

(This book plan, 1993 [University of Minnesota], was almost immediately set aside to pursue instead the formal/hermeneutic path that would become the Sonata Theory project.

James Hepokoski  
Revision--14 October 1993

Draft-Outline for Book:

## The New Music History: An Introduction

Approximately 50-55,000 words total (around 125 pp. as a book); 11 chapters, c. 5000 words each; key words or concepts in **bold print**; brief bibliography (with annotations?) at the end of each chapter; sample questions for discussion (?).

Itself conceived as a "textbook," this book is specifically intended as a low-cost supplement to any ongoing music-history survey, regardless of the main textbook adopted for that course (Grout, Stolba, and so on). (The assumption is that it will be able to be used in the standard "art-music" survey.) The book itself is to be an accessible, provocative overview of several of the mainstreams of the recent "revolution" in cultural studies and literary theory, here adapted to be directly relevant to the study of music.

As currently envisioned, the book will be written to be accessible to the top half (or so) of the undergraduate markets, while also serving as a reasonable option for graduate history courses. The aim is to provide an undergraduate-level introduction to some of the principal challenges and potential paradigm-shifts in the field of music scholarship. Again, it is especially concerned with: 1) providing an overview of the "paradigm-shifts" that have been going on in other disciplines within the humanities and suggesting some ways that these shifts might be applicable to the study of music; 2) examining the attitudes and assumptions that we bring to the music that we propose to study in a serious, engaged way.

The book will strive to be provocative, but, above all, it must be open-minded and fair to all sides of these controversial issues, it must be accessible to undergraduates and graduate students alike with little or no background in the types of critical thought introduced in the book, and it must be honest about confronting the most controversial topics in a direct, intellectually responsible way. My intention is neither to force nor to threaten: this is not a polemic; rather, it is a guide. The book could be adopted for use by music-history teachers with strikingly different attitudes and opinions about the included topics. Thus the book could help unfreeze the traditional art-music-history survey; to help bring such courses "up-to-date" methodologically; to open such course to present-day controversies in a changing world; to encourage students to develop the skill of asking serious questions about the music--and the music "histories"--that they are studying at the college level.

If all goes well, the book could be completed by the end of 1994 or early 1995.

## Tentative Outline: Subject to Revision as the Writing Proceeds

In a **preface**, make it clear that the book primarily addresses the consideration of music after 1700 or so. Obviously, this is not comprehensive, nor is it intended to be. (What can we do in an introductory book of only around 125 pages?) It does, however, confront some of the central issues with regard to the repertory (repertoires) that most of the students actually deal with, practically, in their musical lives. Etc.

Some additional reasons for this: 1) this is the author's primary area of concentration in his own work; 2) this is the source of the standard repertory; 3) it was only in the modern era that music acquired a history in the first place (Eric Hobsbawm's term: "the invention of tradition"); 4) the material in the book can be introduced in the middle of a year-long survey (probably not appropriate at the beginning).

Another issue to face at once: all of this is a site of vigorous, ongoing controversy within the academy. High tensions. Various factions with various interests (different varieties of liberal humanists, minority-studies scholars, feminists, marxists, cultural materialists, new historicists, paleo- and neoconservatives, and so on). One good solution (the one advocated in 1992 by Gerald Graff): to teach the conflicts surrounding the so-called "culture wars." This book is one response to that challenge.

### Chapters

#### 1. The Late-Twentieth-Century Revolution in Cultural Studies.

- A) Overview and impact of the recent controversies; the challenge to formalism, empiricism, and/or positivism on behalf of new "sociological" approaches; "Eurocentrism," "multiculturalism"; cultural studies and current social "activism"; the terms "poststructuralism" (including deconstruction) and "postmodernism." Lots of capsulized definitions.

**2. History, Persuasion, and Cultural Power: Considering Art Music from a Broader Perspective.**

- A) Shattering of the "myth" of historical objectivity: the attitudes of the historian are implicated in any history he or she writes. Implications?
- B) E.H. Carr's dictum: Before you study history, study the historian.
- C) Thus histories are always "loaded" (not necessarily wrongly or with insidious intent--but, nonetheless, they are socioculturally loaded, and it is also our task to expose and consider the assumptions under which they are written.)
- D) Thus, questions arise: who wrote the history (or the piece of music)? for whom? why? who financed it? for whose interests? which world-view does it affirm?
- E) Karl Popper story: shift of attention to the way we tell our stories as opposed to focusing only on their ostensible "content."
- F) Concept: Discourse as power. (Foucault, etc.); Concept: Hegemony (Gramsci); music as representation.
- G) Alternative positions and views of history: Collingwood and Dahlhaus. If we cannot escape subjectivity, how can we deal with it? (Intersubjective criticism; acceptance of provisionality of knowledge and hypotheses, etc.)

**3. Toward a Multicultural Discourse: "History" and "Histories."**

- A) There is no such thing as a single "history" of music. Instead, the current view is that there are many overlapping and mutually unfolding "histories."
- B) Decline of the concept of a single, overarching narrative of a monolithic history. (Lyotard, no more "metanarratives.")
- C) Briefly: how did the standard "music history" (art music) story come to be constructed in the way that it was?
  - 1) e.g., one way is to see it as a project ratifying Germanic cultural identity, c. 1750-1950. (Also: other ways)
  - 2) Concept: "tradition" (Gadamer, Dahlhaus)
- D) General issue and the challenge therein: to confront the multiple histories; to broaden to world musics, music of differing social strata and for different social/aesthetic purposes, etc.
- E) But note: this does not in any way delegitimize the study of art music and its culture; the main issue is not to assert that this is the "only" history, or the only one worth studying--not to assign it a privileged status with regard to other musics.

4. Did an "Individual Genius" Write Beethoven's Fifth Symphony?: The "Death of the Composer."

- A) Catchphrase: "the death of the author" (or, "death of the subject"); how can this be? (Sources in Barthes and Foucault.)
- B) Shift to a more sociological emphasis; the "language" of music inherited by Beethoven has itself an embedded meaning not entirely controllable by LVB. Explain.
- C) A central claim: dialogism and heteroglossia (Bakhtin)-- multiple (social) voices or points of view within a supposedly "unified" text; be sure to explain this, as one of the central points of the chapter. Language/music as existing as a space of dialogue between self and other.
- D) Jameson, Postmodernism, p. 31: "Our own recent criticism, from Macherey on, has been concerned to stress the heterogeneity and profound discontinuities of the work of art, no longer unified or organic, but now a virtual grab bag or lumber room of disjoined subsystems and random raw materials and impulses of all kinds. The former work of art, in other words, has now turned out to be a text, whose reading proceeds by differentiation rather than by unification."
- E) Illustrate with an example or two from the Fifth.
- F) Concept: Reception History (do listeners--not composers-- establish what a piece of music actually means?): Fish [affective stylistics] and Iser)
- G) Subheading: Music as Artwork or Music as Cultural Text?
  - 1) Historical Concept: Autonomy of art (music). Art as supposedly separate from the business of life, etc.-- art music as a "redemptive space." Related to the concept of the "work." (Self-enclosed, unified, etc.)
  - 2) The collapse (or so it is claimed) of the "work" into what is now generally regard as a cultural "text." The implications thereof (including the challenge to the concept of individual genius).

5. The "Institution of Art Music."

- A) Define (Bürger, Hohendahl, etc., along with the concept of [British] "cultural materialism"); the main issue is, how is music disseminated and promoted within the society that esteems it? What are the social formations that make the practice of this or that kind of music possible?
- B) Sketch out the institution of art music as it had developed by c. 1850-1950: composers, publishers, performers, concert halls, agents, music historians, music theorists, newspaper critics, etc. Enormous, interlocking network--but serving the interests of....? The role of each element in the network?

- C) Composers are not isolated subjects working solely from a supposed private "inspiration"; they necessarily intersect with the institution that supports them and makes them possible. (Concept: cultural "discourse network").
- D) Adorno et al.: concept of "culture industry" and "commodification."
- E) Again: New Historicists (Montrose, Greenblatt, Gallagher, et al.). Especially Greenblatt's concept of discourse or cultural products as embodying the "circulation or exchange of social energy." Key terms: circulation, negotiation, exchange, cultural work, and the dominant "currencies" involved ("money and prestige"). "Economies of prestige."
- F) For example, instead of "genius," cf. Pierre Bourdieu's sobering concept of "career-building" within established social systems: what happens if we elect to understand the "great composers" primarily as successful careerists?)

## 6. What about Popular Musics? Unpacking the "Art"/"Non-Art" Dichotomy.

- A) Origins of the strict "separation" between "high art" and all other types. (German-speaking countries, c. 1780-1840).
- B) Some postmodern views: Andreas Huyssen, for example, speaks of the traditional high-art "fear of contamination" by popular culture. Why is this now breaking down?
- C) Mid-century criticisms of popular culture: Adorno, et al. Fear of "administered" societies, etc.
- D) Impact of technology, mass culture in twentieth century. Inundation in late 20th century; impossible to recover earlier modes of perceiving and evaluating music? (Even for the "art-music" repertory--supposedly "timeless, universal"?)
- E) Postmodernism: includes an eager acceptance of the popular arts; breakdown of the previously imposed separation between "art" and supposed "non-art."
- F) Case study, in brief?: Popular music and the rise of rock.
- G) MTV Videos as example of "ironized" discourse (discourse that often undermines or is indifferent to its own meaning--concerned more with the "intensities" produced via a rapid manipulation of images?).
- H) But, larger issue: how do we study popular repertories? Meant to be folded into the praxis of life, not studied and analyzed. (says Dahlhaus: pre-autonomy) Are our analytical tools biased toward "high-art" repertories? Sociological approaches? The theories of Frith, Shepherd, Tomlinson (avoid analysis altogether?), et al.
- G) But, larger issue: how do we study popular repertories? Are our analytical tools biased toward "high-art" repertories? Sociological approaches? Various theories of popular music: Frith, Shepherd, et al.

**7. The Musics of Majorities and Minorities: The Concept of "(Post)colonial Discourse."**

- A) Interrelationships of musical style and social power/prestige. (Again: "Economies of prestige"; music as an arena in social power conflicts may manifest themselves).
- B) Concept: Aesthetic "colonization." (Cultural theorists involved: Foucault, Said, etc.)
- C) Case study: "orientalism" in Western art music. The concept of the Other.
- D) Case study: African-American Music/Culture (Amiri Baraka, Houston Baker, Henry Louis Gates, "signifying," etc.)--- Blues.
- E) One of the central lessons of Foucault, et al.: not to arrogate the right to speak for the "other." To grant those "others" their own voices, and to listen to what they are saying. The Western tradition of appropriation/explication of "others."
- E) Etc. (To be substantially expanded)

**8. Gender and Sexuality in Music and Music History.**

- A) Psychological approaches: Freud, Lacan, feminist theory, gay/lesbian studies (including queer theory): distinctions, etc. "Desire" as a key concept ("trope") in current theoretical work (Lyotard, Deleuze).
- B) Where are the woman composers? Ecriture feminine?
- C) Case study: Wagner and "sexualized" language in his theory of music.
- D) Controversial case studies (gay): Britten, Tchaikovsky.
- E) Case study: The recent Schubert wars.
- F) Can music "encode" aspects of sexuality? Or is this "essentialism" and stereotyping? Examples of recent claims: Brett, McClary, et al.
- G) Models of "gendered" sonata form.
- H) The "body" as a site of musical discourse: concepts and proposals.
- H) Problems and promises: the issues of reductionism and essentialism; yet, the opening up of an important mode of thinking that was previously ignored. Etc.

**9. Music, Cultural Systems, and Governments: the Politics of Music.**

- A) Explicit: French Revolution; Music as a central issue in twentieth-century totalitarian regimes; etc. The role of popular music. Also (especially in the twentieth century):
  - 1) Germany (Third Reich), Italy (Mussolini), Soviet Union (Stalin, et al.)
  - 2) But: expectations of "music" in Western liberal-humanist governments?
- B) Implicit: Music as (tacit) cultural affirmation.

- C) JH Hypothesis: the principal category (though not the only one) driving twentieth-century art music after World War I: politics and social statement. (I.e., this replaces the earlier, more dominant category of "art/aesthetics") Especially clear after the European political and social collapses of 1918.

#### 10. The Problem of Aesthetic Evaluation: History and "Progress."

- A) Implicit models of musical "progress" in textbooks; examples of loaded judgments. (Caution!) (Once again, the collapse of faith in metanarratives.)
- B) The "progressive/reactionary" dichotomy: how valid a basis for "aesthetic" evaluation?
- C) Adorno and the concept of "material" and its evolution. (the bulk of the chapter?)
- D) Special attention to: new music "revolution" of Schoenberg and Stravinsky; the "reaction" of Strauss. Reconsidered views of all this.
- E) Once again: the concept of the postmodern.

#### 11. Traditional and New Music Histories: A Rapprochement?

- A) The concept of any given piece or style of music carrying many "messages" simultaneously: aesthetic, formal, stylistic, generic, social, political, sexual, economic, and so on.
- B) Undeniable: This multiplicity is the reality underpinning the musical experience; any isolation of a single strand at the expense of the others diminishes our perception of what music has been, is, and can be.
- C) Needed: Openness to see the larger content of music; not to abandon the vision that we have attained thus far within the standard tradition, but to open our eyes and ears and to see and hear that there is also much more to it.
- D) No single (ideological) solution. What might be needed is a willingness to "mix and/or match" the older and the newer musicologies (plural) to suit the problems at hand. Each methodology, pursued only by itself (both old and new), can lead to an unwelcome extremism and exclusion that stifles rather than opens debate. Appeal?: a vision that includes the best aspects of the competing methodologies, while retaining a healthy suspicion of the ideological extremes.
- E) Above all: music of all kinds needs to be resituated back into the practice of the way we actually live our lives and view the world around us. It is not a "special activity" limited only to the concert stage, practice room, or classroom. Thus, ultimately, what we want is to understand music--as performers, critics, scholars, teachers--not only as a site for "enjoyment" but also as a site for serious cultural thought.....thought that really matters.