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Abstract: Some would argue that the idea we get of a composer by listening to his incomplete music in which a voice has been reconstructed is not “authentic”. But the idea we can get of him by ignoring his incomplete compositions altogether, as if they never existed, is much less “authentic”. The article examines the issue and validity of the reconstruction of polyphonic music with one or more missing parts in critical editions from a philosophical, philological and practical point of view and establishes some criteria for the acceptability of the results.
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As is well known, many collections of polyphonic music published in separate partbooks have been preserved in an incomplete state because of the loss of some voices. In the present state of knowledge it is not easy to quantify them. The results of some surveys of limited periods or portions of the repertoire may prove useful for gaining an idea of their extent.¹

The fate of incomplete collections is mostly that of being forgotten (indeed, they are neither published, nor studied nor performed); however, in some cases, the missing parts have been reassembled in such a way as to make them performable again. Although the relevance of such operations is unquestionable, they may raise some doubts about the authenticity of their results. This article will address that issue by showing the elements

¹ In the current state of research it is not easy to quantify the polyphonic collections published in separate parts that have come down to us incomplete. To gain an idea of the percentage of incomplete as opposed to complete collections, the results of some surveys conducted on limited periods or portions of the repertoire are useful. See Toffetti and Taschetti, “In Search of the Lost Voice”; Cassia, “Bembo’s Soundscape”.

 Izvleček: Trdili bi lahko, da ob poslušanju glasbenega dela, ki ni popolnoma ohranjeno in je kak glas uređenje dodan, ne dobimo prave oziroma avtentične slike o skladatelju. A po drugi strani v primeru, da nepopolno ohranjene skladbe ignoriramo in jih sploh ne izvajamo, o skladatelju ne dobimo nobenega vtipa. Razprava obravnava vprašanje in upravičenost kritične uredniške rekonstrukcije večglasnih glasbenih del z enim ali več manjkajočimi glasovi s filozofskega, filološkega in praktičnega vidika ter vzpostavlja nekatera temeljna merila za sprejemljive končne izdelke.

Ključne besede: avtentičnost, rekonstrukcija manjkajočih delov, kritična izdaja, glasbena analiza, emendatio
of its complexity, examining the criterion of authenticity as applied to music editing, and questioning the appropriateness of its use when dealing with the restitution of *lacunae* and the recomposition of missing parts.

The custom of adapting music for practical purposes has been widespread among musicians for centuries. Performers have always made adjustments to compositions, recomposed parts that do not “work” or introduced adaptations to the musical text with the simple aim of being able to perform them more comfortably in concert. Most of the time, this is done without any declaration and without asking anyone’s permission.

In the early seventeenth century many composers were at the same time *maestri di cappella* and/or organists, musicians or cantors, so that the line between composition and performance was less clear than it is today. Not only did musicians of the time have no need to ask permission from composers to adapt their music to the concrete circumstances of performance, but they often also had the latters’ explicit blessing.

Let us consider, for example, what Giovanni Ghizzolo suggests to performers in the “Avvertimenti alli cantori et organisti” (Notes to Singers and Organists) appended to his *Opus 15, Messa, salmi, lettanie B. V., falsi bordoni et Gloria Patri concertati a cinque o nove voci*, published in Venice in 1619:2

2 “AVVERTIMENTI DELL’ AUTHORE ALLI CANTORI, ET ORGANISTI. Per voler in parte sodisfare al giuditoso gusto, che le persone di questa nostra età ricercano nelle compositioni, non mi è parso fuor di proposito voler concertare in tal maniera questa mia opera, che insieme havendo del vago conservi anco il grave, o vogliamo dire, secondo il modo di parlare d’alcuni ritenghi la debita maniera dell’arte; in oltre che dove sarà copia di voci possi cantare a nove, dove penuria a cinque; e dove copia d’instrumenti in parte servi per sinfonia; et acciò in questa varietà tanto li cantori, quanto li organisti habbino facilità, mi è parso brevemente qui accennare alcuni avvertimenti. Primo è, che quest’opera si puol cantare a cinque voci servendosi in ciò li cantori solo del primo choro, si che come di sopra dicevo, la sudetta opera potrà servire anco dove penuria di cantori. Secondo è che volendo li cantori servirsi di quest’opera anco per far più gran corpo di musica, potranno cantare a nove, o pure volendo dar sodisfattione particolare con l’instrumenti all’auditori, potranno servirsi del secondo choro per sinfonia, sì che secondo la necessità, et occorrenza, in varie guise potranno concertare. Terzo è, che ho voluto ancora, per più commodità delle capelle, o musiche, che del continuo si fanno, concertar talmente la sudetta opera, che la quinta parte, quale è un canto, si possi anco cantare in tenore, havendo in ciò riguardo alla penuria de’ soprani, et alla copia de’ tenori. Quarto è che li organisti, per haver più facilità nel mettere, o levare li registri, secondo il bisogno, potranno riguardare all’infrascritti segni, e primieramente dove troveranno questa parola FORTE tutta distesa, sarà inditio, che entri il secondo choro, et si facci ripieno: ma quando troveranno la sola lettera F. sarà segno, che entri il secondo choro, ma senza ripieno, e quando si troverà la parola PIANO, sarà segno che cessi il secondo choro, e canti solo [il] primo. Quinto è che ritrovandosi l’infrascritte lettere C. A. Q. T. B. sarà segno, che sotto a dette lettere entrino le parti, o del canto, alto, quinto, si che, secondo la necessità di più o meno organo per il concerto, potranno l’organisti porre più o meno registri conforme al bisogno. Ultimo è che niuno deve così in un subito meravigliarsi, se sonando gli paressi di sentire o doi quinte, [o] doi ottave con il basso continuo dell’organo, et impartmentale nella quinta parte; poiché potendosi ella (come ho già detto) trasportare all’ottava bassa in tenore molte volte avverrà, che dall’acuto descendì in grave sotto il basso, ma ciò io ho fatto per più facilità de’ sonatori, come ogn’uno da se stesso potrà giudicare. E questo è quanto m’occorre brevemente d’avvertire”. Ghizzolo, *Messa, salmi, lettanie*, RISM A/I G 1790.
1. [...] this work can be sung with five voices, using the singers only from the first choir for this, so that [...] it can also be used where [there is] a shortage of singers;

2. if the singers wish to use this work to create a larger “body” of music, they can sing with nine [voices], or if they want to give the listeners particular satisfaction with the instruments, they can use the second choir as a symphony;

3. I wanted [...] to put together the afore-mentioned work in such a way that the fifth part, which is a canto, can also be sung as a tenor, taking into account the shortage of sopranos and the abundance of tenors;

4. the organists, to make it easier to open or close the stops [...] will be able to look at the following signs, and first, where they find this word FORTE written in full, it will be an indication that the second choir enters complete with ripieno: but when they find only the letter F. it will denote that the second choir enters, but without ripieno, and when the word PIANO is found, it will be a sign that the second choir ceases and only [the] first sings;

5. the appearance of the following letters, C. A. Q. T. B., will be a sign that the parts of the canto, the alto or the fifth [voice] enter under these letters, so that, according to the need for more or less organ for the concerto, the organists will be able to employ a greater or lesser number of stops;

6. no one should [...] be surprised if, while playing, he seems to hear two fifths [or] two octaves with the basso continuo of the organ, and in particular in the fifth part; since this can [...] be transposed to the low octave in the tenor; many times will it happen that it descends from the high to the low below the bass, but I did this for the ease of the players, as everyone will be able to judge for himself. 3

Hence Ghizzolo on the one hand presupposes, and on the other hand encourages, an active approach on the part of the maestro concertatore or organist, arranging his collection so that it can be performed in at least six different ways: for five voices (singing only the parts of the first choir) or for nine voices (singing the parts of both choirs); entrusting the second choir to either voices or instruments; and singing the soprano part normally or transposing it to the lower octave to be taken by the tenor.

In cases such as this, the different modes of arrangement were explicitly suggested by the composer himself (something that would also have facilitated the sale and diffusion of his musical edition, making it adaptable to cappelle of different sizes). It is probable, however, that during the same period the performers were accustomed to similar adaptations, dictated by the size of the musical ensemble (the number of singers and instrumentalists) actually available, and therefore also prepared to make small interventions in the music (such as transposing a part and adding or removing one or more voices, even an entire choir). In principle, then, it should not be a problem if a modern musician or the editor of a modern edition contributes to making music performable, should it no longer be so on

3 English translation by the author.
account of the loss of a partbook: what would a composer of the time have done if he had found himself in the same situation?

In a critical edition the modern editor’s task is to retain as far as possible everything that was fixed, but to refrain from fixing what was not, and to provide modern performers with all the necessary information to be able to perform the compositions of the period as performers of their time would have rendered them.

As we have seen, however, the compositions published in separate parts that have come down to us incomplete have mostly fallen into oblivion. Only in a few cases have incomplete compositions undergone an “integrative restoration” that has made it possible to restore them to modern listeners. This has led to the publication of musical editions that include a hypothetical reconstruction of the missing part, such as has occurred for the madrigals of Giovanni de Macque⁴ and Giulio Schiavetti,⁵ the motets of Gesualdo,⁶ Frescobaldi’s sacred concertos,⁷ Biagio Marini’s music for vespers,⁸ Giulio Cesare Ardemanio’s “Pastorale”⁹ and many other works – not to mention the numerous individual compositions included in academic books and articles¹⁰ or the online collaborative editions of re-composed music.¹¹

In most cases these re-composed editions have brought with them the modern “world premiere” and the first modern recording of the recently restored music – as has happened, for instance, with Gesualdo’s motets and Frescobaldi’s sacred concertos.

---

⁴ Macque, Il terzo libro de’ madrigali.
⁵ Skjavetić, Vokalne skladbe.
⁷ Frescobaldi, Liber secundus diversarum modulationum (2014); on this critical edition see Toffetti, “Restoring a Masterpiece”.
⁸ Marini, Music for Vespers.
⁹ Ardemanio, Musica a più voci (2012).
¹⁰ Among the many cases that could be cited are the articles by Levitan, “Adrian Willaert’s Famous Duo”; Grenfell Davies, “Willaert’s Quid non ebrietas” (analysis of the alleged duo of Willaert); Lowinsky, “Adrian Willaert’s Chromatic ‘Duo’ Re-examined” (reconstruction of two parts out of four in Adrian Willaert’s “Quid non ebrietas”); Luisi, “Il Liber secundus diversarum modulationum” (reconstruction of the Altus voice in Girolamo Frescobaldi’s motets “Ego clamavi” and “Iesu flosum Mater virginis”); Jasiński, “Christus iam surrexit”; Toffetti, “Note a margine” (recoposition of 2 voices in Marenzio’s motet “Laudate Dominum”). Previous edition without reconstruction of missing part in Marenzio, Opera omnia.
The case of Gesualdo is well known: in 1956 Igor Stravinsky re-composed the missing parts of three motets from Gesualdo’s *Sacrarum cantionum liber primus* for six and seven voices\(^\text{12}\) — “Illumina nos misericordiarum Deus” (1957), “Da pacem” and “Assumpta es Maria” (1959) – albeit using far-from-historical stylistic criteria.\(^\text{13}\) Thanks to his re-compositions, these motets have been performed and recorded on several LPs and CDs (including one by Robert Craft).\(^\text{14}\) More recently, a group of Dutch composers reconstructed the missing parts of all twenty-two motets in the collection,\(^\text{15}\) and two more CDs were recorded, of which the first is based on the reconstruction of James Wood\(^\text{16}\) and the second on that of Marc Busnel.\(^\text{17}\) Thanks to these recordings, it is now evident that Gesualdo, hitherto regarded as one of the greatest madrigal composers of the late Renaissance, actually composed some equally interesting motets.

The same is true of Girolamo Frescobaldi, (rightly) regarded as “one of the greatest keyboard composers of the first half of the seventeenth century”,\(^\text{18}\) whose vocal music was long considered of minor interest. We know that Frescobaldi also composed two collections of sacred music: but the first has been lost, and the second has come down to us incomplete and accordingly has been forgotten for centuries.

A few decades ago, however, two editions of Frescobaldi’s motets from the *Liber secundus* were published that included only the complete motets,\(^\text{19}\) later recorded on a CD.\(^\text{20}\) Following the publication of a new edition containing both the complete and the incomplete motets (together with the recomposition of the missing part),\(^\text{21}\) a new CD that also includes some of the reconstructed motets was recorded.\(^\text{22}\)

While the historical and musical interest of such reconstructions – thanks to which we can finally listen to forgotten music again after centuries – is plain to see, these same operations could possibly raise some perplexities: after all, there is always the risk that they lead us to listen to music that never existed or to take for authentic music


\(^{13}\) Gesualdo, *Illumina nos*; Gesualdo, *Tres sacrae cantiones*. On the reception of Gesualdo’s music in the twentieth century, see Turba, “La recezione novecentesca di Gesualdo”.


\(^{15}\) A collective project involved three contemporary Dutch composers (Henri Broeren, Theo Verbey and Joop Voorn) for the reconstruction of the missing parts and the Cappella Gabrieli ensemble of Rotterdam, conducted by Maarten Michielsen, for the performance. The copyrighted completions were added to Peter Hilton’s transcription, resulting in several performances by the Cappella Gabrieli held between 2005 and 2013 in various European cities (Berlin, Rotterdam, Den Haag, Utrecht, Haarlem and Ouderkerk). On the reception and the modern reconstruction projects of the missing parts of this collection by Gesualdo, see Toffetti, “La ricezione della musica di Gesualdo”.

\(^{16}\) Gesualdo, *Sacrae cantiones liber secundus*.


\(^{18}\) Hammond and Silbiger, “Frescobaldi”, 238.

\(^{19}\) Frescobaldi, *Mottetti a 2 e 3 voci*; Frescobaldi, *Mottetti a 1, 2 e 3 voci*.

\(^{20}\) Frescobaldi, *Integrale dei mottetti*.


\(^{22}\) Frescobaldi, *Organ Works and Motets*. 
what is not. But is it anyway appropriate to apply the concept of authenticity to such an operation?

The concept of authenticity in music has long been applied to performance, giving rise to a debate, especially since the 1980s, that has lasted for decades.\textsuperscript{23} Today it is generally believed that many of these misunderstandings have arisen from the inappropriate use of this concept.\textsuperscript{24}

Similarly, the objection that the result of reconstructing the missing parts would not be authentic is equally misleading. The results of a reconstruction cannot be proved like a theorem. Within a critical edition the reconstruction procedures relate to the amendment operations. Like any other field of philology, musical philology is not a demonstrative science but a historical discipline whose object is the history of a text (of a musical text), and the historical truth is not demonstrable but must be acceptable.

The theory of argumentation, as defined by Norberto Bobbio, is a logical system that does not deal with demonstrations (with steps governed by the principle of necessity), but with non-demonstrative proofs, whose aim is to identify acceptable truths and then make preferable decisions\textsuperscript{25} – and this is exactly what we do when we reconstruct a missing part: we look for acceptable solutions and then discuss which one is preferable. The concept of historical truth is built through a quantitative determination of opposing probabilities. Even in the case of a hypothesis for the reconstruction of a missing part, it will therefore be necessary to ascertain whether there are no different solutions more convincing than the one proposed.

Of course, the very concept of “acceptability” implies an addressee, who must be persuaded by the arguments presented and the way they are presented to accept the conclusions to which the argument leads (and in our case the argument is the critical edition itself). Given the pioneering nature of reconstruction practice, the fact that the result of reconstruction is not accepted may sometimes arise from a lack of competence (that is, philological and analytical competence) of the recipients rather than the re-composer.

What is more, every operation of emendatio involves margins of opinion and is the result of a hypothesis, as such not verifiable. The objection of resting on epistemological foundations that are not sufficiently solid, of mixing original and non-original parts (those that have been emended or reconstructed), and of returning an overall inauthentic composition could be applied to all critical editions that involve processes of emendatio. Who is it that has the authority to determine what degree of certainty is sufficient to legitimize an operation of textual criticism? So the reconstruction of one or more missing

\textsuperscript{23} See, among others, Dreyfus, “Early Music”; Kenyon, \textit{Authenticity and Early Music}; Kivy, \textit{Authenticities}.

\textsuperscript{24} For a broad reflection (in Italian) on this issue, see Nattiez, “Interpretazione e autenticità” (and related bibliography), which summarizes the main themes of the debate on the concept of “authenticity of interpretation”. On the concept of authenticity in music, see also Toffetti, “Dalla musica ficta alla fake music”.

\textsuperscript{25} See, for example, Bobbio, “Pareto e la teoria dell’argomentazione”. “While in the logical-experimental discourse the conclusion comes after, as a necessary consequence of the premises, in the derivations the conclusion is presupposed, and the argumentative procedure does not serve to demonstrate it, but to make it plausible, to make it accepted”.
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Parts differs, if at all, only quantitatively, not qualitatively, from any other emendatio intervention.

Let us take one example. Of Ruggiero Giovannelli’s Mass *Iste est qui ante Deum* there remains only a very damaged and partly illegible manuscript from the musical archive of the Chiesa Nuova, drawn up for the use of Santa Maria della Vallicella, seat of the Congregation of the Oratorio dei Filippini, and preserved in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emanuele II of Rome (I-Rn). In the Kyrie from this Mass, on account of some gaps, there are certain bicinia that are clearly illegible in the partbook. The reconstructions proposed by Paolo Teodori as editor of the critical edition are appropriately placed in square brackets (see Music example 1).

Music example 1
Ruggiero Giovannelli, Mass *Iste est qui ante Deum*, Kyrie, bb. 70–75.

These are relatively short passages, and no one would dream of questioning Paolo Teodori’s edition because of these fragments reconstructed on a hypothetical basis (on the contrary, the editor will be given credit for having proposed a hypothetical reconstruction).

Something similar happens in Marc’Antonio Ingegneri’s collection of hymns (1606), where in one hymn the tenor part is missing, while two other hymns are only partially incomplete, since the tenor part is missing only in certain portions: again, the editor of the critical edition (i.e. the writer) has proposed an integrative hypothesis in the incomplete and two of the partially incomplete hymns, employing smaller type to distinguish the reconstructed part and using italics for the added text (see Music example 2).

---

26 See Giovannelli, *Composizioni sacre*.
27 Ingegneri, *Liber secundus hymnorum*.
28 Ingegneri, *Inni a 4 voci*.  

Music example 2

Another, similar case is that of Enrico Radesca di Foggia’s Thesoro amoroso,\(^{29}\) in which five compositions of the twenty-one in the collection have reached us without the upper voice because of a lacuna in the canto partbook,\(^ {30}\) while the remaining compositions have come down to us complete. In the five incomplete compositions, the editor of the critical edition has provided a hypothetical reconstruction of the missing part.\(^ {31}\)

Let us now consider what happens when an entire partbook is lost. Of the Secondo libro delle divine lodi by Giovanni Battista Riccio, for example, four out of the five partbooks have survived, while the tenor partbook is lost.\(^ {32}\)

Can we conclude that this collection is eighty percent complete? No. Upon closer examination and considering the actual distribution of the parts within the fascicles of the voices, we realize that, out of a total of twenty-eight compositions, only seven are incomplete (two for three voices\(^ {33}\) and five for four voices and bc):\(^ {34}\) therefore seventy-five percent of the compositions are complete, while only twenty-five percent are incomplete. Nevertheless, this collection, like many similar ones, fell into oblivion for over four centuries because just one of the partbooks was lost: the entire collection was wrongly treated as incomplete, whereas three-quarters of the compositions it contains are actually one hundred percent complete and therefore performable in the normal way.

\(^{29}\) Radesca, Thesoro amoroso (1599). RISM A/I R 12.
\(^{30}\) See “Benchè Barbara sia”, “Dove s’intese mai”, “O tu che tieni si capelli d’oro”, “Quest’è quel chiaro giorno”, “Dunque gentili spiriti”.
\(^{31}\) Radesca, Thesoro amoroso (2002).
\(^{33}\) “Ave Domine” and “Dilectus meus”.
\(^{34}\) “Hic est panis”, “Ego sum panis” and “Exultat Maria”, in addition to the two instrumental compositions (the “Sonata a 4” and the “Canzon a 4”).
Moreover, within each incomplete composition, there are sections that can be reconstructed with very reliable results, even if some others pose more difficult problems. Take, for example, Riccio’s four-voice instrumental canzona, which lacks the second of the two upper parts. Within it there are “echo” sections in which a reconstruction of the missing voice has a very high probability of corresponding to the original (see Music example 3, bars 1–8), while in other imitative sections one solution is much more convincing than all the others, even though the others are not so bad; and in some block-chordal sections several convincing solutions can be proposed without there being any good reason to prefer one to the other (see Music example 3, bars 9–10).

Music example 3

When reconstructing a missing part, one realizes that some portions of the reconstruction have a very high degree of reliability, while others involve a greater number of solutions that seem equally plausible. To indicate to the eye this variable degree of reliability, one can if desired highlight different portions of the score by using different colours (or a different grey scale) according to the degree of reliability of the reconstruction (see Music example 3).

This method of highlighting portions of the score according to the reliability of the reconstruction presents some similarities to the theory and methodology of “virtual archaeology”, a set of computer-based visualization practices employed at least since the 1980s to mark hypothetical reconstruction. Today these practices are conceived not only as publicly acknowledged fiction but also as scientific tools that can lead to a deeper understanding of the very process of reconstruction. In the methodology of the so-called EM (Extended Matrix), portions of the restoration related to different virtual stratigraphic units are displayed using different colours.

35 Ferdani et al., “3D Modelling and Visualization”, 1–2.
36 Demetrescu, “Virtual Reconstruction”. See the activity of the VHLab (Virtual Heritage Laboratory) of the CNR-ISPC in Rome. The “virtual stratigraphic units” are intended to represent the reconstructive process graphically in order to make it legible and transparent.
Let us now imagine that the tenor part of Riccio’s *Il secondo libro delle divine lodi* had been preserved with just some small *lacunae*. In that case, the editor would have found himself, as often happens and without anyone complaining, having to reconstruct only a couple of bars corresponding to the missing portions. Whether the missing portion corresponds to an “echo” fragment, where the reconstruction is almost automatic and allows virtually certain results, or to a fragment that poses more problems, no one would accuse such an edition of being based on ungrounded epistemological foundations: after all, one of the editor’s tasks has always been to correct the text where it is wrong and to supplement it where it is lacking. Why should one worry if there are an unusually large number of bars to reconstruct?

The problems posed by reconstruction do not worsen as the number of bars to be reconstructed increases: it may happen that a composition of seventy bars “in echo” is very easy to reconstruct, whereas a single bar poses insurmountable problems. What remains inescapable, in an edition that intends to be critical *de facto* and not only *de jure*, is the need to make every intervention of the editor recognizable: that is, to make the edition completely transparent.37

As previously mentioned, one of the main problems of reconstruction is the fact that its results cannot be verified. But what kind of verification would such an operation require? An acceptable definition of “verification” is “the process of establishing the truth, accuracy or validity of something”. In the case of reconstruction, it is out of the question to re-establish the “truth”, unless the lost partbook is accidentally found.38 But we can still evaluate the competence and the accuracy of the “re-composer”, on which the validity of the results depends (for instance, by inviting him/her to reconstruct a preserved part as if it were missing and then compare the results with the original part).

Sometimes, the reconstruction is the result of group work or the successive efforts of different musicologists who collaborate or alternate in search of increasingly pertinent solutions. In certain cases, it has happened that a part, re-composed by one or more musicologists because it was lost, was later rediscovered and compared with the reconstruction hypotheses: this is the case, for example, with the alto part in two *canzoni villanesche* by Adrian Willaert, “Occhio non fu giamai” and “Quando di rose d’oro”, re-composed by Helga Meier,39 Donna G. Cardamone40 and Luca Bruno and later, fortunately, discovered in the Geneviève Thibault collection.41

All that said, the fact remains that in the case of incomplete music the overall sonic dimension of the original composition will forever remain a mystery to us, and that all

38 On a few occasions, a scholar who had earlier reconstructed a lost voice has been able to check his work against the original. This is what happened to H. Colin Slim: four years after publishing the edition of the Newberry partbooks in 1972, with his reconstruction of the (allegedly) missing Altus part for ten compositions, the missing partbook turned up. Slim later evaluated the quality of his reconstructive hypothesis in a 1978 article, and then published the newly discovered parts. See Slim, *Gift of Madrigals*; Slim, “Royal Treasure”.
39 Willaert, *Madrigali e canzoni*.
40 Willaert and His Circle, *Canzone villanesche*.
41 Bruno, “Le Canzon di Ruzante”.

146
Marina Toffetti: The "Authenticity" of the Reconstruction of Missing Parts?

we can do is produce “fakes”. The percentage of surviving parts compared with missing ones does not change the essence of the matter. If I reconstruct one part out of five the result will not be twenty percent fake and eighty percent authentic, but still one hundred percent fake, because the combination of the reconstructed voice with the original ones does not correspond to anything that has ever been performed before in history. But what is the alternative to reconstructing the missing parts? That of continuing to ignore many thousands of incomplete compositions, considering them irrecoverable – an act that creates a distorted perception of the history of past music.

Although the reconstruction of a missing part, even if conducted with historically informed criteria, represents an operation of a hypothetical nature, to gain a more realistic idea of our musical past we have no choice but to try to reconstruct as much incomplete music as possible, to acquire ever better analytical skills and to be able to listen to music forgotten for centuries in versions ever closer to the lost original.

While the idea we get of a composer by listening to one of his/her incomplete compositions in which a voice has been reconstructed in recent times is inevitably not authentic, the idea that we can have of him without even listening to the piece is surely even more strongly fake.
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AUDI0 RECORDINGS


Znano dejstvo je, da so številne zbirke večglasnih kompozicij, ki so izvirno izhajale v več glasovnih zvezkih, zaradi izgubljenih posameznih glasov preživele le v nepopolni obliki. Čeprav so zato te zbirke večinoma že stoletja pozabljene (niso objavljene, raziskane ali izvajane), so bili v nekaj primerih manjkajoči deli rekonstruirani, tako da se lahko skladbe ponovno izvaja.

Posledice tovrstnih posegov so pogosto notne izdaje, ki jih uredijo muzikologi ali izvajalci, včasih tudi v sodelovanju. Često taki objavi rekonstruiranega dela sledi tudi prva sodobna izvedba in snemanje obnovljene glasbe (tak primer predstavljajo moteti Carla Gesualda, ki jih je rekonstruiral Igor Stravinski, ali pa nedavna rekonstrukcija duhovnih koncertov Girolama Frescobaldija).

Taki posegi so zanimivi predvsem iz zgodovinskega in glasbenega vidika, saj zaradi njih lahko po stoletjih končno spet poslušamo pozabljeno glasbo. Nekateri po drugi strani menijo, da takšni posegi niso utemeljeni. Rekonstruirani del ni avtentičen, skupni rezultat kombinacije izvirnih glasov in dokomponiranih pa je po njihovem mnenju skladba, ki je prej ni bilo.

Pričujoč članek v to razpravo vstopa s kritično obravnavo inherentnosti takega postopanja in predstavi elemente njegove kompleksnosti. Pozornost namenja zlasti konceptu avtentičnosti na področju glasbene filologije in kritičnih glasbenih izdaj ter težav, ki jih povzročajo take spremembe (emendatio). Nadalje se sprašuje o smiselnosti uporabe merila avtentičnosti pri rekonstrukciji manjkajočih delov v nepopolno ohranjeno večglasju, upoštevajoč način predstavitve pridobljenih rezultatov v kritičnih izdajah in izvedbah. Nazadnje predlaga merila za objave v kritičnih izdajah, ki omogočajo nadaljnje izboljšave rekonstruiranih manjkajočih delov.

Da bi si ustvarili realnejšo predstavo o naši glasbeni preteklosti, nam ne preostane drugega, kot da poskušamo rekonstruirati čim več nepopolno ohranjene glasbe. Tako se izboljšujejo naše analitične sposobnosti in smo pripravljeni poslušati to stoletja pozabljeno glasbo v različicah, ki se vedno bolj približujejo izgubljenemu izvirniku. Če predstava, ki si jo ustvarimo o skladatelju ob poslušanju skladbe, v kateri je bil rekonstruiran en glas, ni »avtentična«, pa podobne o njej, če skladbe sploh ne poslušamo, sploh ni, kot da nikoli ni obstajala, in to je še večja »laž«.