

Three Mainstreams within the [so-called] New Musicology  
 (subgroups sometimes at odds w/each other, or intersecting in personal + unpredictable ways ... but very loosely allied in opposition to the traditional institutions of musicology + theory as they existed in the USA/UK 1960-85) - Each sustained by powerful + charismatic personalities! ("power fields") - Generally united in their suspicion/dismissal of ANALYSIS, though in differing degrees.

① Anti-Analytical ("Formalism") Group Centered around primacy of PERFORMANCE

Very French in orientation  
 Barthes -  
 Julia Kristeva  
 Jacques Derrida  
 Foucault

Suspicious of all "systems" of formalist analysis or shallow containment (i.e. often anti-rational; anti-intellectual in tone - in favor of key words:

PERFORMER - "VOICE" - BODY - (sometimes → magic; ritual; myth; irrational - ineffable - physical - etc.) - But subsets:

- (A) More fully anti-rational or "metaphysical" group most strongly in opposition to analytical or hermeneutic system → ineffability of act of performance supersedes the work → works "reclaimed" by "real music" of performance.
  - Contra "interpretation" → Carolyn Abbate
  - Variant (anthropol.) → Gary Tomlinson
- (B) Similar, but more inclined also to empirical studies of real performers (archival) → male/female body on stage; gesture; posture (Mary Ann Smart; other students of R. Patten → K. Henson, etc.)
- (C) Identity politics + body (irrational) → Fem. (Cusick?); Queen St (Butt; Holsinger)

HERE  
 "metaphysics"  
 some tension  
 MUCH ANTI-ACAD NISM  
 "hermeneutics"  
 over

② FORCEFUL HERMENEUTICS / <sup>Emancipatory</sup> Sexual Politics / <sup>Material culture</sup> Some psychoanalysis (Freud, Lacan)

- often more German/American in orientation // Mus = CULTURAL PRACTICE (esp. → high regard for American readings of Adorno)
- (center around S. McClary, Larry Kramer, Philip Brett, Richard Leppert, Rose Subotnik - Chip Whitehead; Byron Adams) R? "CODES"
- "Modest" ARCHIVAL WIK → But More inclined to take a theory + read a piece through it
- Much more inclined to analyze musical texts both musically and historically (New Historicism → "cultural work" of text)
  - actually making an argument on a "strong reading" of evidence
  - will include "body", etc. but not in such a mystifying way.
- Strong lobbying (often) on behalf of popular music / jazz / blues / rap, "cultural studies" "cultural discourse / materialism"
- Adorno, but also <sup>some</sup> queer theory, <sup>American</sup> feminist theory,

potshots at each other  
 - Abbate → p. ix!  
 - Kramer → p. 5!  
 embedded in music

Odd figures = Berthold Hoeckner (German Adornian)  
 Philip Brett (hol, - jouissance?)

Related (VARIANT)

Again - Music as Cultural Practice, but with a real edge!

③ "Political Exposé" Group — Political "deconstruction" / "demystification"  
Composers + works as complicit in politics that we have come to regard as unacceptable or strongly negative —

Co-opting of music + composers into politics (esp. when they seem to claim to be above the fray)

— More "black-belt research" oriented + sometimes suspicious or dismissive

— "DIG UP THE INCRIMINATING EVIDENCE" of the "strong" readings ("pushed") of Group 2

Centers around two figures → Richard Taruskin (use trad. techniques to undermine benign claims)  
John Deatheridge (UK style - debunker)  
→ pro-Abbate!

Cf. Sanna Pedersen

Alex Redding (Harvard... a bit "light")

Goal → to Deflate (or "finally tell truthfully") the Reception Tradition of Classic Figures or pieces in Western Art-Music Tradition —

- How Reputations are made (Shost.)
- "The Invention of Tradition" (Hobsbawm)
- Monuments (Very trendy now)
- "Sites of memory"

Ultimate goal → to rewrite the broad lines of Music History in terms of cultural work + national ideology (to tell the suppressed story)  
"We have the courage to face the truth"

Often → Strong Research + Traditional Evidence-Based Work  
(Gundula Knezer; Laura Binini)

Use traditional archival/research methods to uncover important strands of music history that had been conveniently suppressed.

(New musicaly - in critical ENDS but not in research means)

Abbate - "Drastic or Gnostic"

→ Classic Statement of the Most Extreme Position

Adopting + building on Jankélévitch's advocacy (non-rational) (non-scientistic) of DRASTIC music — real music in the joyous ineffability of performance.  
(195-06) — "a work" doesn't count

(i.e. TOTAL OPPOSITE OF INGARDEN!)

①

Anti-analysis (formalism)

Anti-hermeneutics + "decoding" of ANY sort! (2 categories:)

p. 516 — "hard hermeneutics" → actually believes in some sort of objective

"supra-audible content" in sounds, validated by "the blessing of the dead" (= marxists, Adorno, Freudians, identity politics) (McClayites?) (essentializing) — political interp.)

EITHER

p. 56 OR "soft hermeneutics" → much the same, but acknowledges subjectivity, postmodernism, problem of "scepticism and postmodernism" (direct shot at Larry Kramer? or similar others, perhaps some McClayites)

Problems — Janké. → Music has broad shoulders to bear whatever meaning we ascribe to it. (516) = INEFFABILITY  
— "MUSIC'S INDETERMINACY" — (516)

i.e. it can mean anything, so why bother to pose the question?  
Cloud-pictures?

∴ "It is this that frees us" (516), i.e., from any critical task of analysis / hermeneutics (!!)

∴ "Why repay the freedom we are given by putting the gift-giver into a cage"? (516)

— Related shot: Wagner as hermeneuticist in "Das Judentum in der Musik"  
(p. 519 — !! → Same as ANY current search for meaning  
Only thing that separates? → Are we on the side of the Devils or the Angels (519)

② What I'll call the "TU QUOQUE METAPHYSICS WARS" —

— i.e., in embracing the liberatory free play + spontaneity of performance, bodies + sound in performance (cf. Barthes<sup>p. 512, n. 22</sup> + Jankélévitch)

C. Ab. has been accused of anti-rationally re-mystifying music by emphatically placing it into a space that's totally clear of any scientific or rational discourse. (L. Kramer charge; McClay...)  
("Allergies" to word mystery = p. 521, n. 35)

Her tack here → You think I'm metaphysical / ineffable,  
YOU'RE THE REAL HOCUS-FOCUS METAPHYSICIANS by trying

to ascribe abstract meanings ("words") that decode the music  
or use music to prop up your own abstractions... removed from any,  
real experience of music as body + sound + voice, The Quoque,  
(523 → Music at once ineffable and sticky... Words stick to it.)

- THUS ABBATE'S STRING OF DENUNCIATIONS (by <sup>succumbing</sup> word choice) of hermeneutic  
mysticism [like a clinical diagnosis...]

505 - "Metaphysical mania" retreats from real music to abstractions

509 - Music as "captured text" for science.

512: The "gnostic  
moment"  
under the aspect  
of eternity.

513 - "clandestine mysticism" [of all] musical hermeneutics.

517 - granting music "grandiose powers" 518 "revealing force"

520 - "Mysticism incognito" (Tanuliu on Rite + politics)

522 - "fantasies about racial [or other] essence embodied in music or  
the invention that generates..."

524 - Contra all CODES + DECODING; (also 525)

"the cryptographic sublime" (524)

526 - "chthonic discourse" (McClary / Subotnik / Knapp)

527 - "technomysticism" ETC

### ③ Again - CONTRA CODES + DECODING (524-26)

④ Response - not analysis but "Doing this really fast is fun" or "Here comes a  
big jump" (p. 511) - Turned into a credo for "the words explaining music"  
on p. 533, near end.

Despite caveat (533 - "would not damp down the gnostic")

What would this do to:

1) Shakespeare Studies ("giving this speech is really fun")  
or ANY cultural endeavor?

Unplugs the mind? + Schizophrenia?

2nd Q - re: Fink

Much of article = powerful indictment of academia's predominant focus on art music as a privileged discourse of prestige + cultural authority.

— But outside the academy and a few marginal niches, few real people care: the world has moved on.

— The reality → collapse of cultural authority + hence a totally level playing field among all musics.

— Hence → no reason to privilege it any more in the academy (textbooks, etc.)

True? In a world where few people care about this music (though just about everyone is interested in the vast sea of other kinds of commercialized music) ... In a world where this music is seen as passé, snobby, elitist ...

Why sobby it?  
Are we doomed?

What's the default role of art music after the collapse of its cultural authority + unique prestige claims?

## Popular Music Articles - Krims / Fink / Walter

All 3 have a deep, deep suspicion of (scorn for) 1980s/90s in-place musicology and music theory practices (formalism) (and its ideologies, covert, etc.) —  
— Esp. its ridicule + dismissal by cultural-studies scholars, who have seen no value for pop. music in any kind of formal or analytical work.  
(Cf. Frith on Walter, Wals. p. 20 [ ]  
(Cf. the Q in Fink, p. 159, top. [ \* ] )  
— 2 of them quote Elvis Costello / Thelma Houston — Walter, p. 22 "Writing about music is like dancing about architecture" [ = Abbate position? ]

But all wish to defend analysis + musicology, one way or another, by reshaping or recasting "analysis" along quite different lines — that would require a disciplinary expert (musicology; theory) to handle.

① KRIMS → Writes from Marxist (quasi-orthodox) perspective (cf. Klumpenhouwer)  
(After long discourse saying we should be post-Adorno, since his paradigm of capitalism no longer applies in an age of quasi-contradictory "flexible accumulation"  
or "post-Fordism")

Solution → Emphasize ind. works' participation in GENRES (142) ... First, be sure that your genres are adequate and REAL (operative in the minds of the performers + listeners) — then SEEK OUT "HIDDEN SOCIAL RELATIONS" (142) at work in those genres — to real, material "URBAN ETHOS" in the sounds themselves + how they are put together.

(Like Adorno → "Form is the sedimentation of content," but rejecting Adorno's critique of "standardization" of pop music as applying to an earlier, outdated phase of capitalism)

(Thereby 'rescuing' pop music from Adorno's critique")

His genres → 1990s

REALITY RAP (Raekwon/AZA, Wu-Tang Clan, Snoop Dogg, Dr. Dre, etc.)

KNOWLEDGE RAP (Mobb Deep, featuring Nas)

+ How Genres shifted — in late 1990s (related to gentrification !!)

"urban ethos" → (simplistic) reviews of headlines from 1990s (152-54)

Doesn't say "codes" but means "code"

## ② FINK

— Flamboyant, witty prose canon dead + 144  
— Utter collapse of "cultural authority" of classical canon — "All we have left is ballroom"

But yet! Analysis (of some sort!) can be valuable, even though "all discussion of form need not be formalist" (p. 159) — [tightrope!]

∴ "anxiety over analysis of popular music" (159) — How to face it?

McClary-esque solutions (UCLA) —

① We do need to examine the music critically, analytically but!

(161) → "We must stop asking what rock means and start asking how it makes you feel"

i.e. CENTRAL CRITICAL TASK → to approach music as a realm of personal reaction  
(165 → McClary → any analytical description must have as a goal how "music constructs bodily desire" — "kicks butt") (165)

∴ Less "abstract" + more firm the body — but still ANALYSIS

→ McClary merged with Sontag, twice (pp. 159-61 → avoid philistinism of interp. w/o analysis → LOOK AT FORM

② Result → "an erotics of art." (167)

FINK → SOLUTION IN CODES AND DECODING (exactly contra Adorno!)

See pp. 166-67 "cracking deeply embedded cultural codes"/"cultural code-or-content" (Neo-Adorno — McClary) — But mainly → Is his "Howard Doy" decoding impressive? (no) disappointing? (yes) — Do NOT need musical expertise to say what he says. (drum → D.J. Fontana → double-time "striptease" rhytm)

③ WALSER — Same (McClary-esque) strategy — McC (p. 17) "The study of popular music should also include the study of popular music"

— Walser's defense of analysis ("It's OK" p. 22) ("Analyze we must" 21)

Like Fink (+ McClary + Adorno) → "negotiation of shared CODES" (20)

— Music "seems transparent, UNCODED ... (21) but isn't really.

— "signification" (p. 20) — "how music works + signifies" in communities (23) "conventions" (27)

Again (as in Fink) → How music makes one feel physically, esp. in terms of binding together communities.

AND → NO MORALISTIC JUDGMENTS (qua Frith! p. 19!) ABOUT WHICH KIND OF MUSIC IS BEST, qua MUSIC APPRECIATION —

Instead: read codes AND explain sympathetically why its niche audience is drawn to it.

(4 exa — convincing? Very weak!

CONTRA ALL

"Mu Apprec" flavor!  
Good for him!

"Feed Tulu" Kenny G?

# Smart "Introduction" to Siren Songs

982

Hoffmann - Nietzsche - Heidegger - Barthes trope in Smart, intro.

1	<u>systems</u>	vs	<u>jouissance</u> <u>rhapsody</u>	(p. 4)
1	words		music	" ("siren song" p. 4)
1	masculine		feminine	"
(p. 6)	structural control		"thrill to <u>isolated</u> laugh or cry"	(p. 5) <sup>isolated moments</sup> (p. 11)
	<u>diatonic</u>		<u>chromatic</u> ("seductive rhetoric")	(p. 5, 6)
p. 6	operatic convention (= death)		primal cry [Poizat] [from Lacan]	6-7
			tangible performed <u>voices</u> / performers (physicality)	(7)
8	fixed categories, certainties		undermine via instability	(8)
(10)	"the yoke of the systematic"		exceeds cognitive grasp (9), excess of materiality (9)	
			"the <u>body</u> on stage"	(9)

Goal → not overturning [?] but "integration of the body ...  
into opera studies" (10)  
"restore a sense of opera's physicality" (17)

Cf. again → the old Idealistic/Romantic trope of music as beyond words,  
beyond systems, the sublime, the infinite, the excessive, etc.  
(Smart understands this → see p. 9 middle "discourse of romanticism")

2003

(not used 2005)

# Conversation Networks / Circles →

Methodological Issues "We encounter music" —

The WE here (+ elsewhere) is often construed as a restricted subclass of initiators, selected and/or cited for its cachet of prestige within that subclass.

∴ WHO one cites (esp. early on) typically serves as a signal to both insiders and outsiders ... i.e., one cites not always to make an argument but as a sign or display of affiliation → to be "read" by others in the group or as a defiant gesture to outsiders,

∴ Disciplines are fields (Bourdieu) containing constellations of competing subgroups (conversation networks vying for stronger positions in the field ... or total hegemony) ... Citations are at least as much signifying practices within the field as they are argumentational or supportive in one's thought ... Articles as performatives within the field)

∴ Two Sides to This

① WHO ONE CITES (my allies in my conversation network)

② WHO ONE LEAVES OUT as IRRELEVANT to any <sup>significant</sup> work within the group.

(e.g., to cite the work of a rival group, in almost any other than a negative context, is to betray the power-bid of one's own conversational circle)

Now, one may read (or produce) ANY article in this way - theory or music history ... as a power-bid within the discipline, a mode of self-display.

Smart  
cites

Kristeva	}	p. 3, as transmitted "knowledge"
Cixous		
* Abbate		
* McClary		p. 4
Clément		
Robinson		p. 6
* Tomlinson		p. 7
Porizat (Lacan)		6-7
Barthes (S/Z)		
Butler		p. 8
Koestenbaum		
Castle		

Note: of these 12, only 3 are music historians (\*)  
and none are music theorists

And the 3 music historians are those names identified with the new musicology,  
or that group seeking to replace or delegitimize their construction  
of traditional musicology — (none of the three is known for analysis —  
all have written in opposition to analysis)

All of the 9 others are founding sources in the recovery of the jouissance  
or primal pleasure beyond system — Almost all of the 9 were founding  
sources of feminist or gay/lesbian analysis.

Not cited → Any of the traditions of music-analytical/music-historical work  
open in the last 100 years.

(One could do the same with Cohn - with Brett, etc)

Split hermeneutic

Revering/Verstehen for the cited group (little or no criticism -  
cited primarily as knowledgeable and important sources  
within the discussion; self-evidently so  
(even acknowledging quibbling difference))

Suspicion + Ideology Critique for the outsiders -

What is the value of a conversation network?

- Power-hold?
- Reduction of complexities to a manageable size?