Studi di estetica, anno XLVIII, IV serie, 2/2020 Sensibilia
ISSN 0585-4733, ISSN digitale 1825-8646, DOI 10.7413/18258646130

Lisa Giombini, Stefano Oliva

Resonating lacunae
Berio, Brandi and music restoration[1]

Abstract
In this paper, we take a closer look at Luciano Berio's Rendering *(1989), a work which was explicitly conceived of as a "restoration" of Schubert's unfinished Tenth Symphony (Berio 1989: 453). We argue that Berio's operation on Schubert's fragments, unconventional as it was from a philological point of view, reflects many principles envisaged by Cesare Brandi in his* Theory of Restoration *(1963) particularly with regard to the treatment of so-called lacunae. Berio's analogy between music and painting restoration has interesting musicological implications and impacts on a number of philosophical issues such as originality, creativity and how we can relate authentically with the past.*

Key words:
Resonance; Rendering; Restoration, Werktreue.

Received: 14/03/2020
Approved: 23/06/2020
Editing by: Federica Frattaroli

lisa.giombini@uniroma3.it
oliva.fil@gmail.com

[1] Both authors contributed equally to the conception of this work and read and approved the final manuscript. However, sections 1-2 are to be attributed to Lisa Giombini; sections 3-4 are to be attributed to Stefano Oliva.

1. *Introduction. Resonating past*

That the past can resonate in the present is a familiar theme in our culture. Just as sound waves can propagate through a material medium such as air or water until they reach distant points in space, so the past – it is assumed – can propagate through the material works of humanity until it reaches distant points in time. Unlike sound waves, however, it is not easy to understand how we are to capture the resonance of the past. Sometimes, signals from the past come disturbed, weak or interrupted to us, so that we can't quite grasp them. Sometimes, the voices of the past dissolve into the clutter of voices from the present, and we are no longer able to recognize their timbre. So how are we to understand the past's resonance? How can we relate to it?

Relations with the past may take different forms[2]. We may try to grasp the past by copying, reproducing or replicating it; alternatively, we may strive to preserve, protect or shelter the past by locking it up in museum and gallery showcases. When the past's shapes and features are lost, incomplete or fragmentary, we attempt to *restore* what has been lost to the way in which it used to be. Restoration calls to mind collapsed buildings and damaged statues, lacunose paintings and patchy monuments – a world of physical objects, artefacts and artworks that we try to make whole again, in defiance of the constant threat of time. But what about fragmentary pieces of music? Can a musical work be "restored", in any proper sense of the term?

At first glance, talking about restoration appears out of place when it comes to music. Unlike paintings and sculptures, musical works are not physical objects, nor do they age, at least according to a basic understanding of the notion. Even if we conceive musical works as special kinds of texts, scores or sheets, the task of restoring them – should they turn out to be deficient or incomplete – would be the responsibility of the philologist, not the restorer.

It would be wrong, however, to think music restoration as just a matter of philology, musicology or musical criticism, for – as we hope to

[2] In his celebrated *The Past is a Foreign Country*, David Lowenthal (2015) indicates a legion of different ways through which we usually relate to the past. Interestingly, however: "Simply to identify something as 'past'", he writes, "affects its ambience [...] Preserving things inevitably transforms them, often in unintended and undesired ways" (Lowenthal 2015: 20).

show in this paper – it raises instead deep philosophical concerns, primarily involving the notion of authorship and the concept of *Werktreue*, "fidelity to the work".

To prove this, we will take into account how one prominent figure in contemporary music, the Italian composer Luciano Berio (1925-2003), operated in his 1989 work *Rendering* to "restore" – in his word – the famous drafts for a Tenth Symphony that Robert Schubert began composing during the final months of his life (ca. 1828). Rather than completing Schubert's work in his own style, adding musically consistent passages to recreate a fictional unity between the piece's surviving fragments, Berio chose to go down a very different path. Although aiming to re-establish the work's aesthetic continuity, he didn't disguise the fragmentary nature of Schubert's drafts, but tried instead to preserve, and even in fact to enhance, the original incompleteness of these sketches, while interpolating his own personal material to fill in or connect the sparse passages. In doing so, Berio moved beyond traditional criteria of music philology, and rather went along the lines of modern approaches towards the restoration of lacunose paintings and visual artworks, as devised especially by the Italian art critic, historian and philosopher Cesare Brandi (1906-1988).

In this regard, an important caveat needs to be considered. Proving the existence of an actual historical connection between Berio and Brandi is certainly a relevant issue to be addressed in an account of contemporary Italian philosophy and, more generally, of 20th century Italian culture. This, however, will *not* be our focus in this paper. More than a historical survey, our aim here is to juxtapose the two thinkers' aesthetic approaches on a purely conceptual level, and then draw the philosophical consequences of this comparison. To this extent, even if the alleged historical continuity between Berio and Brandi were to be proven false by empirical evidences, our argument, we presume, shall remain untouched.

Having clarified this, let us start our investigation with Brandi.

2. *Cesare Brandi on lacunae*

Brandi is internationally renowned as one of the fathers of contemporary conservation theory as well as the author of a seminal essay on the

topic, *Theory of Restoration*, from 1963, translated into English in 2005[3]. The *Theory,* which summarizes the thoughts and reflections Brandi collected on the topic throughout his long experience as Director of the *Istituto Centrale del Restauro* in Rome (1939-1959), established the foundations for a new approach to art restoration. It was a unique and unprecedented project at that time, and in many regards it still is today, as testified by the notoriety that Brandi's account has gained internationally. Not by chance, the basic principles Brandi envisaged in his work still ground many international charters on heritage conservation and restoration, starting from the 1964 Venice Charter[4].

Part of this success is due to the fact that Brandi did not simply present his own ideas on how to approach conservation treatments – as many had done before him[5] – but tried instead to build up a solid theoretical background from which practical guidelines for restoration decision-making could be drawn. Providing practitioners with a rigorous scientific framework by which to set up their activity, the *Theory* went far beyond the conceptual approximations that characterised previous approaches to the issue. The structure of the text appears in itself as a meticulous logical construction, in which deductions follow strictly from a number of premises considered as "axioms"[6].

Philosophically, Brandi's understanding of restoration stems from the author's underlying conception of aesthetics, of which it represents not just a practical application, but rather an essential theoretical component. A crucial role in this sense is played by the figure of Benedetto Croce, whose idealistic perspective Brandi has been dealing with, work-

[3] Brandi's approach in the *Theory*, however, was renown to the international community of restorers and conservators long before it was finally translated into English in 2005.

[4] *The Venice Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites* – one of the first documents to provide an international framework for the conservation and restoration of heritage properties – was indeed greatly inspired by Brandi's approach to restoration in the *Theory.* Cfr. Jokilehto (1998: 229-33).

[5] It has become conventional to trace restoration's origins from a start somewhere during the Italian Renaissance, even though the first organized attempts to provide a theoretical background for the practice only date back to a period between the 18th and 19th centuries. For a classical work on the history of conservation see Conti (2007: 1-31) especially chap. 1 "Towards Restoration".

[6] For a useful analysis on the novelty of Brandi's approach to restoration in the *Theory*, cfr. Carboni (2004). For more general discussions on Brandi's theory of restoration, cfr. the two collections of essays edited by Luigi Russo (1986; 2006). Cfr. also D'Angelo (2006) on this.

ing on and reinterpreting throughout his entire oeuvre[7]. From Croce, Brandi inherits his refusal of a positivist and scientist methodology, as well as an emphasis given to concepts of autonomy, individuality and timelessness of the work of art. Unlike Croce, however, Brandi does not believe that the object of aesthetic appreciation "emanates" from the subject's consciousness. For him, art is neither a lyrical effusion nor a form of intuition-expression[8]; rather, it is a process of "formulation", in which an "image" is externalised in the material of an artwork and translated into lines, volumes, colours, forms. Above and beyond Croce, thus, Brandi's approach owns much to authors such as Husserl, Heidegger, and Sartre, all scarcely known at that time in Italy (D'Angelo 2007: 194). Particularly, as we are about to see, many terminological choices in the *Theory* seem modeled on Husserl's phenomenological vocabulary, through the mediation of Sartre's *L'imaginaire* (cfr. Philippot 1953; Carboni 2004; D'Angelo 2006).

At the outset of the *Theory*, Brandi contends that an intrinsic duplicity characterizes our usual construal of artworks. He refers to this duplicity as the "dialectics" between two main "values", "features" or "elements" that co-habit in every artwork – what he calls, in Italian, the *istanza estetica* and the *istanza storica* (Brandi 2005: 74). Regardless of their individual quality or nature, all works of art are, for Brandi, always at the same time visually enjoyable objects that demands aesthetic appreciation as well as material documents of human history. The co-presence of historical and aesthetic aspects in the same artwork is, according to Brandi, of fundamental importance for the theory of restoration. He condensed this idea in the following principle: "Restoration", he writes, "consists of the methodological moment of the recognition of the work of art, in its physical consistency and in *its twofold aesthetic and historical polarity*, in view of its transmission to the future" (Brandi 2005: 50, emphasis added). Since it is not possible to sacrifice *a priori* either of the two instances of the artwork's "twofold polarity", finding a balance between these opposite stances should constitute, according to Brandi, the main goal of the restorer – not an easy one, though, as testified by the number of controversies continuously arising in the field.

[7] Garroni (1959: 124) argues in this regard that Brandi has rediscovered Croce, but has bent him "to a non-Crocian perspective".

[8] See Croce's review to Brandi's *Carmine o della pittura* (1946). On the relation between Croce and Brandi, cfr. also Garroni (1959), Russo (1969), Barille (1986), Morpurgo-Tagliabue (1986). A systematic comparison between the two philosophers can be found in D'Angelo (1982) and in D'Angelo (2007).

One particularly problematic case is represented by the treatment of so-called *lacunae*, to which the final part of the *Theory* is devoted (cfr. in Brandi 2005: 90-3, *Postscripts to the Treatment of Lacunae*). A *lacuna*, in Brandi's words, can be defined as "an unjustified interruption in the form of an artwork" (Brandi 2005: 91), like a gap or an empty space created by the absence of something in the work's material and caused by normal aging processes or disruptive events or catastrophes. Historically, the question of lacunae aroused in the period following World War II, when a large number of artworks, including paintings, needed to be safeguarded and restored after the harassment caused by the conflict.

Before Brandi, traditional approaches to the reintegration of lacunae involved operating on the work through what is generally known as "stylistic restoration" or – as it is sometime said – through restoration via *anastylosis*[9]. This implied an attempt to reconstruct all the missing elements of the original piece, integrating losses either by "induction" or by "approximation" (Brandi 2005: 92), with respect to principles of stylistic and philological consistency[10].

According to Brandi, however, a similar approach to lacunae reintegration must be thoroughly avoided. All efforts at complete restitution, he warns, inevitably produce historical falsifications, no matter how perfect they may actually be. Stylistic restoration or restoration "in the style of the original" is indeed "the most serious heresy" (Brandi 2005: 64) [11]. For the sake of the work's aesthetic value, restorers take on the role of "the original artist or creator" and in rebuilding parts or entire works, they merge the old and the new, the authentic and the inauthentic, and end up producing an overall sensation of deceitfulness (Brandi 2005: 91).

What, then, should restorers do when presented with a lacunose artwork to compensate the loss? Brandi's argument goes as follows.

[9]*Anastylosis*, in architectural reconstruction, refers to the practice of rebuilding archaeological ruins using either original materials or newly fabricated components. A well-known example of *anastylosis* is the reconstruction of the Library of Celsus, in Ephesus, Turkey. More generally, restoration via *anastylosis* can be used to indicate all interventions that aim to repristinate the original aspect of the object by filling or reconstructing all its parts.

[10] For a comprehensive analysis of the method of *tratteggio*, cfr. Philippot, Philippot (1984: 301-10).

[11] Brandi also calls it "restoration by fantasy": "There will be (and certainly have been) people who would insert restoration into precisely this most intimate and unrepeatable phase of the artistic process […] it is restoration by fantasy." (Brandi 2005: 64).

From an aesthetic viewpoint, each work of art is characterized by the unity of its "image" taken as a whole[12]. The notion of image, in Brandi's terms, epitomizes not only the figurative or representational content of a work, but also the perception and appreciation we have of it as pure form[13]. In this sense, the image is for Brandi what really needs to be preserved of an artwork, as it constitutes its essence – the actual result of the artist's creative process. Gaps, losses and lacunae, however, – having shapes and colours that are not consistent with the work's figurative aspect – are "inserted into the work of art as a foreign body" and in this sense, disturb its aesthetic unity by intruding upon the legibility of the image. To this extent, the most serious problem of a lacunose artwork is not what is *missing* but what is *inserted* inappropriately. Drawing on studies in Gestalt psychology, Brandi argues that a lacuna can be interpreted in terms of a figure in relation to a ground:

> The lacuna will be sensed as a figure that relegates the painted, sculpted or architectural image to the background, against which the lacuna "figure" stands out. The disturbance produced by the lacuna comes much more from this receding of image to ground, and from the lacuna's violent intrusion, as a figure, into a context that tries to expel it, than from the formal interruption that the lacuna produces within the image. (Brandi 2005: 93)

What happens is that, when a lacuna interrupts the structure of a painting, we perceive the gap as the foremost figure to which the remaining surface of the painting is reduced to background. From this recession of the figure to the ground and the "violent intrusion" of the lacuna as a figure comes the effect of aesthetic disturbance.

How are we to neutralize this effect? According to Brandi, what should be done in the first place is to reduce the perceived prominence taken on by the lacuna with respect to the original image: "A reduction has to be made in the prominent figurative value taken on by the lacuna with respect to the real figure – which is, of course, the work of art" (Brandi 2005: 93). The lacuna must be re-transformed into a ground behind the image now restored to its figurative role.

[12] Interpreters have pointed out that Brandi's notion of "image" may derive from Sartre's conception of the transcendence of the aesthetic object with respect to the material it is composed of. Cfr., in particular, D'Angelo (2006: 48-50).
[13] For details on Brandi's conception of image, cfr. Brandi (2010).

To achieve this result, the solution proposed by Brandi is that of *tratteggio*[14] a method developed at the *Istituto Centrale del Restauro* during the years 1945-50 and based on the mechanisms of perception described by Gestalt psychology. *Tratteggio* implies transposing the modelling and drawing of a painting into a system of hatchings devised according to a principle of tone division. In practice, the system consists in a series of small vertical lines averaging one centimetre in length. The first lines, which indicate the basic tone of the retouching, are placed at regular intervals, and these intervals in turn are filled with a second colour, and then again with a third colour, in order to reconstitute the required tone and modelling by means of the juxtaposition of nuances. Each line in itself must be weak in intensity, the desired intensity of the whole being obtained by the superposition of several lines rather than by strength of colour, which would cause the retouching to lack the chromatic complexity indispensable for a good integration (cfr. Philippot, Philippot 1984: 301-10).

The general purpose of this method, according to Brandi, is to repristinate the work's aesthetic continuity, while clearly differentiating the retouching from the original. Just as the use of different typefaces in a printed text can be easy to identify, all integrations to an artwork must be easy to recognize yet without interfering with the formal unity one is trying to re-establish. This means that at the distance from which the artwork is normally viewed, integrations should be invisible. From a closer viewpoint, however, they should be immediately detectable without the aid of special equipment.

This idea seems to rely, in Brandi's approach, on an absolute form of respect for the original artist's handiwork, which represents for him the first and most important criterion to be followed in restoration. Our behaviour towards an artwork must indeed be, as he writes, "limited to respect" (Brandi 2005: 92), since restoration is not in itself artistic creation, nor is the restorer an "artifex additus artifici", an artist who adds his own work to the original work so as to modify it. For discussion on this idea, cfr. D'Angelo (2017: 125-40).

Instead, restoration is, for Brandi, a critical activity of interpretation, and the restorer is *at the service* of the artist's work, like a critic or a

[14] Notice that *tratteggio* can only apply to the reconstruction of limited or small losses. Large losses and losses situated in areas that could not be reconstructed have to be treated differently so they recede behind the image and serve as a uniform ground. In such cases other methods of identifiable retouching may be preferable, cfr. Philippot (1990: 418).

connoisseur whose job is to understand in each single case how the relevant object works as an artwork, what makes it especially valuable, peculiar and so on, in order to decide how to preserve it. Indeed, "art criticism", Brandi states in one of his philosophical dialogues, "embraces not only the attribution and promotion of a certain artwork, but also the procedures enacted to safeguard and preserve it, in order to transmit it to the future society. Restoration is thus a form of criticism" (Brandi 1962: 164)[15].

We can draw some important lessons from Brandi on how we should go about treating lacunose works or filling losses. First, reintegration, as a form of critical interpretation, can only be aesthetically justifiable as long as it aims at retrieving the formal unity of the work and the legibility of its image. Second, all operations should stop where hypothesis begins. A retouching pushed until it is almost invisible, or illusionist, is to be condemned in principle, since it would constitute a fake. Third, all integrations must be easily identifiable by the recipient, since restoration is never creation.

What is now to be seen is whether these principles, which Brandi conceived explicitly with respect to lacunose works of visual art, may find any relevant application in music.

3. *Luciano Berio's* Rendering

In the 1970s, surviving piano sketches for a Tenth Symphony by Schubert were correctly identified as dating back to shortly before the composer's premature death. The sketches consist of three movements written in piano score with some indications of orchestration. The movements are not complete, presenting only individual sections of formal designs, the outlines and dimensions of which remain unspecified. In addition, preliminary and exploratory versions of these sections fill many pages.

[15] As Carboni (2002: 137-40; 2005: 139) has underlined, a similar understanding of the practical-empirical value of criticism can be found in the famous art critic Roberto Longhi, despite his different cultural-scientific approach. In his article *Proposte per una critica d'arte* (*Proposals for Art Criticism*) from 1950, Longhi describes as "critical gestures" Rubens' decision to buy a Caravaggio on behalf of the Duke of Mantua, as well as other concrete acts carried out within the artworld, which he sees as endowed with an intrinsic critical value, regardless of any academic partition between disciplines.

Elaborating on these fragments, in 1989-1990 Berio composed a work which he aptly named *Rendering*, a choice suggesting not simply a form of "restitution" or "completion" of Schubert's pre-existing material, but a proper form of "restoration" (Gartmann 1995: 196-7). That Schubert's sketches attracted Berio is not surprising. Berio's involvement with arranging and orchestrating other composers' works extends throughout his entire oeuvre. In the Author's Note which accompanies *Rendering*, he explains:

> During the last several years, I have been asked once and again to do "something" with Schubert, but I always declined this kind but cumbersome invitation. Until I received a copy of the sketches that the 31-year-old Franz had been accumulating during the last few weeks of his life in preparation for a Tenth Symphony in D major (D. 936 A). These sketches are fairly complex and of great beauty: they add a further indication of the new paths that were taking Schubert away from Beethoven's influence. Seduced by those sketches, I therefore decided to restore them: restore and not complete nor reconstruct. (Berio 1989-1990)

This decision – to restore and not to reconstruct – takes on special relevance when compared to similar operations of reintegration of Schubert's sketches carried out in the same decade (around 1980s) by other composers, especially Brian Newbould (1984) and Pierre Bartholomée (1984). A scholar of Schubert, and an erudite one as well, Newbould in particular is internationally renowned for his realisations of symphonies left unfinished by Schubert (including the famous Seventh Symphony) as well as for his completion of Schubert's chamber and solo pieces. The chaotic mishmash of different materials and vague formal indications of Schubert's drafts did not deter Newbould from completing the symphony in its entirety. Trying to act as philologically as possible and only seldomly indulging in speculations, Newbould realized an accurate pastiche out of the jumble of Schubert's fragments[16].

For his part, Berio decided to take a radically different path:

> I have never been attracted to those operations of philological bureaucracy which sometimes lead musicologists to pretend they are Schubert (if not Beethoven) and "complete the Symphony as Schubert himself might have done". This is a curious form of mimesis that has something in common with those pic-

[16] Interestingly, Newbould's philological reconstruction slightly differs from that of Bartholomée, whose use of Schubert's material is more arbitrary, to the point that he chose to insert a further tempo, a *Scherzo,* taken from the D 708A symphonic fragment, between the second and third movement.

ture restorations sometimes responsible for irreparable damages, as in the case of the Raffaello frescoes at the Farnesina in Rome[17]. (Berio 1989-1990)

Consequently, he dismissed any attempt at reconstruction – that is, of him working behind the scenes to present the symphony Schubert had imagined. Instead, he compares himself to a restorer: "As I worked on Schubert's sketches, I set myself the target of following those modern restoration criteria that aim at reviving the old colors without however trying to disguise the damage that time has caused, often leaving inevitable empty patches in the composition (as in the case of Giotto in Assisi)" (Berio 1989-90).

This comparison between the treatment of musical fragments and the restoration of time-worn frescoes may seem quite curious at first, since Schubert's symphony, unlike Giotto's frescoes, never existed as a complete artwork, meaning that there was *stricto sensu* nothing to restore. The analogy, however, affects the way Berio operated with Schubert's sketches. Not wanting to fill in the gaps with stylistically plausible additions, he chose instead to leave them, while adding his own original material as a "a kind of connective tissue constantly different and changing, always pianissimo and 'distant', intermingled with reminiscences of the late Schubert" (Berio 1989-1990). While distancing Berio from the traditional methods of music reconstruction, this decision brought him closer to the dictates of Brandi's idea of restoration.

Not by chance, Berio refers to these interpolations as "a delicate musical cement" (Berio 1989-1990) in the gaps between one sketch and the other. The notion of "cement", here, captures of course the quality of these integrations, which appear "grey" and "static" next to the revived Schubert, an effect achieved by a music consisting of fixed sonorities being played without expression and "*quasi senza suono*". Moreover, "this delicate musical cement that comments on the discontinuities and the gaps between one sketch and the other" must always be announced "by the sound of a celesta" (Berio 1989-1990), so as to make it detectable against Schubert's original contribution.

[17] To the same extent, while "In the nineteenth century, when restoring a painting by Giotto [...] we arrived at a form of painting, between the idiot and the criminal, with the restorers completing the paintings in the way in which, in their view, Giotto himself would have done", Berio comments, "What is fortunately being done today is to put a plaster that makes clear the missing part: in that place remains an empty, grayish stain, which appears very dramatic". (Berio 1991: 256)

Without re-creating an "artificial continuity in Schubert's sketches" (Berio 1998: 367), Berio's targeted interventions give consistency to the original material, exalting its peculiar expressiveness (Berio 1995a: 329). Like the method of *tratteggio*, his work on Schubert's lacunose score returns the piece to its aesthetic legibility, while preserving its original fragmentary nature. Through Berio's interpolations, losses and gaps in the musical weave are transformed into a neutral "ground" behind Schubert's musical *images* now restored to their prominent role of "figures". This is achieved through the juxtaposition of a "musical plaster (or lime)" to Schubert's fragments, one made up of several different things, including themes from pre-existent works – Berio's own ones and works by other composers – and what he calls a "pulverized Schubert's material" (Berio 1989: 453). Relevantly, this "musical plaster", while easy to discern, does not intrude upon the work's re-established unity. To this extent, to a shallow listening, Berio's integrations result imperceptible, but to a more careful or attentive listening, however, they are instead immediately recognizable.

It seems therefore that *Rendering* complies, ideally at least, with the basic principles set out by Brandi in his approach to the treatment of lacunae as described in the *Theory*: the idea that reintegration, as a form of critical interpretation, should aim to re-establish the formal unity of the work potentially contained in the fragments, yet retouching should avoid mimetic integration and always remain easily recognizable.

Clearly, Berio's intent in *Rendering* is to avoid any confusion between Schubert's sketches and his own interpolations – between the restorer and the *artifex*. Accepting an overall musical effect that is not "Schubert-like" – that is, not mimetic with respect to the hypothetical intentions or the distinctive style of the composer – *Rendering* represents an example of that sophisticated form of restoration Brandi promoted in his essay. Indeed, as we have seen, the efficacy of a restoration is not, for Brandi, a question of the degree of imitation one is able to achieve, but rather of the *critical interpretation* behind the reconstruction, of the overall conception that drives it. To the same extent, Berio's devises his intervention on Schubert's sketches as a restitution proposed in a critical edition of a text, something which does not interrupt the flow of the discourse, but establishes its exact nature in a critical note.

Based on the former considerations, we are led to disagree with the position advocated by the music historian David Metzer (2000). Writing about *Rendering*, Metzer notices that the idea of restoration that emerges from this work is "unconventional", because: "A conventional

restoration would vanquish that void rather than have it reclaim a past work. Moreover, it would never break that work apart". But Berio, Metzer continues, "unlike the art restorers he admires, has used restoration not as a means of attaining *historical fidelity* but rather as a creative act, one that evokes loss and disintegration" (Metzer 2000: 103; emphasis added). Contrary to Metzer's assumptions, Berio's intervention in *Rendering* seems to us to follow closely the inspiration of the "restorers he admires" (arguably Brandi)[18], to the extent to which they do not commit to "historical fidelity" – namely historical plausibility or verisimilitude – but rather to a deeper ideal of "fidelity to the work" or *Werktreue*, respect for the authentic creation of the artifex.

This concern for the work's authenticity is also proven by Berio attributing a new title (*Rendering*) to the Symphony and placing his name up front, citing dual authorship (Schubert-Berio), a moves which immediately warns the reader that Rendering *is* and at the same time *is not* Schubert's Tenth Symphony. It *is* because it uses the original, autograph materials of the composer; it *is not* because such materials are inserted into a totally new (thus necessarily inauthentic) framework made up of his own "delicate musical cement". This solution – based again on respect for the *Werktreue* – ties the famous composer to his famous compatriot and art critic.

If a difference between Brandi and Berio is to be found, it lies instead in the *consequences* of this respect for the original work. Brandi's idea is to suppress as much as possible the practitioner's own personality, since, for him, the restorer is not an artist but a critic. On the contrary, Berio's commitment to the *Werktreue* ideal does not confine him to a neutral role as a composer, but rather triggers his artistic creativity. Indeed, for Berio, the artist is always a critic, and critical activity is necessarily creative. This is testified by Berio's recourse to what he calls "commentary techniques" in his compositional practice. Berio's idea is that music, qua expressive form, is able to reflect on itself just like verbal language. This process of musical analysis ultimately results in the composition of further music. In this spirit, he claims: "I still think [...] that my best analysis of Schubert is perhaps Rendering, i.e. the commentary and

[18] An important question is whether Berio actually read Brandi's text. Given the popularity of Brandi's *Theory* in Italy, it is reasonable to think that he actually did, although Brandi's name is only cited once in Berio's works (and precisely by Sandro Cappelletto in a 1995 interview; see Berio 1995b). Whether he read it firsthand or not, as an Italian intellectual working in the cultural milieu of mid twentieth-century, Berio was of course perfectly aware of the lesson of his countryman.

restoration of the sketches of his tenth Symphony in D major" (Berio 2003: 488).

Berio's interest in creative commentary and criticism also supports his unorthodox conception of music history. We are used to consider musical works as "objects" eternally conserved in the dusty rooms of the "imaginary museum of musical works", to use Lydia Goehr's (1992) famous phrasing, a place where they can be spared from change and becoming. In opposition to this fetishistic tendency, Berio promotes a non-museological approach, according to which compositional freedom and creativity are required if one is to relate authentically to the past.

> We also need to challenge the idea that musical experience could be compared to a huge, protective building, designed by history and constructed over several millennia by countless men (and now, finally, also by women). Not that we could ever get to see a floor plan, a cross-section, or a profile of this immense metaphorical building. We might wander through a few rooms, trying to grasp the content and function of each of them (the Ars nova room, the Baroque room, the Schubert, Mahler, and Stravinsky rooms, the Viennese, the Darmstadt, the "set theory" rooms-and, why not, the minimalist and the post-modern rooms), but in doing so we would be conditioned by what we had already heard and known; we would then reinterpret each experience, modify its perspective, and therefore also the building's global history. The history of such modifications is the history of our actions and ideas, which sometimes seem to run ahead of the arrival of the actual work that will embody. (Berio 2006: 2-3)

In this framework, no *Werktreue* is given until a critical confrontation occurs between the past and the present, so instead of imprisoning music in the golden prison of philology, we should rather let music out of the museum, or perhaps let the museum change.

4. *Conclusions. Restoring, rendering, resonating*

As the reader might have noticed, most of the terms encountered in this paper – notions such as resonance, restoration, reintegration, rendering – share the fact of being introduced by the prefix "re-". This is no coincidence. This prefix is indeed a grammatical index for actions or processes which involve a confrontation or an active engagement with the past. In particular, in most European languages, "re-" indicates repetition of an action both in an *iterative* sense – expressing duplication or repetition – and in an *intensive* one – expressing strengthening or reinforcement. So for example, "re-" as in the word "resonance" can either be read in an

iterative way ("make something sound again") or, alternatively, in an intensive one ("make something sound louder"). Moreover, the particle "re-" is also characterized by a semantic ambiguity denoting something that can either repeat and re-instance a past process or overturn it. This is the reason why the word "re-volutio" can refer to the backward path of the stars in astronomy as well as to a progressive change that leads to historical progress.

Interestingly for us here, it seems that the ambiguity expressed by the "re-" particle with regard to a past action finds relevant instances in the practice of restoration. Etymologically, the term "restoring", from the Latin verb *re-staurare* (to repristinate), implies a co-presence of two antithetic nuances oscillating between the opposite meanings of "renewing, making it new" – in the sense of doing something again – and "returning something to a previous state", in the sense of going back in time, reversing a process. When it comes to concrete interventions, this may suggest the practitioner the impossibility of a "repetition of the identical" (where the past is not elaborated) and indicate instead an understanding of restoration as involving a "change of state" in an object.

Taking these considerations into account helps us ground our argument on an even more solid foundation. For Brandi, restoration can never be, not even linguistically, a practice of mere replication or repetition of the past, for this, as we have seen, is for him both impossible and unjustified. In a similar way, Berio's theoretical reflection and compositional practice – both in *Rendering* and elsewhere – do not simply imply recreating works that could "sound like" the original ones, but rather consist in a re-elaboration that takes history into charge and opens it to new understandings.

Different as they are from one another, both their approaches tell us a crucial philosophical lesson about how to behave with respect to the legacy that comes to us from the past, if we want to be faithful to it. In no way can we hope to reconstruct the past except on the basis of inquiries suggested to us by our own situation – the cultural situation of the 20th century – for it is impossible to eliminate the influence of one's era and tastes from one's interpretation of the past. No *Werktreue* is given until a critical confrontation occurs between the past and the present, no authenticity without critical reinterpretation.

The past, indeed, has a set of voices, like a symphony orchestra. At one given moment in time, it sounds one way, at the next, another. In between these two moments, things have been added and subtracted, so that if we limit ourselves to capturing a single instant, it will sound slight-

ly false, somewhat strident to us. The past resonates with us polyphonically, so the question is: Do we know how to listen?

Bibliography

Berio, L., *[In margine alla "Sinfonia Incompiuta" di Schubert]* (1989), in *Scritti sulla musica*, a c. di A.I. De Benedictis, Torino, Einaudi, 2013, pp. 444-61.

Berio, L., *Rendering (author's note)* (1989-1990), Centro Studi Luciano Berio, http://www.lucianoberio.org/node/1448?1304392085=1.

Berio, L., *Intervista con Luciano Berio. Di Eero Tarasti* (1991), in *Interviste e colloqui*, a c. di V.C. Ottomano, Torino, Einaudi, 2017, pp. 243-58.

Berio, L., *La musica non è un atto solitario. Conversazione con Theo Muller* (1995a), in *Interviste e colloqui*, a c. di Ottomano, Torino, Einaudi, 2017, pp. 323-44.

Berio, L., *Nel labirinto della musica. Incontro con Luciano Berio. Di Sandro Cappelletto* (1995b), in *Interviste e colloqui*, a c. di V.C. Ottomano, Torino, Einaudi, 2017, pp. 315-21.

Berio, L., *Intervista a Luciano Berio. Di Francesco Ermini Polacci* (1998), in *Interviste e colloqui*, a c. di V.C. Ottomano, Torino, Einaudi, 2017, pp. 365-71.

Berio, L., *Invito* (2003), in *Scritti sulla musica*, a c. di A.I. De Benedictis, Torino, Einaudi, 2013, pp. 482-98.

Berio, L., *Remembering the future*, Cambridge-London, Harvard UP, 2006.

Barilli, R., *L'estetica di Brandi: con Kant e contro Croce*, in L. Russo (a c. di), *Brandi e l'estetica*, "Supplemento degli annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Palermo", Palermo, Luxograf, 1986.

Brandi, C., *Theory of Restoration*, Engl. transl. C. Rockwell, Firenze, Nardini, 2005.

Brandi, C., *Carmine o della pittura,* Torino, Einaudi, 1962.

Brandi, C., *Segno e immagine,* a c. di L. Russo, P. D'Angelo, Palermo, Aesthetica, 2010.

Carboni, M., *Cesare Brandi. Teoria e esperienza dell'arte*, Milano, Jaka Book, 2004.

Conti, A., *A history of the restoration and conservation of works of art* (1973), Engl. transl. H. Glanville, Oxford, Elsevier, 2007.

Croce, B., *Recensione a* Carmine o della pittura, "Quaderni della critica diretti da B. Croce", n. 4 (1946), pp. 81-3, available on-line: https://ojs.uniroma1.it/index.php/quadernidellacritica/article/view/2687/2684.

D'Angelo, P., *L'estetica di Benedetto Croce*, Roma-Bari, Laterza, 1982.

D'Angelo, P., *L'estetica italiana del Novecento*, Roma-Bari, Laterza, 2007.

D'Angelo, P., *Cesare Brandi. Critica d'arte e filosofia,* Macerata, Quodlibet, 2006.

D'Angelo, P., *Il restauro dell'arte contemporanea e la teoria del restauro di Cesare Brandi*, in V. Cuomo (a c. di), *Arti e tecniche del Novecento*, Napoli, Kajak edizioni, 2017, pp. 125-40.

Garroni, E., *Arte e vita. Note in margine all'estetica di Cesare Brandi*, "Giornale critico della filosofia italiana", n. 38/1 (1959), pp. 123-37.

Gartmann, T., *"Restauro" – Approccio ai frammenti di una sinfonia di Schubert: "*Rendering*"*, in E. Restagno (a c. di), *Berio*, Torino, Edt, 1995, pp. 193-224.

Goehr, L., *The imaginary museum of musical works. An essay in the philosophy of music*, Oxford, Oxford UP, 1992.

Jokilehto, J., *The context of the Venice charter,* "Conservation and management of archaeological sites", n. 2 (1998), pp. 229-33.

Lowental, D., *The past is a foreign country*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1985.

Metzer, D., *Musical decay: Luciano Berio's "Rendering" and John Cage's "Europera 5"*, "Journal of the royal musical association", n. 125/1 (2000), pp. 93-114.

Morpurgo-Tagliabue, G., *Maieutica di Brandi,* in L. Russo (a c. di), *Brandi e l'estetica*, "Supplemento degli annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Palermo", Palermo, Luxograf, 1986.

Philippot, P., *Une phénomenologie de la création artistique*, "Revue internationale de philosophie", n. 26/4 (1953), pp. 392-99.

Philippot, P., *Pénétrer l'art, Restaurer l'œuvre: Une vision humaniste. Hommage en forme de florilège,* Kortrijk, Groeninghe Eds., 1990, pp. 413-415.

Philippot, P., Philippot, A., *Problems of presentation*, in *Conservation of wall paintings*, London, Butterworths, 1984, pp. 301-10.

Russo, L. (a c. di), *Brandi e l'estetica*, "Supplemento degli annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Palermo", Palermo, Luxograf, 1986.

Russo, L., *Itinerario dell'estetica di Cesare Brandi. Da* Carmine *a* Struttura e architettura, "Trimente", n. 2/3-4 (1969).

Russo, L. (a c. di), *Attraverso l'immagine. In ricordo di Cesare Brandi*, Palermo, Aesthetica Preprint, 2006.