

## Introduction

---

With a title like the one this book is carrying, I've got some explaining to do. What kind of "end" am I talking about? Well, two, actually. "Early music" has long outgrown its name, which is no longer adequate to describe what is happening in the twenty-first century. By reflecting on what we really mean by the term, we might discover some interesting insights into what we "Early musicians" have been doing, and what we might do in the future. As has been clear for a generation now, the one thing our music is not is "Early," "ancienne," or "oude." (An irony, to think that by turning straw into gold, antiquated into current, we have caused our very name to become obsolete.)

Actually, my first thought in choosing this title was to talk about what, finally, is the cause and purpose of Early music's existence, its "end." I'll nibble at this question and offer some thoughts. Asking what Early music is for leads to other questions. . . . Come to think of it, on balance, you'll probably be getting more questions than answers here. I think it's only fair to warn you of that now.

### *Literacy*

Ours is an exceedingly literate society. In music, we give the highest status to our musicians in white-tie and tails, the "art" musicians, who perform the kind of music to which we give the name "Classical." Classical musicians have evolved in a curious way: they're so good now at reading

music that their natural ability to improvise has atrophied. Most of them have no choice but to perform from written pages (in the memory or on the stand).

Literacy has created listeners and performers who are preoccupied with the “repertoire” or Canon of great works, and a text-fetishism that does not allow performers to change any detail of the “masterpieces” of the past. There are many researchers who devote their lives to finding out the “intentions” of composers. So it’s not surprising that Classical musicians don’t improvise much. In fact, few of us can improvise at all. We even write out our graces and cadenzas.

Please don’t misunderstand me: as musicians, we are as good today as the musicians of the past. But our training has become overspecialized, directed as it is toward playing written music. Derek Bailey puts our current situation in a nutshell:

One reason why the standard Western instrumental training produces non-improvisors (and it doesn’t just produce violinists, pianists, cellists, etcetera; it produces specifically non-improvisors, musicians rendered incapable of attempting improvisation) is that not only does it teach how to play an instrument, it teaches that the creation of music is a separate activity from playing that instrument. Learning how to create music is a separate study totally divorced from playing an instrument.<sup>1</sup>

This separation between composing and performing hasn’t always existed. Before the rise of Romanticism, improvisation and composition were normal activities for any musician. In a time when new pieces were in constant demand, being a composer was nothing special, just part of the process of producing music. But even if a musician didn’t always write his improvisations down, he had to know how to make up music on the spot. Without that ability, he couldn’t play the music of the time.

Baroque notation is like shorthand, a quality known in the trade as “thin” writing. Baroque composers rarely included marks of expression like phrasing gestures, dynamics, note-shaping, flexibility of tempo, and subtlety of rhythm. Variables of that kind are implied in the playing style, however, so performers supplied them as a matter of course. Thin writing was not thin because “thick” writing hadn’t been invented yet; it was deliberate. It accommodated spontaneous input from the performers. To play or sing only what was written would not have been sufficient or have pleased the listeners—least of all the composer. It would have been like a jazz saxophonist playing only the tune, and straight at that! In the Baroque period, a musician needed less written information, like a combination of an improvising jazzman and a reading Classical player. In any case, neither the essential graces (the *agréments*) or the more elaborate *passaggi* could be accurately notated, and when they were improvised it left room for some aspects of a piece to be different each time it was performed. This created an ad hoc environment that was reinforced by other

elements: rehearsal was minimal, the leader played in the group, and the media (such as playing styles and instruments) were constantly changing.

### *The Romantic Revolution*

What hangs like a veil between the musicians of today and those of pre-Romantic times are the changes in mentality, the paradigm shifts that are symbolized by the Industrial Revolution that took place between about 1760 and 1840, and more specifically the French Revolution that began in 1789.

To make the story of nineteenth-century culture start in the year of the French Revolution is at once convenient and accurate, even though nothing in history “starts” at a precise moment. For although the revolution itself had its beginnings in ideas and conditions preceding that date, it is clear that the events of 1789 brought together and crystallized a multitude of hopes, fears, and desires into something visible, potent, and irreversible. . . . There are so many evidences of a new direction in thought and culture.<sup>2</sup>

The musical revolution does not seem to have been gradual. It was truly a break in history. The major change in the designs and techniques of every kind of musical instrument at the beginning of the Romantic period, for instance, was no slow evolution; it was a rupture with the past that took place in less than two generations. Everything, it seems, was changing.

### *Canonism and Classicism*

For centuries the ideals and standards of quality of literature, architecture, and the graphic arts had been set by examples that originated in Classical antiquity. Artists and writers had done their utmost to emulate these “Classic” models. But in music, no such examples had survived; very little evidence of the nature of ancient Greek and Roman music has ever been found. The Romantics decided to create their own Classical models, using the exquisite conceit that music was an “autonomous,” “absolute” medium. Music could at last move up from craft to art; could become “Classical.” Composers became the heroes, promoted to the status of genius. Musical pantheons were erected, and plaster busts of composers, like so many ancient Roman emperors, appeared on family pianos.

A Canon of Classical works began to be built up, with Beethoven’s symphonies providing the backbone. This way of thinking, called *Canonism*, was the cornerstone of the Romantic movement from its beginnings, and represented a fundamental shift in Western musical culture. An expression of the present-day Canonic attitude is the survival of many musical institutions founded in the nineteenth century: publishing houses, journals, orchestras, opera houses, and conservatories. Canonism

is symbolized by nineteenth-century concert halls with the names of “great” composers immortalized in friezes around the walls.

The Classical Canon is the repertoire we all know from the nineteenth century, undeniably beautiful music to which most musicians of the present day still dedicate their talents. In such a context, a composer’s works came to be seen almost as scripture. The “paradigm of music as consisting in works written by the great of the past, transmitted in writing and accepted by the current generation through its enactment, supported by written programs, by basically non-innovatory performers”<sup>3</sup> pretty well describes the Classical music scene of today.

Despite Canonism’s continuing widespread authority, most musicians nowadays are scarcely conscious of it as a concept. Yet it is so pervasive that not only does it form the core of the repertoire for symphony auditions, but any good young instrumentalist knows how each piece is expected to be played, right down to bowings, dynamic marks, and places to breathe.

The Canonic ideology leads to a number of corollaries that form the basic assumptions of Classically oriented musicians. They include:

- great respect for composers, represented by the cults of genius and originality,
- the almost scriptural awe of musical “works,”
- an obsession with the original intentions of the composer,
- the practice of listening to music as ritual,
- the custom of repeated hearings of a limited number of works.

Canonism is strictly a “Classical” thing. Jazz doesn’t worry about the “intentions” of a composer, rock doesn’t give much weight to who “composed” a piece, pop music doesn’t get hung up on a proscribed and immovable repertoire. Nor were they an issue for our ancestors before about 1800 either. Baroque composers weren’t artists, after all. They were clever craftsmen, rather like building contractors or horse-race jockeys today, more interested in competence than greatness. Nor did the scores in which their compositions were written (or more commonly, the un-scored parts) have any importance beyond facilitating their real work, which was performing concerts. In any case, the pages of notes they handed out were incomplete and quite useless without the musicians who knew how to convert them into music.

Modern HIP musicians are under the Canonic spell too. Usually Classically trained, they sometimes find themselves confusing fidelity to a style with fidelity to particular hero-composers. Against their own logic, they sometimes treat scores as untouchable (that is, unchangeable), and they frequently listen and play the same works (like Messiahs and Christmas oratorios) much more often than they were ever meant to be heard. Without thinking, they also tend to lump Period performance with “Classical” music (as witnessed by their adoption of the Victorian dress suit and

frock, the uniforms—Period, actually—of both the Romantic and Modernist symphony musician), and they perform in anachronistic environments (purpose-built concert halls filled with silently respectful audiences). These are all creations of Canonism; none of them had been considered necessary before the “modern age.”

### *Progress or Adaptation*

One of the basic messages of HIP is the rejection of the belief in progress that still holds many of us—unconsciously—in thrall. The history of music, HIP is saying, is not a story of gradual improvement; or, as Collingwood put it, “Bach was not trying to write like Beethoven and failing; Athens was not a relatively unsuccessful attempt to produce Rome.”<sup>4</sup> The history of art can be seen as a kind of Darwinian evolution only if we remember one essential condition: evolution depends on the principle of appropriate adaptation to environment. Art history recounts a succession of artistic assumptions, ideologies, and motives. The goals of a Vivaldi concerto are quite different from those of Mozart, Beethoven, or Paganini; and to compare them is rewarding only in the context of their differing artistic aims. Most important of all, the evolutionary theory ceases to work if it is associated with value judgments. A common assumption among musicians is that art evolves in a continuous line to the perfection of the present. This implies that the world of art today must be the best of all possible worlds—a conclusion that is patently absurd.<sup>5</sup>

### *Serendipity*

To appreciate the full implications of these fundamental differences between Romantic and pre-Romantic music takes time. One could even say the work of modern HIP musicians consists of the slow realization of how different a pre-Romantic piece can sound. And this realization often comes along with an effect known as “Serendipity.” Serendipity means the joyful phenomenon of making happy and agreeable discoveries unintentionally.<sup>6</sup> The classic example is Columbus setting out to find a route to the Indies and accidentally discovering America instead.

The Serendipity effect is directly tied to the pursuit of authenticity. It addresses the question—not an unreasonable one—whether it really matters if we perform details as they were done in their period. My experience has been pretty consistent: the reason for incomprehensible practices does not often become evident until we actually do it that way ourselves, sometimes for a long time. Stated as a principle of musicking, we could say that if you attempt to be historically consistent, persistence will eventually show a logic that was not immediately obvious. Although it doesn’t guarantee them, Serendipity promises rewards for experiment.

Taruskin himself finds that the effect of the historically oriented frame of mind may open performers'

minds and ears to new experiences, and enable them to transcend their habitual, and therefore unconsidered, ways of hearing and thinking about the music. . . . The object is not to duplicate the sounds of the past, for if that were our aim we should never know whether we had succeeded. What we are aiming at, rather, is the startling shock of newness, of immediacy, the sense of rightness that occurs when after countless frustrating experiments we feel as though we have achieved the identification of performance style with the demands of the music.<sup>7</sup>

### *Musical Rhetoric*

Prior to the Romantic Revolution, music and the arts in general were based on values and practices that seem fundamentally different from those we call "modern." The magnitude of the gap is difficult to appreciate and often difficult to see. These differences are discussed more thoroughly in the chapters that follow, but I want to give here some idea of what they are, in order to suggest that, seen dimly through the veils of Romanticism that hang between them and us, there was an alternate system, another ethos. It was an ethos that once worked, and while we do not need all of it, any more than we need the economies and governments of the period, we can learn from it and draw on it for inspiration for our own present time. At the very least, a knowledge of an alternate value system will help us better understand our own.

To quote Walter Ong, "until the modern technological age, which effectively began with the Industrial Revolution and Romanticism, Western culture in its intellectual and academic manifestations can be meaningfully described as rhetorical culture."<sup>8</sup> Rhetoric, a system of public communication and persuasion invented by the ancient Greeks, developed by the Romans, and enthusiastically revived in the Renaissance, was mentioned or discussed by virtually everyone who wrote about music until about 1800.

Music based on Rhetoric had as its main aim evoking and provoking emotions—the Affects, or Passions—that were shared by everyone, audience and performers alike. Canonic music, by contrast, was usually autobiographical in some sense, often describing an extreme and solitary experience of the artist-composer: individual catharsis or enlightenment. Another difference is that in a performance, the Baroque composer was better off alive, in order to help make his music work well by playing along. The Romantic artist-composer, on the other hand, was best dead, because that seemed to make it easier to appreciate his genius. While Rhetorical music was temporary, like today's films—appreciated, then forgotten—Canonic music was eternal and enduring. Rhetorical music was transient,

disposable, its repertoire constantly changing. Canonic music was by definition stable, repeatable, and orthodox.

With the rise of Canonism, Rhetoric found itself marginalized and eventually demoted to little more than a negative vibe; “Rhetoric” nowadays often means something like “bombast.” The compelling force of the idea of musical Canon makes it hard for us now to imagine how basic the principles of Rhetoric once were to musicians.

### *Authenticity as a Statement of Intent*

We don’t think about it much, but in fact those old pieces were not written for us. Nobody back then knew what we would be like, what kinds of instruments we would be playing, or what we would expect from our music. In fact, they didn’t even know we would be playing their pieces. So, a little adaptation is called for to fit their music to us.

Here’s where we get onto the subject of Authenticity because there’s a choice of approaches. One way is like “Chinese-Canadian” restaurants, where the inspiration is from China (and perhaps the cook as well), but the end result does not surprise the palette of a Canadian who “knows what he likes.” This is how a symphony orchestra plays Vivaldi’s *Seasons*, for instance, using the inspiration of a culture nearly 300 years removed from us and adapting it to the familiar sounds of the symphony orchestra. (I won’t say “modern orchestra” because the instruments being played aren’t modern in any sense; we’ll get to that later.)

There is another approach to eating Chinese food outside of China. Some people look for food not adapted to some other taste; what we might call “authentic” Chinese. Menus are written in Chinese only. Some of the tastes may take time to learn to appreciate, but the experience is “expanding,” perhaps in more ways than one (!). This, we could say, is a way of describing the concept of Authenticity.

For modern symphony musicians, “music of the past belongs to the present as music, not as documentary evidence,”<sup>9</sup> as Dahlhaus put it. James Parakilas called this “music as tradition”:

Classical performers present music as tradition by making the past continuous with the present. . . . Listeners hearing music as tradition hear it as something belonging to them. . . . Classical composers, however warmly personified, speak a timeless, universal message. They speak to modern listeners because they have spoken to generations of listeners.<sup>10</sup>

What is curious about this approach is that preserving a performing style is like trying to hold water in your hand. It is a lovely illusion to think of modern symphony concerts as part of an unbroken tradition, but historically speaking there isn’t much difference between symphony orchestras

and “Early music” concerts. Both are working with lost traditions, the difference being how they think of them.

At first glance, a movement like HIP (the Historically Inspired Performance movement), which actively tries to join historical awareness to historical music, seems like the perfect example of Canonism: honoring dead composers. But it is the paradox of HIP that it uses the past as inspiration but does not, like Canonism, pretend to be a continuation of it. HIP starts in the present and ends in the present. As Collingwood put it, “The revolutionary can only regard his revolution as a progress in so far as he is also an historian, genuinely re-enacting in his own historical thought the life he nevertheless rejects.”<sup>11</sup> HIP highlights the historical dimension; it draws attention to the profound differences of music before and after 1800 in ideology, values, and performing practices. And as HIP gradually succeeds in embracing pre-Canonic, Rhetorical practices, it is conscious of taking distance from the values and customs of Canonism. The symphony musician playing Brahms and the Early musician playing Bach are both playing in styles whose oral traditions have been lost, but the difference between them is between a blink and a wink, their own perception of what they are doing in relation to history.

More than anything else, Authenticity seems to be a statement of intent. Totally accurate historical performance is probably impossible to achieve. To know it has been achieved is certainly impossible. But that isn’t the goal. What produces interesting results is the *attempt* to be historically accurate, that is, authentic.

There was a time when “AUTHENTIC” sold records like “ORGANIC” sells tomatoes. Musicians didn’t usually make up the liner notes that went with their recordings, and if they were described as “Authentic” when they were really “an *attempt* to be authentic,” it seemed like quibbling.

Before the 1980s, HIP was not well enough established to attract much attention or sympathetic criticism. But in that decade, Richard Taruskin began publishing his critical articles and reviews. Taruskin brilliantly articulated the nature of Modernism and its threat to HIP, and in doing so did a great service to music.<sup>12</sup> Eloquently and wittily, Taruskin also stuck a good many holes in HIP’s balloon in his articles, questioning the ultimate reliability of historical information in general and the motives of performers. His writings, unfortunately, had the effect of embedding Authenticity in “scare-quotes,” which is the way it usually appears these days. “Authenticity” has even been called “the movement’s ominous theory” and an “arrogant claim.” Authenticity became a hexed word and served for a while as a kind of lightning rod for anybody who was dissatisfied with some aspect of the Movement.

Despite this, the idea that the word represents refuses to go away. The reason is clear: Authenticity is simple, it is logical, and (as we have seen) it is central and essential to the concept called HIP.

### *“Scare-Quotes” for Authenticity*

Taruskin objected to the moral and ethical overtones of the claim by HIP musicians to use “instruments or styles of playing that are historically appropriate to the music being performed,” which devalues other approaches to performance. He invoked the “invidious comparison”: who, he asked, would want to use inauthentic instruments or styles of playing?<sup>13</sup>

I don’t see a problem here. Who indeed? A value judgment it certainly is, but nobody’s forcing anybody else to change their instruments or styles of playing. Whatever word we use for the concept of historically appropriate actions, I can’t see why noticing and acknowledging historical changes of style and instrument needs defending.

It seems to me that what does need defending, and what is logically and aesthetically questionable, is the old traditional attitude, the chronocentrism described in chapter 1 that insists on using a single performing style for the music of all periods and blithely ignores differences of style and instruments. A colleague of mine, in a moment of levity, wondered whether there were any convenient terms or acronyms for various forms of “non-HIP.” He suggested

Historically Clueless Performance? Wild Guesswork Performance? Whatever Feels Right Performance? Whatever My Personal Hero Did Must Be Right Performance? Didn’t Do My Homework So I’ll Wing It Performance? Anything Goes Performance? History Is Irrelevant Performance? Whatever They Did On My Favorite Recording That’s What I Must Imitate Performance? Just The Facts Ma’am Performance? What My Teacher’s Teacher’s Teacher Did Because He Was Beethoven Performance? OK, I’m getting carried away here, but all those types of performance *do* exist, even if there aren’t convenient labels for them.<sup>14</sup>

Even if tongue-in-cheek, this list is a pretty good summary of the rationales for not playing HIP.

Let’s reverse the anachronism, and imagine one of Brahms’s piano concertos played on a harpsichord. Absurd idea—but is it any more absurd than Bach’s harpsichord concertos played on the modern grand?<sup>15</sup>

### *The End of Early Music*

We describe the unknown by comparing it to the known. Early music was once a different kind of music from the norm, often deliberately different. To take one instance, there was the normal Boehm flute; then there were the historical flutes, which were variants, like the “Baroque flute,” the “Renaissance flute,” and so on. The same with the “modern” bassoon and the “Baroque” bassoon, “Baroque” drums—and this is quite incredible if you think about it—even the “Baroque violin”! The violin, the archetypal object and symbol of the seventeenth century, was given a name that

suggested that the altered string setups used in the symphony orchestras of today were supposed to represent the real norm, the plain “violin.” Then there was the harpsichord, which, if it hadn’t had a separate name, would have been the “Baroque piano.” In the same way, historical performing styles were looked on as exceptions and taught in a special class called “Performance Practice,” where one learned about curious ways of performing, out of the traditional mainstream.

But the mainstream is always changing, and these “Early” instruments and their “Early” playing styles now no longer seem so exceptional or exotic. They’ve stopped being “Early.” There is a tradition, young as it is, that gives logic to them. An indication of this is that as recently as the 1980s, recordings were often advertised as using “historical instruments”; you rarely see that on CDs nowadays. It has become normal and unremarkable.

So, if “Early music” is no longer Early, let’s call it by a more accurate name. That name should be “Modern music,” since it is a relatively recent phenomenon. But this term is already taken. In fact the idea that really captures the spirit of the period we’ve been calling “early,” the principle that motivated artists, intellectuals, and musicians of the time, was Rhetoric, the art of communication. As I will discuss in the coming chapters, music was such an eminent example of applied Rhetoric, it would be logical to call it by this, its principal paradigm, its operating system. Rhetoric is particularly appropriate because it was a system the Romantics despised and marginalized. *Rhetorical music* thus expresses the essence of the musical spirit prior to the Romantic Revolution.

Here we are, then, at the beginning of this book, witnessing one small end of “Early music.” From now on, I’ll call it by this new name, *Rhetorical music*.

### *Musicking*

“Musicking” is a word coined by a very interesting author, Christopher Small. By “musicking,” Small means to imply that music is not a thing, but an activity, and includes “all musical activity from composing to performing to listening to a Walkman to singing in the shower—even cleaning up after a concert is a kind of musicking.”

Taking Small’s meaning, I think of musicking as a kind of “multi-disciplinary” term that helps me frame my own concept of a nexus of Rhetorical musical activities that includes performing, instrument making, editing music or making it available to musicians, teaching musical performance and music history, studying music history, composing new pieces and analyzing existing ones, and so on. All of these are forms of historical musicking, and the dynamic that joins them is a sense of style. The same principles and values frequently apply more or less consistently over all these activities.

### *Terminology and Concepts*

Speaking of names for things, Confucius pointed out that when terms are not well defined, discussion is not smooth. So it's probably worthwhile to take a little time for this.

There is no way to know if our modern restorations accurately recall the original repertoire and practices of music before 1800, try as we might. So we can't in all honesty give the same names to the original and the restoration. Thus a modern copy of an old *original* instrument is a *Period* instrument. A modern musician whose sense of style is based on an old original style is a "Period performer" or a "historical performer." I use "Period style" in a generic sense for an infinite number of styles, united only by the fact that they all must be restored from lost originals.

There are two aspects of style: Romanticism, for instance, as compared with Romantic performing protocol. The latter is the performing techniques and conventions, the manner or protocol in which a piece is executed that uniquely distinguishes it as a style. The other aspect of style is a general attitude or stance that applies to all the arts, music included; these are the ideas that are taken for granted: the philosophy, artistic assumptions, and motives of a style, its *ideology*, in other words. Classical musicians play in Modern style, for instance, without the faintest clues about Modernism, or how it differs from Romanticism. I will normally call these two aspects *ideologies* and *performing protocol*. It seems strange that these two aspects of any given style are not directly related. There is no causal connection between Portamento and Romanticism, for instance.

Within the Rhetorical era, my focus is primarily music from about 1600 to 1800, for two reasons. One is that it is the period in which I have worked as a performer. The other is that the motivating principles of the music of this period, the Baroque, were revolutionary when they appeared and were largely obliterated when they were supplanted, so in their revival they seem once again revolutionary.

Here are some other terms I use frequently:

Affect: Passion; Affection; Humour; mental state; feeling; emotion  
 agogics: taking rhythmic freedoms in order to distinguish the relative melodic importance of notes  
 agréments: essential graces; small ornaments like appoggiaturas, trills, and mordents, usually marked with coded signs. *Compare* passaggi  
 authentic : historically accurate and credible  
 beat hierarchy: difference of stress on the beats of the bar; Good and Bad Notes  
 Canonic music = Romantic music  
 chronocentrism: the attitude that one's own time or period is superior; the equivalent in time of the spatial concept of ethnocentrism.  
 Contrasted here with: pluralism

Classical period: roughly 1770–1800

climax phrase = long-line phrase

delivery: effective performance; *compare* declamation

declamation (*Vortrag*): playing or singing in an impassioned oratorical manner; expressing strong feelings addressed to the passions of the listeners. *See also* Eloquent style

Early music : *see* HIP, Period style, and Rhetorical music (all valid simultaneously)

eloquence: vividly or movingly expressive public discourse; good Delivery, marked by force and persuasiveness; being effective at touching an audience and moving their hearts

Eloquent style: a Baroque performing style that is vividly and movingly expressive; playing or singing in an impassioned oratorical manner. Based on declamation and gestural phrasing. Contrasted here with: Strait style

essential graces: *see* agréments

figure : a specific, recognised motif or gesture

gestural phrasing: phrasing based on gestures and figures rather than on the overarching long-line

gesture: a physical movement that has meaning

gesture, musical: a generic figure; a short sequence of notes; a musical building block; a segment or subdivision of a phrase; the smallest unit of musical meaning into which a melodic line can be divided

HIP (historically-inspired performance; historically-informed performance): a movement in reaction to the Romantic and Modernist movements. Also called Authenticity Movement; Early music Movement; Period Performance Movement; Second Practice. Contrasted here with: original performance

historical performer = Period performer

ideology : the philosophy, artistic assumptions, and motives of a style rather than its performing protocol (the manner, techniques, and conventions by which a piece is executed)

invention: the composer's essential thematic idea, whether of an entire composition or the smallest gesture within it; the first stage of an oration or composition: the inspiration and argument

*Klang-rede*: musical discourse

long-line phrase: phrase developed in the early nineteenth century, often taken in one breath or bow, starting softly, building to a “goal” or “climax,” then diminishing. = climax phrase

musicking: coined by Christopher Small. Implies that music is not a thing, but an activity. Musicking includes “all musical activity from composing to performing to listening to a Walkman to singing in the shower—even cleaning up after a concert is a kind of musicking.”<sup>16</sup>

OVPP : one voice per part in Bach's vocal pieces

- passaggi: elaborate improvisations or diminutions; free ornamentation; Coloraturen; optional variations; Passages (Galliard), variations (Neumann); extempore variations (Quantz)
- performance practice: Common Practice; evidence of what and how music was performed; practical stylistic conventions of historical performance
- Period: activity produced in the present in imitation of one from a particular historical period (as in “Period furniture” or “Period costumes”). In this book it normally means the musical style of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Contrasted here with: “original;” Ancient
- Period composition: a modern composition convincingly in the style of a past period
- Period instrument: an instrument that is contemporaneous with the time the music was written
- Period style: style no longer performed through an oral tradition but needing to be acquired through written sources.
- pluralism: the awareness of the historical development of music and the changes of style that have taken place in it. Contrasted here with: chronocentrism
- replica: a copy exact in all details; a clone
- Rhetorical music: music made when musical Rhetoric was valued and used, beginning with the Renaissance and including the late eighteenth century; rejected by the Romantic Revolution
- Romantic Revolution: the Æsthetic Revolution; Great Divide or Cultural Hinge framed by the Industrial Revolution, roughly concurrent with the French revolution (1789) and Beethoven’s Third Symphony (1803).
- Romantic music: music from about 1800 onward (including most contemporary music)
- Romantic period: the period from about 1800 onward, dominated by the aesthetic values of Romanticism
- Romanticism: the musical ideology of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; not Romantic style
- rubato / *tempo rubato* : expressive alteration of tempo
- Serendipity: making happy and agreeable discoveries unexpectedly
- Strait style: a form of Period style characterised by emotional detachment and a lack of expressiveness; Modernist Period style

*Page 16 is blank*