

Current Issues in Historical-Critical Practice

Selected readings and discussions centering around key issues, controversies, and problems within the humanities generally, along with a consideration of their implications for advanced work in musicology.

Required Purchases

Makaryk, Irena. Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms . Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1993.

Preziosi, Donald. Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1989.

Dahlhaus, Carl. Foundations of Music History. Trans. J.B. Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982. [Orig. Grundlagen der Musikgeschichte, Cologne, Gerig, 1977.]

List of Readings in Addition to Those Found in the Three “Required-Purchase” Books

**(This list is subject to revision as
the course proceeds: we may experience
a few deletions and/or additions)**

Weber, William. “Beyond Zeitgeist: Recent Work in Music History.” Journal of Modern History 66 (1994), 321-45.

Nehamas, Alexander. “Subject and Object: The Examined Life of Michel Foucault.” The New Republic, 15 February 1993, 27-36.

- Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." Trans. Stephen Heath. Image--Music--Text. New York: Noonday, 1977. Pp. 142-48. [Orig. publ. as "La mort de l'auteur," Mantéia 5 (1968).]
- Barthes, Roland. "From Work to Text." Trans. Stephen Heath. Image--Music--Text. New York: Noonday, 1977. Pp. 155-64. [Orig. publ. as "De l'œuvre au texte," Revue d'esthétique 3 (1971).]
- Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author?" Trans. Josué V. Harari. In The Foucault Reader. Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon, 1984. Pp. 101-20. (Trans. orig. publ. in Foucault, Language, Counter-Memory, Practice, ed. D. Bouchard, Cornell Univ. Press, 1977, and in the anthology, ed. Harari, Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism, Cornell Univ. Press, 1979; Original, French version publ. as "Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?" Bulletin de la Société française de Philosophie 63 (1969), 73-95).
- Foucault, Michel. Extracts from The History of Sexuality, vol. 1. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Random House, 1978; Vintage, 1980). [Orig. La volonté de savoir, Paris, Gallimard, 1976.]
- a) "The Repressive Hypothesis," pp. 17-49. [Also available in The Foucault Reader, pp. 301-29.]
 - b) "Method," pp. 92-102.
- Foucault, Michel. Extracts from Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon, 1977; Vintage 1979. [Orig. Surveiller et punir; Naissance de la prison, Paris, Gallimard, 1975.]
- a) "The Means of Correct Training," pp. 170-94. [Also available in The Foucault Reader, pp. 188-205.]
 - b) "Panopticism," pp. 195-228. [Extracts available in The Foucault Reader, pp. 206-13.]
- Selected Essays from H. Aram Veeseer, ed., The New Historicism. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- a) Veeseer, H. Aram. "Introduction." Pp. ix-xvi.
 - b) Newton, Judith Lowder. "History as Usual? Feminism and the 'New Historicism.'" Pp. 152-67.
 - c) Graff, Gerald. "Co-optation." Pp. 168-81.

Dellamora, Richard. "Introduction: Masculine Desire and the Question of the Subject." Masculine Desire: The Sexual Politics of Victorian Aestheticism. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1990. Pp. 1-15.

Four Essays from Partisan Review, Vol. 60, No. 4 (Fall 1993, "The Politics of Political Correctness")

a) Searle, John. R. "Is There a Crisis in American Higher Education?" Pp. 693-709.

b) Martin, Jerry L. "The Postmodern Argument Reconsidered." Pp. 638-54.

c) Haack, Susan. "Knowledge and Propaganda: Reflections of an Old Feminist." Pp. 556-64.

d) Marcus, Steven. "Soft Totalitarianism." Pp. 630-38.

Hohendahl, Peter Uwe. "Introduction: The Institution of Literature." In Building a National Literature: The Case of Germany, 1830-1870. [1985] Trans. Renate Baron Franciscano. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989. Pp. 1-43.

Rorty, Richard. Review of Killing Time: The Autobiography of Paul Feyerabend [1995]. The New Republic, 31 July 1995, pp. 32-36.

Dahlhaus, Carl. "The Musical Work of Art as a Subject of Sociology." In Schoenberg and the New Music. Trans. Derrick Puffett and Alfred Clayton. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987. Pp. 234-47. [Orig. "Das musikalische Kunstwerk als Gegenstand der Soziologie," International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music 5 (1974).]

Hepokoski, James. "Music and Genre: Reflections on Two Texts and a Counter-Text." (Typescript of a draft in progress.)

Selected Articles from The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics. Ed. Alex Preminger and T. V. F. Brogan. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1993. Especially:

- a) "Deconstruction."
- b) "Cultural Criticism"
- c) "Feminist Poetics"
- d) "Historicism"
- e) "Intertextuality."
- f) "Russian Formalism"
- g) "Semiotics, Poetic"
- h) "Textuality"

Projected Seminar Plan (May be slightly altered during the quarter)

- 21 Sep Intro. to Course: the “Work”/“Text” Dichotomy, etc.
- a) Weber, “Beyond Zeitgeist: Recent Work in Music History”
- Note: everybody is responsible for reading Makaryk Clusters 2, 6, 10, and 13 at the appropriate times. No formal class sessions will be held on them, however.
-
- 26 Sep Makaryk Cluster 1: Metacriticism
- a) “Modernism and Postmodernism” from The New Princeton Dictionary of Poetry and Poetics
- 28 Sep Makaryk Cluster 3: Structuralism
- a) “Textuality” and “Intertextuality” from The New Princeton Dictionary of Poetry and Poetics
- b) Barthes, “From Work to Text”
- c) Barthes, “The Death of the Author”
- d) Foucault, “What is an Author?”
-
- 3 Oct Makaryk Cluster 4: Deconstruction.
- 5 Oct Makaryk Cluster 5: New Historicism
- a) Nehamas, “Subject and Object”

b) Veesper, "Introduction"

c) Graff, "Co-optation"

10 Oct Makaryk Cluster 7: Marxist Criticism

12 Oct Makaryk Cluster 8: Psychoanalytic Theory

17 Oct Makaryk Cluster 9: Feminist Criticism (and Gender Criticism)

a) Newton, "History as Usual? Feminism and the 'New Historicism'"

b) Foucault, "The Repressive Hypothesis" and "Method" from The History of Sexuality.

c) Dellamora, "Introduction: Masculine Desire and the Question of the Subject"

19 Oct Makaryk Cluster 11-12: Postcolonial Theory, "Black Criticism"

24 Oct Makaryk Cluster 14: Reader-Response Criticism

26 Oct Makaryk Cluster 15: Frankfurt School

a) Hohendahl, "Introduction"

30 Oct Contra: Four Opposing Arguments (Searle, Martin, Haack, Marcus)

AMS Break During the break, read the extracts from Foucault, Discipline and Punish and begin Preziosi (first two chapters)

7 Nov Preziosi, Preface and Chs. 1 and 2

9 Nov Preziosi, Chs. 3 and 6.

Five Final Sessions, to be scheduled: Carl Dahlhaus, "The Musical Work of Art as a Subject of Sociology" and Foundations of Music History. The Selected chapters of FMH will be read in the following order: 8, 9, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 . . . Also: JH: "Music and Genre: Reflections on Two Texts and a Counter-Text."

CLASS PROCEDURE

(FOR THE MAKARYK CLUSTERS, PREZIOSI,
AND RELATED READINGS;
A REASSESSMENT OF THE PROCEDURE
WILL OCCUR AT OR BEFORE MID-QUARTER)

Normally, each major cluster of readings will be considered or discussed for about an hour. You are responsible for generating much of the discussion. For each cluster, one of you will take on the role of the presenter; the others will be respondents. The role of the presenter will be continually rotated throughout the class. There will usually be four presentations per week (although for a few of the clusters and later readings, we may dispense with the formality of the presentations).

AS PRESENTER--you are responsible for delivering a 12- to 15-minute quasi-formal talk (no longer!!) to the class. You may want to read the draft of a short paper, or you may want to work from expanded notes. In any case, it must be interesting, significant, and efficient. Don't bore us.

1. You are responsible for having immersed yourself in the content/world of the reading cluster. Submit it to particularly careful study; whenever desirable seek additional sources to clarify what we have all read in the cluster. Seek out copies of selected books/articles mentioned to get a sense of what they are like. Everyone else will also have read your cluster of readings--but you are expected to have done it more thoroughly.
2. Choose an important paragraph, central point, or set of central points within the reading cluster. Engage it critically and responsibly from the standpoint of the discipline of musicology. Remember--we have all read what you have read: what can you tell us that will advance our understanding of the reading, or that will take a position regarding it? Whenever possible, take a position and the point addressed: avoid bland, banal, or tepid presentations.
3. Suggestions. We might often be interested in such things as:
 - a) Why could such a point be important to (your own?) work in musicology or to musicology in general? (If it is not important, choose another point.)
 - 1) When appropriate, provide some concrete examples of how this could be helpful in a given repertory, a given piece, a given musical problem, and so on.

- 2) What are the risks, the possible abuses, the potential pitfalls or likely criticisms from such an approach?
 - b) What can you tell us about the paragraph/point that might help us to understand it more thoroughly? (Would a fuller explanation be helpful?) Are there crucial ramifications of the issue that less thorough readers are likely to miss? If you decide to make your presentation an “explanatory” one, first assure yourself that we are likely to need the explanation you are providing. Sometimes we do not.
 - c) Can the argument be accepted at face value? Is it overstated? Does it overlook anything?
3. Note: for every two class presentations that you make, turn in one formal paper shortly thereafter (within a week): 1000 to 1300 words. Thus of every two presentations that you make, one of them is to be linked with a carefully written paper: you choose whichever of the two you like.

AS RESPONDENT (i.e., the rest of the class for every presentation)

1. Respond to the position/argument made by the presenter. (Make him/her defend the position, agree, present an alternative point of view, and so on.)
2. Be prepared (through prior preparation, of course) to say which paragraph or point you would have chosen had you been the presenter and why. What was provocative about it to you?
3. Be prepared to make a general assessment of the utility to musicology of the methodology outlined in the essay. Which things clearly won't work? Which will?

EVERYONE--for every chapter

- 1) Come to class with a list of 5 to 7 additional key terms or phrases from the cluster that seem important/central/usable in our own work. (Additional terms--not provided in the Makaryk-Cluster sheets--that we ought to know: we'll keep an ongoing list.) Be able to define each term in a paragraph or two (if asked). As we proceed, avoid terms that seem to repeat or merely duplicate what we have already done.
- 2) Come to class with a list of 3 or 4 additional key authors and/or works that we should all keep in mind. (Here, too: an ongoing list.)

FINAL ESSAY

Position Paper: 3000-3300 words (not counting footnotes). Indicate the word-count in pencil on the first page of the typescript.

General level: that of Weber, Nehamas, Rorty, etc. Scholarly (but accessible) level. Topic:

Read from this side of the “revolution” in humanistic/cultural-critical studies, what value--or lack of it--should Carl Dahlhaus’s Foundations of Music History, a document of the German 1970s, have for today’s English-speaking musicologists? Have newer modes of inquiry rendered his arguments largely irrelevant?

Or (?)

Stick carefully to this topic and do not get sidetracked on other issues. Whatever your position, the essay must be carefully written and responsibly argued. It should show your familiarity with both the “new” vocabulary/concerns and with the central themes of Dahlhaus. It should also refer to several of the authors that we have read in the course. (In this respect, you should consider it something of a summary-paper for the whole course, not only for its last few weeks.)

Above all, its level and tone should be commensurate with the subject. At least for this paper: No strident, polemical reductions of the arguments of either one side or the other. Both Dahlhaus and the newer scholarship must be presented accurately and with adequate sensitivity and fairness, even when (or if) you disagree sharply with one side or the other. In short: you may take a strong position if you like, but you are not to be casually dismissive of the “opposing” side.

Use a standard footnote apparatus to refer readers to more detailed explanations of key concepts and issues. Clearly, you don’t have to re-explain every concept that you use.

Double-space everything in your typescript (except for quadruple spaces between major sections, between the title and the text, setting of block-indentations, etc.). No cover-pages or binders. No staples (just a paper clip). Put your name in the upper-right corner and, two or three double-spaces further down from that, the title, centered. Never mind the course number or my name. (Submit it, that is, as if you were sending it in to a journal or book for publication.)