

# Goldsmiths Research Online

*Goldsmiths Research Online (GRO)  
is the institutional research repository for  
Goldsmiths, University of London*

## Citation

Norton, Barley and Matsumoto, Naomi, eds. 2018. Music as Heritage: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives. Abingdon: Routledge. ISBN 9781138228047 [Edited Book]

## Persistent URL

<https://research.gold.ac.uk/id/eprint/24080/>

## Versions

The version presented here may differ from the published, performed or presented work. Please go to the persistent GRO record above for more information.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Goldsmiths, University of London via the following email address: [gro@gold.ac.uk](mailto:gro@gold.ac.uk).

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated. For more information, please contact the GRO team: [gro@gold.ac.uk](mailto:gro@gold.ac.uk)

## Introduction

### Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives on Music as Heritage

Barley Norton and Naomi Matsumoto

This is an apposite time for the study of ‘music as heritage’. As economic, technological and cultural change gathers pace across the world, debate about the sustainability of music heritage has become ever more pressing. Discourse on intangible cultural heritage has blossomed in recent years and musical practices have been transformed by safeguarding agendas. The chapters in this book, *Music as Heritage*, take stock of these transformations, bringing ethnographic and historical perspectives to bear on the impact and meanings of music heritage in the contemporary world.

*Music as Heritage* is divided into three parts, with each part oriented around key issues and themes: Part 1 ‘Representing Music Heritage’ concentrates on the politics, ethics and representation of music heritage revival and promotion; Part 2 ‘Safeguarding Music Heritage’ examines the impact of safeguarding policies on musical communities and methods of music transmission; and Part 3 ‘Repositioning Music Heritage’ considers the movement of music heritage within and across national boundaries and examines how musical change and innovation relate to safeguarding initiatives. In considering the political, ethical and representational issues that shape safeguarding agendas, Part 1 sets the context for further fine-grained discussions of the aesthetic and practical concerns faced by musicians in Part 2. Part 3 expands out to transnational interactions in diverse musical spheres from post-revival movements to avant-garde compositions. It reflects on how eco-museums, cultural regeneration and tourist development have impinged on music traditions. Although the four chapters in each of the three parts share some broad themes, there are points of convergence and overlap between all the chapters and some central threads run throughout the volume. Many contributors, for instance, explore the interactions between safeguarding policies and musicians’ practices.

Collectively, the chapters draw on both ethnographic and historical research, often in combination together. Heritage discourse connects the past, present and future. Following Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s definition, heritage is ‘a mode of cultural production in the present that has recourse to the past’ (1995: 369), and heritage production in the present aims to shape the future. Understanding the nature and development of intangible cultural heritage, therefore, must take into account synchronic and diachronic perspectives. To varying degrees,

all of the chapters draw on historical narratives and traces of the past to contextualise the present and to contemplate the future. In some cases, historical documents – such as audio and audiovisual recordings, musical scores and first-hand descriptions of past events – are mined by performers to sustain and revive music heritage. In others, tangible historical documentation takes a less prominent role in safeguarding efforts, with oral history and embodied knowledge of music traditions prioritized instead. Based on an array of ethnographic and historical materials, *Music as Heritage* investigates the uneven realities of transmitting and performing music traditions as systems of heritage management have arisen.

### **The Theoretical Terrain of Music Heritage**

A burgeoning body of scholarship has outlined and evaluated the historical development of the concept of intangible cultural heritage (or ICH), which came to be enshrined in UNESCO's 2003 Convention on Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage (Smith and Akagawa 2009; Waterton and Watson 2016). Following the first efforts by Japan and Korea to preserve and promote 'cultural properties' in the 1950s and 1960s, the concept of intangible cultural heritage gradually took shape in the last decades of the twentieth century in counterbalance to the notion of tangible heritage outlined in UNESCO's World Heritage Convention of 1972. UNESCO's path to the 2003 Convention included several incremental steps: in 1972, UNESCO's Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies incorporated 'modes of life', 'traditions' and 'beliefs' in definitions of 'cultural heritage'; in 1989, the 'Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore' was adopted; in 1993, the Living Human Treasures policy was announced; in 1997 the programme of the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity was launched; and in 2002 a position on Intangible Heritage and Cultural Diversity was established.<sup>1</sup> Alongside UNESCO's activities, national preservation schemes and regional bodies have also been established (Howard 2012b: 12–14).

As international and national mechanisms and procedures have developed, scholarly work has assessed the problems, drawbacks and opportunities of ICH policies. This has included: reflection on the theoretical underpinnings of the Convention and its practical implementation (e.g. Kurin 2004 and 2007; Smith and Akagawa 2009; Ruggles and Silverman 2009; Alivizatou 2012a; Stefano et al. 2012), evaluation of heritagisation as a globalizing process (e.g. Nas 2002; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 2006; Ronström 2014) and discussion of the economics and politics of ICH (e.g. Bendix 2009; Bendix et al. 2012). Few

academics have called for the dismantling of heritage management systems, which are deeply entrenched in many parts of the world, and to some extent critiques have been muted by academic involvement in the bureaucracy of heritage safeguarding (Howard 2012b: 11). However, a level of internal critique has pointed out some of the problems and potential dangers of the Convention (Kurin 2004) and social scientists have analysed the regulatory framework of global heritage as a form of neoliberal governmentality (Bendix et al. 2012). Rosemary Coombe, for instance, argues that intangible heritage resources are increasingly treated as ‘forms of capital to be developed and marketed’ in conjunction with international expert communities involved in the surveillance and control of ICH (Coombe 2012: 381). Coombe reflects on the conditions that ultimately ‘will thwart or advance struggles for social justice’ in the hope that safeguarding initiatives can offer ‘new opportunities for political aspiration, articulation and assemblage’ (2012: 385).

Community participation is at the core of the UNESCO Convention, yet the problems of participation in safeguarding initiatives, both practically and theoretically, have often been raised. The anthropologist Oscar Salemink, for example, forcefully argues that ‘the description and inscription of heritage sites, objects and practices result in the writing off of the constituent communities as viable and reliable cultural agents’ (2016: 339). Based on his experience of several UNESCO inscriptions relating to ICH in Vietnam, Salemink states that culture bearers are disconnected from their ‘culture turned spectacle’ (2016: 339). Furthermore, he notes how, in response to the perceived threat to cultural diversity posed by globalisation, ‘more globalisation is called forth, and local communities are subject to outside gazes and interventions’ (2016: 338). This brings attention to the dangers of a self-perpetuating cycle of international oversight that may unwittingly lead to disenfranchisement rather than advancing social justice.

Heritage discourse is a growing concern in ethnomusicology. What once might have been referred to as ‘traditional music’ or ‘folk music’ is increasingly being recast as ‘heritage music’ (Ronström 2014). Owe Ronström notes how ‘the shift from tradition to heritage, introduces new discourses and redefines concepts; it changes our understandings of what kind of past the music comes from, to whom it belongs, and what it stands for’ (2014: 54). The rise of intangible cultural heritage is embedded in processes of globalisation. Fears of the loss of culture in the face of globalisation has led many nation states to turn to the promotion of ICH in assertions of national identity and authority over cultural expression. Ronström persuasively argues that heritage is ‘a homogenizing counterforce to the diversifying and globalizing forces of post- or late modernity’ (Ronström 2014: 56). Although the preservation

of intangible heritage is often presented as a push back against global forces, it is important to remember that it is part and parcel of them.

Cognisant of the ever widening reach of heritage discourse, *Music as Heritage* aims to enhance understanding of musical traditions within the context of the promotion and circulation of heritage within and across national boundaries. By considering the ways in which musical practices are being reconfigured in the transnational traffic of heritage, it makes a contribution to the growing number of studies that address the impact of heritage policies on musical communities (e.g. Weintraub 2009; Howard 2012a; Bithell and Hill 2014; Foster and Gilman 2015; Serafimovska et al. 2016; Machin-Autenreith 2017). UNESCO's 2003 Convention is a significant reference point for research on music heritage and some chapters deal directly with its ideological tenets and effects. While UNESCO's framework and national action plans have tended to centralise the production of heritage in a top-down administrative system governed by experts, the 'local', 'national', and 'global' are intertwined in the production of heritage in complex ways. National and international policies on intangible cultural heritage are not all-encompassing and do not fully determine the diverse musical manifestations within the globalizing forces of late modernity. Musical products and practices routinely circulate across geographical and cultural boundaries, and musicians have varying degrees of engagement with heritage management systems. Understanding the everyday realities of musicians and their range of views about safeguarding policies is an important undertaking. Some have supported and taken up opportunities offered by initiatives aimed at sustaining traditions, whereas others have benefited little or been hindered by the interference of management bodies. It is also instructive to pay attention to spheres of musical activity that lie outside UNESCO's reach and to probe the reasons why some traditions are chosen for safeguarding whereas others are not. A focus on music practices and genres that have been overlooked or have avoided ICH management structures, either inadvertently or purposefully, highlights the limits of top-down heritage agendas.

Recent ethnomusicological research on heritage issues is rooted in a longer history of engagement in the discipline with the documentation, transmission and preservation of oral traditions. Ideas about cultural identity, diversity and creativity, which lie at the core of ICH discourse, have long been of interest to ethnomusicologists. Preservationist agendas were a significant factor in ethnomusicology's early history and persist in different guises to this day (Nettl 2015: 169–187). Although, in the past, some ethnomusicologists proposed a scientific, non-interventionist approach to the study of music cultures, preservation continues to be an

underlying motivation for some research and claims to objectivity are now rarely asserted. Whether or not ethnomusicologists consider themselves to be ‘applied’, there is a growing embrace of activist, engaged or applied approaches, which typically emphasise advocacy and intervention to benefit music communities.<sup>2</sup> Engaged research in ethnomusicology has moved away from terms like preservation, which suggest a rigid freezing in time, and has gravitated towards framing terms like ecology, sustainability and resilience in order to reflect on musical shifts over time (see Titon 2009a; Pettan and Titon 2015; Schippers and Grant 2016). In analyses of the cycles of music revival and post-revival the emphasis is on recontextualisation, innovation and transformation, rather than attempting to authenticate a fixed version of the past (see Bithell and Hill 2014).

Through organisations like the International Council for Traditional Music, which is in formal consultative relations with UNESCO, a number of ethnomusicologists have been involved in the development and critique of heritage policies (e.g. McCann et al. 2001, Seeger 2009; Van Zanten 2013). Applied, policy-oriented academic research has also engaged with music endangerment and safeguarding. The five-domain framework for documenting and assessing musical sustainability outlined in *The Sustainable Futures for Music Culture* project, which was funded in Australia from 2009 to 2014, is one recent example of applied research that aims to stimulate musical diversity and ‘assist communities to forge musical futures on their own terms’ (Schippers and Grant 2016: 15). Ideally, systems of heritage management would benefit from academic research and reports outlining lessons to be learnt in the implementation of safeguarding initiatives. However, national and international bureaucratic structures tend to be more focused on the processes of nomination and inscription, than on the complex issues that arise once policies are implemented.

The drive towards the documentation of music through audio and audiovisual recordings in heritage management is exemplified in UNESCO’s requirement for national parties to complete inventories when nominating ICH elements. Such emphasis on documentation brings to the fore the inherent paradox of ‘preserving the living’, of ‘making permanent the impermanent and therefore capturing and freezing that which is meant to appear, disappear and reappear’ (Alivizatou 2012b: 10). This can feed into an unhelpful ‘salvage paradigm’, which ‘leaves little room for change and adaptation’ (Alivizatou 2012b: 18), and dimensions of power and control in the documentation and representation of ICH are also important to evaluate (see Graham 2009; Norton this volume). Audio and audiovisual materials, however, can be put to many purposes; as well as being a ‘resource for sustaining music genres’ (Grant 2016: 37) they have potential to be used imaginatively to stimulate

creativity and inspire new practices. During fieldwork, researchers often make audio and video recordings and there have been calls for ethnomusicologists to be more engaged in proactively repatriating archives to make them more useful to source communities (Landau and Topp Fargion 2012). In a similar vein to thinking of archiving as a ‘social process’ (Landau and Topp Fargion 2012: 136), in this volume Terada proposes a way of working with video that is based on an on-going collaborative process with source communities.

In parallel with anthropological critiques of heritage management as a form of neoliberal governmentality, some ethnomusicological research has reflected on how music heritage is instrumentalised as a market commodity, notably as an economic resource in tourist development (e.g. Titon 2009a, Taylor 2017). Timothy Taylor discusses the uneasy relationship between UNESCO’s ICH safeguarding and neoliberal capitalism. UNESCO recognition, Taylor points out, is a kind of ‘halo effect’; it confers upon musical practices a ‘privileged status in today’s commodity culture’ (2017: 153).<sup>3</sup> The impact of commercialisation in the promotion of music heritage is hard to ignore, not least because UNESCO itself is increasingly measuring the value of cultural heritage in terms of the contribution it can make to economic development. As Hwee-San Tan notes in this volume, the promotion of ICH in China has become an economic policy both nationally and internationally.

Critics of cultural commodification have noted that it typically involves the replacement of social value with monetary value. The expediency of culture as ‘a resource for other ends’ is a pervasive feature of contemporary social life (Yúdice 2003: 25). As a resource, culture can be exploited for economic and political purposes in a transnational commodity market that feeds off the local. Participatory music-making based on intimate social relations, reciprocity and exchanges of sentiment, for instance, can be ruptured by short-term financial transactions in the global marketplace for culture. Such a transition is highlighted in Lauren Meeker’s study of quan họ folk singing in northern Vietnam (Meeker 2013). Meeker charts how quan họ has undergone a transition from being a social embedded village activity to being performed on the stage at festivals, which emphasise the display of identity rather than the exchange of sentiment. A consequence of marrying heritage preservation with tourist commerce, as Jeff Todd Titon notes, is that ‘heritage management is doomed to the paradox of constructing staged authenticities’ (2009b: 119).

A further danger with heritagisation processes that lead to commercialisation is that they may undermine the vitality of music transmission. Jeff Todd Titon cautions, using an ecological analogy, that ‘representations of music at cultural heritage sites managed for

tourists run the risk of being like chemical fertilizers, artificial stimuli that feed the plant but starve the soil' (2009b: 122). To avoid such degradation, Titon suggests that cultural heritage policies should aim to encourage local, participatory music-making: 'Managing the cultural soil means partnering with the musical culture-bearers and community scholars to help them care for their musical traditions in their community contexts' (2009b: 124).

Although it is sometimes hard not to see the process of music heritagisation as a thinly veiled process of commercialisation and commodification, performance has an exuberance, an excess, which is hard to reduce to economic exchange value alone. Cultural commodification and the identity industry, as John and Jean Comaroff have noted, lead to new forms of sociability and collective experience. In their words, 'just as culture is being commodified, so the commodity is itself being rendered explicitly cultural – and, consequently, is increasingly apprehended as the generic source of sociality' (Comaroff and Comaroff 2009: 28). Tourist performances and heritage festivals themselves become sites in which new patterns of sociality and new forms of identity are forged. As Caroline Bithell observes in the case of Georgian polyphonic singing in this volume, tourist performances and the participation of foreign performers have resulted in reciprocal exchanges of sentiment across cultural boundaries, which have invigorated the vitality of the tradition, rather than distorted or undermined it.

While disdain for the impact of the commercialisation and commodification of musical practices lingers in some academic circles, Simon McKerrell has called for music scholars to embrace the opportunities for leveraging 'heritage capital' into 'economic capital' to assist music sustainability (see McKerrell, forthcoming). He proposes a processual model of 'tacit heritage exchange', which takes into account how 'the affective qualities and the feelings experienced through participation in traditional music performance become the commodity exchanged' (forthcoming: 13). In an attempt to 'dissolve the old binaristic conceptions of authentic musical experiences versus economic exchange value', McKerrell makes a rallying call for scholars to make a contribution to formulating cultural policy on the traditional arts in a way that recognises 'the complexities of values and exchanges in tacit heritage where the commodity can be ineffable senses of belonging, identity, pleasure, joy and Selfhood' (forthcoming: 17–18). Such calls for scholarly activism aim to spur ethnomusicologists into recognising the potential value and impact of their work for musical communities in economic, as well as cultural and aesthetic terms.

Critical heritage discourse has had a relatively limited impact on the work of historical musicologists who focus on 'western art music'. Nonetheless, historical musicology



has not been alien to viewing music as heritage. Indeed, as early as 1929, Hubert J. Foss entitled his survey of European art music *The Heritage of Music*, signalling that his selection criteria focused on the meretricious and influential aspects of the past. Similar motivations seem to have governed Michael Raeburn and Alan Kendall when, some 60 years later, they reused the title for a 4-volume compendium of the history of western art music (Raeburn and Kendall 1989). Not surprisingly, a certain simplicity was involved here, and the term ‘heritage’ primarily became attached to practices in certain ‘musical capitals’ or institutions,<sup>4</sup> or to signal a compendium of ‘master’ composers.<sup>5</sup> Such an uncritical usage of ‘heritage’ also implied that ‘western art music’ was at the pinnacle, above other kinds of music. However, the justification for such treatment was rarely found, nor was any strong awareness shown of the debates about heritage in the social sciences. While the original anthology by Foss in 1929 was praised by a reviewer as being ‘in a great part adequate to its high title’ (anonymous 1928: 84–85), reviewers for the newer series by Raeburn and Kendall shied away from discussing the implied governing concept. They mainly discussed the utility of yet another attempt to provide a comprehensive account of western art music.<sup>6</sup>

The reluctance of historical musicologists to examine the notion of heritage itself seems to arise from two distinct ideas. First, the value of western art music has been considered to be incontestable and its survival not at stake. Second, a conceit was promulgated that classical music ‘heritage’ was for ‘everyone’, not belonging to, or being representative of, the identity of a particular sub-group or ‘community’. Recently, however, some European countries that have traditionally been described as ‘peripheral’ to the ‘mainstream’ of western art music have launched ‘heritage’ projects for their art music repertoire. The Norwegian Music Heritage Project, for example, aims to preserve and disseminate the country’s art-music legacy composed between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries, including works by Ole Bull, Edvard Grieg and Johan Svendsen (see Baumann 2014). As part of the project, the National Library of Norway has digitized all of its collections and made them accessible to the public (see Holth and Baumann 2011). Such a venture shows interesting parallels, as well as shared dilemmas, with projects that aim to safeguarding ‘traditional’ musics elsewhere in the world. The underlying idea is that heritage is a vital component of national or cultural identity, and it becomes particularly significant when the identity of a community is somewhat marginalised or endangered.

Of late, the issues of marginalisation and endangerment have also become increasingly relevant to western art music itself, as its future audiences seem less certain and its practices and purposes are seen in some quarters as undemocratic and elitist. Some

traditions of western art music might be considered to be in danger of disappearing and an increasing volume of literature now pleads for the ‘saving’ of western art music. This critical situation arises not only through the economic threat of being marginalised by the popular music industry but also by a kind of cultural submersion. In the face of this, some have championed western art music by emphasising the power that music has to draw all people together in appreciation of their common humanity (Kramer 2007: 190–193), while others, more provocatively, assert that western art music has greater value than other types through its technical sophistication and reflection of Enlightenment humanism (Johnson 2002: esp. 27–32). Such prioritisation of western art music over other musics is, of course, highly contentious, and is likely to be received with antipathy by scholars, musicians and audiences who engage with the diversity of music styles beyond the canon of western art music. This is not the place to present a detailed critique of those apologias, but some arguments about musical value and hierarchy come under scrutiny in several chapters in this book.

Some academic work has tried to forge new thinking about the significance of western art music in relation to the processes of globalisation. Immigration on a global scale has rapidly changed the demographic complexity of the world, in Europe and elsewhere, and the hybridisation of styles and practices has become commonplace. This has led to a tendency for musical styles to become separated from their ‘initiating’ cultural roots (see Pryer this volume). In a polemical article, La Face and Bianconi suggest that western art music might become a powerful tool for social inclusion: one shared ideal with which all Europeans can identify (2013: 2). They argue that western art music, beyond minor differences between one country and another, is invaluable for non-European immigrants as they become integrated into their new communities in Europe. However, such a proposal is open to the charge of being naïve, not least because it seems to sweep aside issues of nationalism, even though, as Philip Bohlman points out, ‘nationalism contributes fundamentally to the ontology of European music, that is to music’s “way of being” in Europe’ (2011: xxii). Furthermore, La Face and Bianconi’s suggestions raise more questions than they provide answers. After all, it is not at all clear that ‘western art music’ as a collective umbrella serves and represents the existing demography of Europe, let alone its future reconfigurations. La Face and Bianconi’s proposal seems to imply a stable ‘homogeneity’ to the European Union and arguably perpetuates the problematic and simplistic dichotomy between ‘the West’ and ‘the Rest’.

Given these urgent issues, several chapters in this volume reflect on how the study of western art music can contribute to our understanding of music as heritage. UNESCO’s current ICH lists (i.e. prior to the 2017 cycle) do not include any items directly connected to

actual practices of western art music, apart from the inscription of Cremona's traditional violin craftsmanship, which focuses on the intangible skills of producing a physical object but not those of making music itself. This partly reflects the uneven manner in which European countries have engaged with UNESCO's 2003 Convention: in contrast to Southern and Eastern European countries that swiftly ratified the Convention, the countries in North-Western Europe have been rather reluctant.<sup>7</sup> Yet the absence of western art music from UNESCO's lists does not mean that it is not an important part of world heritage with a rich past and inventive future.

The well-recorded and much-debated history of western art music repertoires has much to offer when thinking about current issues surrounding music heritage. Firstly, reconceptualising what constitutes western art music has been necessary. This vast repertoire is not an homogenous entity in terms of context, style, and original social function; it ranges widely from liturgical music for medieval churches, renaissance courtly entertainments, the programmes of aristocratic or bourgeois concerts, to the avant-garde of high modernism and the experimental movements of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Western art music is not monolithic neither in content, in its intended audiences, nor in its reception, and several case studies in this book illustrate the need for a fluid approach to the thinking about the boundaries between the 'art', 'folk', and 'popular' music of the 'west' (see Matsumoto this volume).

Secondly, traditions and practices connected to western art music have not only been disseminated widely around the world, they have also flourished in diverse ways in new contexts. Composers born outside Europe and North America have actively composed art music for western musical instruments, but their techniques and styles reach beyond mere emulation of their western colleagues. We find in many forward-looking works by non-western composers direct interactions with indigenous, traditional musics within the framework of 'western' art music, as can be seen in the works by Matsudaira Yoritsune and other Japanese composers discussed by Narimoto in this volume. Such interactions demonstrate respect for tradition and cultural identity, while, at the same time, they enable new pathways to be forged in so-called 'western art music'.

Finally, there is a need to re-examine the seemingly polar divide between the tangible and the intangible. Despite the emphasis in UNESCO's project on the intangible, there are several instances among their lists where related physical objects (such as puppets in the Sicilian *opera dei pupi* or violins produced by Cremonese masters) draw as much attention as the intangible, and music revivals are often dependent on a critical assessment of the

interconnections between the tangible and the intangible. This can be seen, for instance, in Stewart-MacDonald's chapter in this volume, which examines how much of the intangible – in particular 'lost' traditions of performance from the early nineteenth century – can be revived through tangible scores and documents. Such research challenges the fixed and standardized notion of the 'work' and has the potential to stimulate greater diversity in future performances. *Music as Heritage*, therefore, aims to illuminate how historical research on art music, in Europe and beyond, can inform broader debates about music heritage and to question entrenched assumptions that discourse on intangible heritage is of little relevance to western art music.

### **Music as Heritage: Contents Overview**

The first two chapters in Part 1 consider the ethics of safeguarding and the reasons why some genres are marginalised whereas others are preserved and promoted. In Chapter 1, Anthony Pryer develops a critique of the notion of 'heritage' itself, through exploring the positive and negative effects of UNESCO's ambitious safeguarding project. He indicates that the UNESCO project has faced dilemmas because it is related to two rapidly changing targets: the shifting sands of political and ideological alliances, and the constantly evolving development of theoretical ideas in relation to some of its core concepts. By drawing on perspectives from legal studies and the philosophy of art, he argues that cultures cannot be treated like human beings because communities die at no fixed point in time, and without constructing any legally binding inventory of their cultural possessions. Moreover, he argues that discussing 'heritage' as a single, lapidary type – the 'ancestral' – will never do justice to the subtle processes of transformation within societies. Hence, he posits a three-fold typology of heritages – 'multi-generational', 'supplemental' and 'discarded' – which work together to provide a 'mobile heritage mosaic' that gradually transforms its host culture.

In Chapter 2, Naomi Matsumoto reveals how opera in the early modern period was directly linked to its local community, and 'high' and 'low' traditions and cultures. This is in contrast to the way in which we nowadays understand the genre – as one of the most telling examples of elite culture, and one which is not an obvious candidate for protection under the ICH schemes. Her range of examples includes not only 'proper' operas composed at the inception of the genre in the seventeenth century but also those related but 'forgotten' genres around that time that fed into opera's ingredients and processes. She exposes in particular its links with Sicilian puppet theatre (*opera dei pupi*), which was inscribed on UNESCO's

Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in 2008. In so doing, she deconstructs the notion of ‘elite’ cultural genres, showing that they are by nature fluid and socially mobile.

Chapters 3 and 4 address how audiovisual media are used in the representation of music heritage and how different approaches to filmmaking intersect with safeguarding agendas. In Chapter 3, Terada Yoshitaka discusses his approach to ethnographic filmmaking as part of his work at the National Museum of Ethnology, Japan. Focusing on two filming projects focusing on Cambodian shadow puppet theatre (*sbaek thomm*) and drum music from the southern Philippines (*kulintang*), Terada explores the uses and relevance of audiovisual media for safeguarding intangible heritage that has been harmed and endangered by political turmoil and war. He argues for a process-oriented approach in which audiovisual media is regarded as a living and organic site where comments and critiques are incorporated throughout the entire process of filmmaking including research, filming, editing and post-production activities. In a shift of emphasis away from viewing film as a product, this approach sees the whole process – from the early research and shooting to post-production and screenings – as an opportunity for sustained collaboration and exchange with native scholars, source communities and audiences.

In chapter 4, Barley Norton explores how film intersects with the heritagisation of musical traditions, focusing on the video materials submitted as part of official system of inscribing intangible cultural heritage on UNESCO’s safeguarding lists. The chapter draws attention to the shifting status of audiovisual documentation in UNESCO’s regulatory framework and the lack of detailed guidance on the approach, content and evaluation of the 10-minute edited films submitted as part of the inscription process. With reference to debates about ethnographical film in visual anthropology and critical scholarship on participatory video, the chapter discusses the limitations of viewing edited videos as an objective form of documentation and the difficulties of prescribing the style and content of films about intangible heritage.

To highlight how political, cultural and aesthetic concerns affect the audiovisual representation of music heritage, Norton’s chapter discusses as a case study the 10-minute film submitted as part of the nomination file ‘Ví and Giặm folk songs of Nghệ Tĩnh’, which was inscribed on UNESCO’s Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in 2014. Drawing on insights gained into the process of making the film on Ví and Giặm folk singing during a short field trip to the region of Nghệ Tĩnh in 2013, it is argued that far from being a neutral form of documentation, audiovisual representations of music

heritage are embedded in particular political, cultural and historical processes. The considerable potential of audiovisual media to influence how music traditions are perceived and practiced is also discussed through a comparison of the official film submitted to UNESCO and a Vietnamese television broadcast of a large-scale staged show organised to celebrate the successful inscription of Ví and Giặm folk singing on the Representation List.

An important theme in Part 2 is the exploration of how policies on heritage have affected musicians and musical practices in different contexts, and the various forms of agency music practitioners have to influence policies and, when necessary, to resist or bypass them. In their efforts to transmit traditions or to revive ‘lost’ ones, musicians are faced with choices about how to adhere to musical aesthetics deemed ‘authentic’, while at the same time making their performances relevant in contemporary contexts.

In Chapter 5, Simon Mills discusses the profound influence of the Korean preservation system on the life of four shamanic ritual (*kut*) traditions in contemporary South Korea: a post-death cleansing ritual Ssikkim kut from the southwest island of Chindo; two rituals traditionally performed by fishing communities on the east sea coast (Tonghaean Pyölshin kut) and south sea coast (Namhaean Pyölshin kut); and a ritual, Kyönggi Todang kut, aimed at appeasing a tutelary deity, performed in the southern part of Kyönggi province, around the capital of Seoul. The four kut, all of which have been listed as ‘Important Intangible Cultural Properties’ in the Korean preservation system, are interesting to compare as they lie across a continuum from ‘real’ to ‘concert’ ritual. At the ‘real’ end of the continuum, rituals are based on the active participation of client communities and a shared commitment to ritual objectives. Towards the ‘concert’ end are various types of staged performance typically marked by a sense of detachment and limited participatory involvement between ritualists and viewers.

Based on in-depth interviews with key ritualists, Mills’ chapter provides insights into practitioners’ views about the preservation system and the opportunities it offers them for sustaining their artistry. In Mills’ positive assessment, the Korean preservation system has been a vital ‘life-support system’, without which the ritual traditions would have undoubtedly dwindled. The interventionist measures of the preservation system have served to establish iconic status for marginalised ritual arts and raised the status of previously stigmatised ritualists. The chapter notes that many Koreans conceive of the kut rituals as ‘museum pieces’, as relics from a superseded past. Yet despite the emphasis on authenticity and non-change in the preservation system, the ritualists interviewed by Mills did not feel that their individual creativity was constrained by the ideology of preservation. Instead, they stressed

the importance of transformation and change in order to maintain cultural relevance. The raised status of ritualists as a result of the preservation system has given them opportunities to impart their experience, knowledge and skills to non-shamanic performers, who have in turn been inspired by shamanic artistry in their own creative work. In the case of these Korean shamanic practices, Mills argues that the preservation system has inspired, not stifled, new musical creations.

In Chapter 6, Min Yen Ong offers a less rosy picture of the impact of top-down government strategies and UNESCO interventions on local musicians and their involvement in the safeguarding of Kunqu opera in China. One of the key effects of China's safeguarding policies and UNESCO's proclamation of Kunqu as a Masterpiece of ICH in 2001 has been a transfer of cultural ownership from the community to the state and the favouring of professional over amateur troupes. Despite the emphasis in the 2003 UNESCO Convention on ensuring the 'widest possible' participation of communities in maintaining heritage, only the theatrical performances of professional troupes are credited in the proclamation and the unstaged singing practices of the Kunqu amateur community are not acknowledged. Though crucial to the transmission of the tradition, amateur troupes largely lie outside the official sphere of government safeguarding initiatives. Such independence results in logistical and financial difficulties for some troupes, but also enables amateurs to freely assert 'authentic' singing techniques and musical aesthetics without political intervention. Drawing on detailed field research with amateur Kunqu communities, Ong contrasts the singing aesthetics of amateurs with the distinctive styles of performance promoted by professional troupes, who are charged by the state with popularising and commercialising the art as a cultural resource. The appointment of Zhang Jun for the UNESCO Artist of Peace Award in 2011 exemplifies the commercial forces driving some safeguarding initiatives, which detract from the traditional aesthetics of amateur performers. Ong's analysis of the Kunqu case highlights the tensions that are prone to arise between the political and commercial agendas of top-down safeguarding measures and local musical communities.

In Chapter 7, David W. Hughes offers an interesting point of comparison with the preceding chapters on musical practices in Korea and China, with his assessment of the vitality of seven different Japanese folk songs or *min'yo*, which are rooted in particular places or 'home towns'. Drawing on several decades of contact with *min'yo* folk singers and cultural officials, Hughes provides a bottom-up view of local folk song. In some of the examples, local communities are indifferent to designation, and even resist it, shattering the usual assumption that support through outside designation and intervention is desirable or

necessary. In instances when songs have been designated as Important Intangible Folk Cultural Properties at different governmental levels (i.e. national, prefectural or municipal), the impact of designation on the vitality of folk songs has not been decisive and is hard to measure. Hughes points out that the sustainability of folk singing largely depends on the will of local communities to continue teaching and performing songs, rather than initiatives resulting from official designation. While acknowledging that not all folk songs necessarily can or should be sustained, Hughes argues that to sustain min'yo as a living tradition it is necessary to: 1) teach folk songs at all levels of schooling, starting at the primary level; 2) sustain the family transmission of songs, which is largely independent of government policies; 3) promote 'stage min'yo' to encourage interest in 'authentic', 'non-stage' versions; and 4) encourage fusions between min'yo and 'Western' musical features – such as arrangements employing non-traditional instruments and choral vocal harmonies or drawing on elements of rock and jazz – to encourage wider appreciation among younger generations.

While some of the Japanese songs discussed by David Hughes are on the verge of extinction, in Chapter 8 Rohan H. Stewart-MacDonald reconsiders the possibilities for reviving aspects of a 'lost' improvisatory tradition of the early nineteenth-century piano concerto in Europe. He approaches this repertoire as a documenter and demonstrator of its particular traditions of improvisation and embellishment – skills central to performers in the early nineteenth century. Those skills were, however, somewhat suppressed with the establishment of the notion of an *Urtext*, an editorial approach which purports to preserve just the notated 'original text' – and that of *Werktreue* (fidelity to the musical work), which some claim displays an overconfident belief that works can have fixed identities and boundaries. Through manifestations of improvisation including notated cadenzas and imitations of vocal ornamentations from selected works by Hummel, Moscheles, Kalkbrenner, Ries and Herz, he posits those factors as artefacts of intangible cultural heritage. He then explores how the performance practices of the pre-recorded era might be revived and adapted to suit the modern-day concert environment.

The chapters in Part 3 engage with the ways in which national, ethnic, class and genre boundaries figure in constructions of musical heritage and consider how tourism and transnational factors, including the movement of musicians and music practices across national borders, influence the ecology of musical systems and innovation.

In chapter 9, Caroline Bithell discusses the complex mix of revivalist and post-revival features that characterises the diverse terrain of Georgian polyphonic singing. UNESCO's proclamation of Georgian Polyphonic Singing as a Masterpiece of the Oral and Intangible



Heritage of Humanity in 2001 ushered in top-down, state-sponsored safeguarding programmes, yet also saw a proliferation of independent, grassroots initiatives. In bypassing the scrutiny of state institutions, grassroots initiatives have been free to pursue alternative paths and goals. The chapter provides a vivid ethnographic account of the numerous traditional music ensembles in the capital Tbilisi, highlighting the tensions between the ‘authentic’ and ‘academic’ styles, between performances that seek to adhere to musical aesthetics associated with the ‘primary folklore’ of village communities and those that follow a more ‘trained’, ‘classical’ style, incorporating the external influences characteristic of ‘secondary folklore’. It brings to the fore the lively debates about authenticity, musical aesthetics and the meanings of performances in different contexts. Notably, the criteria of ‘authenticity’ varies depending on the contexts and settings in which music and dance is performed. Whereas the folklore establishment assert criteria to govern what is ‘correct’ in staged, formal performances, singers have more flexibility for spontaneity and experimentation in domestic spaces and other ‘real-life’ settings that lie outside of the purview of official scrutiny. Depending on the context, some ensembles move fluidly between performances that comply with the established criteria for authenticity and neo-folk fusion projects.

In recent years, Georgian choirs have sprung up in numerous countries and there has been a steady rise in singing camps and study tours, often held in remote villages in Georgia, for overseas visitors. As Bithell highlights, the ever-widening network of foreign aficionados of Georgian polyphony and frequent transnational border crossings have added significantly to the vitality of the tradition. In contrast to situations where foreign influence and the staging of heritage for tourists have had a detrimental effect on musical traditions, Bithell argues that direct engagement with Georgian polyphony by singers of different nationalities has allowed for reciprocal exchanges of sentiment between individuals and has contributed to the musical vitality and economic regeneration of rural communities. Through such boundary crossings and collaborative projects, the chapter charts how Georgian polyphony has made the transition to the status of ‘world heritage’.

In Chapter 10, Hwee-San Tan takes a broad view of the implementation of ICH policies in China, as set out in the government’s three-stage plan that extends from 2004 to 2020. In order to provide a picture of the realities and practicalities of ICH safeguarding initiatives in China, the chapter balances evaluation of official rhetoric with case studies that focus on how ICH inventories and digital resources have been created at different administration levels. The top-down nature of government bureaucracy in China means that

local musicians and culture bearers have little agency in determining the implementation of cultural policies, although Tan notes that some independent, grass-roots activities have arisen alongside large scale, government-led safeguarding projects. The chapter also scrutinises the concept of ‘eco-cultural protection areas’, which has recently been introduced in China as a strategy of ICH safeguarding aimed at promoting a cultural ecology rooted in a symbiosis between the environment and the people. Based on her research of the Minnan Eco-Cultural Protection Area, Tan discusses how such areas are linked to economic development, the promotion of cultural tourism and the expansion of the cultural industries. The chapter highlights how cultural heritage in China is not only being used to build national cohesion and identity, but is also integral to the government’s plans for economic development and its efforts to enhance its international standing and prestige.

With Chapter 11, we are brought to the world of Karnatak music in South India. While in many respects South Indian art music is thriving, the chapter scrutinises the narratives of decline attached to two instruments: the *vīṇā* (plucked lute) and the *nāgasvaram* (double reed shawm). Lara Pearson unravels the complex reasons for the relative neglect of these instruments. Neglect is attributed in part to the recasting of Karnatak music as national cultural heritage and the canonisation of the format for classical concerts in the early twentieth century, which has led to a degree of ossification. Hindered by its framing as an embodiment of religious devotion, the *vīṇā* and some repertoire associated with it have been marginalised in classical concerts, as have the temple performances of the *nāgasvaram*. In recent years, professional musicians, who play the *nāgasvaram* in the *Periya Mēlam* ensemble in temple contexts, have suffered from a decline in status, pay and conditions, which is endangering the transmission of expert skills.

The impact of UNESCO’s Convention, although not without effects, is less immediate in India than in some parts of Asia. Discourses of national cultural revival have played out in the performing arts in India at least since the period of reform and renovation in the early twentieth century. In the cases of the *vīṇā* and *nāgasvaram* and their performance contexts, UNESCO inscription has not transpired and national engagement with cultural safeguarding has not led to bold new initiatives to develop sustainable musical ecosystems or funding systems. Yet there is some scope for innovation from within. Cultural innovation and change in a generally conservative cultural and religious context is enabled by societal shifts as seen, for example, in the challenges by some musicians to Brahmin cultural dominance and caste exclusion in determining musical practices and aesthetics. Exploring the discourses that surround drives for preservation and innovation in contemporary Karnatak music,

Pearson reflects on how these discourses, while apparently concerning only details of musical practice, often touch on wider and more controversial issues regarding religion, caste, politics and gender.

In Chapter 12, Rica Narimoto, a distinguished composer herself, seeks new solutions to the question of what methods should be used to safeguarding musical heritage by investigating avant-garde works by Japanese composers who utilise traditional musical ideas. She begins by uncovering how composers of ‘new music’ in post-World-War-II Japan were influenced by the aesthetics and styles of traditional Japanese music. She then analyses in detail *Metamorphosis on Saibara* for orchestra (1953) by Matsudaira Yoritsune (1907–2001), which is based on *gagaku* – an old style of Japanese court music which was inscribed on UNESCO’s Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in 2009. Narimoto demonstrates that the composer’s profound understanding of the *gagaku* genre helped make his music highly original, culturally valuable, and aesthetically important. She argues that even if Matsudaira himself never actively aimed to ‘preserve’ Japan’s music heritage, his work gave *gagaku* a new cultural status and artistic meaning, which has even fed back into the practices of traditional *gagaku* ensembles. By demonstrating how Matsudaira embraced both tradition and the avant-garde, Narimoto explores an understanding of music heritage that is not fixed in the past, but rather is characterised by continual transformation and change.

---

<sup>1</sup> See: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/working-towards-a-convention-00004> (last accessed, September 2017).

<sup>2</sup> Jeff Todd Titon refers to applied ethnomusicology as ‘a music-centered intervention in a particular community, whose purpose is to benefit that community – for example, a social improvement, a musical benefit, a cultural good, an economic advantage, or a combination of these and other benefits’ (Titon 2015: 3).

<sup>3</sup> Despite arguing that the ideology of intangible cultural heritage emanates from neoliberal capitalist processes, Taylor suggests that ‘there is no longer any way to be “outside” capitalism’ and concedes that UNESCO’s safeguarding system is an attempt to tame the effects of capitalist processes of commodification (2017: 154).

<sup>4</sup> For example, Gertenberg 1968 and Town 2012.

<sup>5</sup> For example, Mondon 2013 and Giroud and Branger (eds) 2014.

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, Peggie 1990.

<sup>7</sup> See: <http://www.unesco.org/eri/la/convention.asp?KO=17116&language=E> (last accessed September 2017). The United Kingdom has not ratified the Convention, although other countries in North-Western Europe have gradually done so (e.g. France and Belgium in 2006, Norway in 2007, Sweden in 2011, Germany and Finland in 2013, and Ireland in 2015).