; far from it, by this means we can perceive their roles in the past and the present in more accurate terms. If anything, precise use of the concept of canon as found in Bergeron's thinking has if anything augmented our sense of the canonic nature of musical craft in the sixteenth century – and the traditions that flowed from it.

All this makes clear that countries such as France and Britain entered the nineteenth century with considerably different frameworks by which to view music of the sixteenth century. Ancient Music and *la musique ancienne* had very different components. Yet despite these differences, the two countries shared common principles of musical craftmanship and developed repertories of old works that established the basis for widespread revival of sixteenth-century music. Britain had taken the lead in the study and performance of old music in general, and that of the sixteenth century particularly. While much less of that had evolved in France, the notion of *la musique ancienne* laid down a firm foundation upon which the new classical-music tradition was to come about. The tradition of musical craft that took shape late in the fifteenth century underlay what evolved in both countries.

---

22 Jeffrey Dean and Honey Meconi have taken interesting opposing views on this problem recently: Dean, "Listening to Sacred Polyphony c. 1500," *Early Music*, 25 (November 1997), pp. 611-37; Meconi, "Listening to Sacred Polyphony," *ibid.*, 26 (May 1998), pp. 375-79.