

Introduction

*John Shepherd, Jocelyne Guilbault, and
Murray Dineen*

This collection offers essays that show the various ways in which music studies are currently unfolding. Music studies now draw not only on work from the disciplines of music, but on work from disciplines and intellectual traditions outside music. This collection is unique in bringing together carefully selected and original examples of work from across this entire spectrum, and organizing them according to two principles that should guide future developments in music studies.

The first of these principles—entrenched in Part One of the collection, “Institutions, Ideologies, Positions, and Power”—is that the intellectual, institutional, and political issues raised by the questions of what music is being studied, how it is being studied, and who is studying it must always remain open to full and candid discussion. The second principle—embodied in the remainder of the volume—is that music can no longer be regarded as an object, an object immune, for example, to the kinds of issues raised in Part One: music can no longer be reduced by scholars to the condition of its sounds alone. In focusing on music’s role in economies of exchange, in the performance of sex and gender, and in the life of ethnic communities, the last three parts of this collection are dedicated to the proposition that music is integrally involved in the formation of identities (gendered, classed, ethnic, religious, subcultural, and so

on), as well as in the broader social, historical, political, economic, and institutional dynamics through which such identity formation takes place.

By encapsulating in this way what is now a startlingly broad field of study, *Crossing Over* provides a much needed resource. It affords a basis for discussion which cannot help but be intently cross-disciplinary in character. It encourages those with backgrounds in historical musicology, music theory, ethnomusicology, popular music studies, cultural studies, feminist studies, ethnic studies, sociology, cultural anthropology, and communication studies (among others) to talk to one another meaningfully across disciplinary boundaries about music and the wide range of theories and methods now used in its study. We believe this to be very important for the future of music studies. Until the 1980s (and despite the influence of ethnomusicology) the study of music in universities was remarkably narrow in its scope and methods. Since then, there has been a veritable explosion in the kinds of music that can be studied and in the methods by which they can be studied. Yet this change has been bought at the cost of a certain fragmentation. There have been tensions between those wedded to more established approaches and those eager to embrace the new, as well as between those advancing different versions of the new. These tensions will be beneficial to music studies only if their foundations can be explored openly. This is precisely what this volume seeks to stimulate.

By covering in these ways the wide intellectual territory that now constitutes music studies, this collection attests to a profound change. If the last twenty years have experienced a burgeoning plethora of approaches to the study of music, they have also witnessed a decided change in the character of the objects being studied. Objects of study have become less securely defined. Once

thought of as having genuine status in objective reality, “classical,” “serious,” “traditional,” and “popular” musics are now understood to be discursively constituted as objects of study, as being constituted in ways whose histories themselves require excavation and interrogation. The category of “music” is itself not immune from such questioning. In fact, much turns on how the object of study is constituted, how research is conducted, and how findings are formulated.

The intersection of new objects of study with new ways of thinking has in many instances weakened disciplinary boundaries. Numerous scholars in historical musicology, music theory, ethnomusicology, popular music studies, and music education now share concerns rather than defining their professional activities by preoccupations thought of as largely exclusive. These concerns are also shared with disciplines and intellectual domains whose objects of study are not primarily musical. It is the purpose of this collection of articles to celebrate these developments, and to suggest that they provide the basis for an increasing number of intellectually collaborative ventures in the study of music.

These essays were written by scholars invited to an occasional international conference, *Border Crossings: New Directions in Music Studies* (organized by the School for Studies in Art and Culture at Carleton University and the Department of Music at the University of Ottawa). Yet, while the authors can be identified with particular disciplinary interests and intellectual orientations (historical musicology, music theory, ethnomusicology, popular music studies, sociology, communication, cultural studies, ethnic studies, feminism, and gay and lesbian studies), the collection of articles aims to show how a wide variety of approaches can *share* concerns, and *mutually* lend their own important insights to a greater undertak-

ing: the study of music as a fundamental form of human understanding and expression. What *is* it that we are studying? *Who* is empowered to study and speak about it (who is this *we*)? What *does* it contribute to human life and human identity? *How* does it contribute? In linking themes of institutionalization, ideologies, power, ritual, transmission, sound, gender, sexuality, practice, performance, ethnicity, identity, and social mediation across disciplines and orientations, this collection looks to the future when music studies as a multidisciplinary undertaking will explore a variegated form of human expression with the full range of interrelated perspectives relevant to its diversity and complexity.



The study of music cannot take place without a politics that links institutional practices, ideological orientations, intellectual positions, and the exercise of power. It is this political territory that the collection's first section explores in attempting to understand the different motivations that scholars have brought to the study of music. David Gramit's essay, "The Roaring Lion," focuses on the primacy of musical experience as a means of distinguishing between "musicology as a discipline" and the undertaking of "critical musicology" in relation to that discipline. "Precisely what 'the aesthetic experience' signifies proves slippery at best," says Gramit, "but statements of allegiance to it cut across the boundaries of otherwise conflicting musicological camps." However, Gramit argues, a closer examination of the link between musicological discourse and the aesthetic experience cannot be explicitly undertaken since for established musicology "to investigate such a relation is to destroy it." The risk for established musicology, says Gramit in quot-

ing Lawrence Kramer, is “the dispersal into context of what we usually grasp as the immediacy of music.” In musicological discourse, Gramit continues, “a faith grounded in the centrality of the individual aesthetic experience of the musical work becomes the foundation of all other inquiry, so basic that it rarely comes to direct expression except in polemics, when a declaration of orthodoxy or an accusation of heresy is called for.... The object of the faith constituted in *the* musical experience is a realm...uncontaminated by the claims of material, everyday life.” Critical musicology, on the other hand, “treats the foundational experience not as an article of faith but as the focus of inquiry.” For Gramit, critical musicology is not interested in *the* musical experience, but in *a* musical experience—or, more precisely, ranges of musical experiences, each with its own, specific context of material, everyday life. “A critical musicology,” Gramit concludes, “both recognizes the intense experience we call aesthetic and explores its historical contingency, a double perspective of involvement and detachment.”

One problem in entering this “double perspective of involvement and detachment” is how to escape the influence of established modes of thought and the institutional arrangements of which they are symptomatic and to which they contribute. Attempts to think differently about music are frequently bedeviled by the circumstances of their own historical contingency. Murray Dineen illustrates this tendency graphically in teasing out the contradictions inherent in Adorno’s concept of the “adequate listener.” Adorno remains a towering figure in the sociology of music. His work has been an important influence on the thinking of critical musicologists such as Rose Subotnik and Susan McClary, as Gramit points out. Yet for all the critical ground he opened up, for all his insistence on examining the total social-musical field,

Adorno's thinking remained trapped in an ideal of *the* uncontaminated musical experience. Such an experience became the symbol for an ideal social order that did not yet exist. For this reason, as Dineen explains, neither the adequate listener nor the adequate listener's antithesis, the jitterbug, can hear music "as a sociological index," a mode of listening requiring the "very self-consciousness that would seem to be the goal of [Adorno's] critique of listening." According to Dineen, the jitterbug is "the product of a social order that denies in the mass production of popular music the individual liberty and self-awareness it should propagate." The adequate listener, on the other hand, "also a product of a social order, masters a formidable listening ability, one which takes into account, however, nothing of the self and its historical necessity, especially its struggle for liberty from tyranny." As Richard Middleton has argued (Middleton 1990), Adorno asked all the right questions and conceived of musical practice as a total socio-historical field, but allowed *his* particular circumstances to close off history, to close off the social, political, and cultural spaces within which socio-musical practices materially occur. It would appear that much remains to be resolved in attaining the "double perspective of involvement and detachment."

The contradictions and difficulties inherent in this double perspective are confronted head-on by Middleton in his contribution to this volume. He takes as his point of departure criticisms of commentaries on popular music by individuals with academic training. The trade magazine *Music Week*, for example, objected to the fact that the judging panel for the 1994 Mercury Award (the British music industry prize) included "egghead academics and journalists who think too much for their own good." As Middleton points out, "what is at issue is whose music this is, or more specifically, who may speak

about it.” For one critic, “it is a problem that scholars ‘mix up our musical euphoria and academic rhetoric from time to time’.” Here, Middleton argues that popular music is an important component of the biographies of many critical musicologists, the source of an experience that is progenitor of both passion and the will to understand (see, for example, Middleton 1993 and Shepherd 1994). For this reason, Middleton argues, “the intent is not to appropriate but simply to participate: to allow the music’s gestures to energize the scholar-participant, producing a phenomenology of subjective response guided by the ‘implicit theory’ of the vernacular practice.” “Intellectuals need to study popular music,” concludes Middleton, “not so much for *its* sake (for most of its history it has managed pretty well without such attention) but for their own.” However, the study of popular music by critical musicologists is not a matter of pure self-indulgence. It requires, as Middleton notes, “a position ‘on the far side’ of vernacular knowledge” commensurate with an understanding of “the politics of the Low-Other.” In being cognizant of the damage that can be done to experiences of popular music (and, indeed, of any kind of music) by established rational, academic thought, this position can lead to the expansion of such thought with, as Middleton puts it, profound ramifications for music studies as a whole.

It is to this re-thinking of music studies that John Shepherd and Peter Wicke contribute in their article by contemplating the possibility that music is a distinctive social practice not reducible to the condition either of its sounds or of other social practices. In contemplating this possibility, Shepherd and Wicke problematize the relation between music’s sounds and music. While the former are material phenomena on which people can and must operate in order to produce music, music itself is a

set of processes that, while materially grounded, are nonetheless inextricably cultural in character. Shepherd and Wicke argue that the notion of music as “autonomous art” has rested paradoxically on a reduction of music to its material bases in sound at the expense of an understanding that music can only arise through the intersection of the material and the historically contingent as put in play by people. While it is inconceivable that music could exist without sound, it is equally inconceivable that music could exist without individual people as socially and culturally constituted. However, in arguing that music has a material base that is distinct from music as a set of cultural practices, Shepherd and Wicke are *not* suggesting that sound is either a neutral or a determining component of music. Music’s material bases are interpolated *fully* within the social relations that constitute individual people culturally and, as such, are mediated by forces giving rise to specific patterns of exchange out of which affects and meanings emerge.



The social mediation of music’s material aspects is explored in quite different ways by the three essays of the collection’s second section, “Music and Economies of Exchange.” Here, material bases that make possible musical economies of exchange are conceived variously as musical commodities (Will Straw), social relations of production (Regula Burckhardt Qureshi), and the body (Gary Tomlinson).

In his contribution to this volume, Will Straw reflects on the characteristics and conditions that seem specific to music as a commodity and therefore as material culture. While music is often seen as fragile or even immaterial in contrast to the solidity and permanence of

the commodity forms through which it is mediated, Straw notes that the “fragility” of the cultural commodity itself “has been a persistent theme within cultural economics and sociology” and that claims about music’s fragility “are often mirrored in descriptions of the musical commodity similarly disappearing within unending processes of commodity turnover.” Straw rejects customary explanations for the relatively unpredictable and unstable character of the market for musical commodities rooted in presumptions concerning the nature of cultural use value. He understands this unpredictable and unstable character not in terms of “the fragility or hazy nature of cultural use value,” therefore, but in terms of the specific characteristics of music as a commodity. In comparison with other commodity forms, cultural commodities behave more according to the principles of a “life cycle”—a concept of intrinsically “temporal” character. It is Straw’s conclusion that the “fragility of cultural commodities stems not from the flimsiness of their use value, but from a particular relationship to exhaustion and repeatability.”

Straw then goes on to consider the ways in which the distinctive biography of the musical commodity is transferred onto the biography of the consumer as collector. Straw argues that if collecting can be understood as an exercise in rescue of the commodity, then it is also a form of rescue for the collector, a process through which a love of the new (*neophilia*) constantly drives the impulse to collect.

In this sense, “the collection is not the mark of an order but of an unending unease, and the revealing moment is not that in which the newly-acquired object takes its place within an intelligible series but, rather, the immediately subsequent moment in which desperate desire is born again.” The impulse to collect thus has conse-

quences for the traditional image of “calculating, rational capitalism” and for activities of categorization, be they those of the music industry, established or vernacular scholarship, or the discographical instinct. In this respect, concludes Straw, “the collector’s urge is driven less by the desire for completion than by the need for reassurance that a given period will escape the logic of reissue programs or discographical documentation,” and collections come to possess a distinctive and “rich semiotic density.”

Regula Burckhardt Qureshi’s concern with the social relations of musical production derives from two related sets of contradictions. The first has to do with the social circumstances of the practice of Hindustani art music, in which the entrenched, subaltern, social and economic statuses of musicians vis-à-vis their patrons were belied by their superordinate position in performance, in which “they reigned supreme, holding court, as it were, among their elite patrons”—as masters of disciples, who might include members of this social elite. In these latter, musical relations, the dissonance of class antagonism was “submerged in the discourse, both verbal and sonic, of music,” that always gave rise to “a shared musical experience.” The second set of contradictions has to do with the study of art music, in which the Western habit of “engaging with this music in isolation, independent of its social dimensions, easily enables the Western student to extend this ‘theory of (musical) practice’ to professionalized elite music in other societies.” It is thus not surprising, reveals Qureshi, that “it has taken [her] until now to face exploring the social dimensions of Hindustani music.”

In the context of a wide-ranging critique of musicological scholarship—both established and progressive, which she sees as concentrating unduly on the “musical

experience" at the expense of the social relations sustaining it—Qureshi argues for a return to Marxist-oriented analyses capable of throwing light on the social conditions of musical production. Qureshi's resurrection of Marxism is thus by way of "the anthropological use of mode of production theory" from the late seventies. However, in thus deviating from what she identifies as "the current antimaterialist mainstream in Marxist thought," Qureshi is at pains to retain "two abiding Marxist priorities": a dissolution of the separation of cultural processes from social and economic relations, and an identification with the cause of the oppressed. This recasting of materialism is also informed by more recent developments within anthropology, whereby an "anti-imperialist critique...has problematized both grand theory and the subject position of ethnographers" (as outsiders). This agenda has implications both for ethnomusicology and music scholarship more widely. Ethnomusicologists "have long been reaching into the toolbox of anthropology," notes Qureshi, "both for foundational arguments and...to create musical ethnographies." However, "these pragmatic adaptations have been largely untheorized." In fact, Qureshi observes, "until very recently, little social theory had ever made it into considerations of process in music scholarship."

Qureshi's contribution ends with a schematic yet enticing illustration of how such a theoretical agenda might be applied to an analysis of the situation that fueled its development: the situation of Hindustani musicians. She does this by showing how Indian art music occupies "a special place of importance as a meeting and mediating space between feudal classes because it articulates emotions that support conscious understanding, creating a unity of thought and feeling." In the light of this schematic indication, Qureshi questions why powerful sonic

connections such as these “remain un verbalized,” why “their ‘valued world’ [is] cordoned off by a pervasive scholarly consensus, Indian as well as Western.” To address this question, she concludes, is “to problematize music scholarship and what motivates its expansion into social terrain.”

Tomlinson’s contribution to this collection comprises a reading of Montaigne’s essay “Of cannibals,” an essay unique in Montaigne’s work in the attention it pays to music. “Of cannibals” derives its subject matter from the contact made by Frenchmen with Tupinamba Indians in the Bay of Rio in the 1550s. As Tomlinson observes, the first-hand ethnographic evidence reported by Montaigne consists mostly of the words of two songs. The two songs are concerned, respectively, with cannibalism as an outcome of war among the Tupi, and with the circumstance of polygamy in Tupi society. Yet, despite Montaigne’s reliance on song, the considerable body of commentary that has grown up around this essay demonstrates, says Tomlinson, “a constitutive deafness to this aspect of Montaigne’s text.”

In seeing through the cracks both in Montaigne’s text and in commentaries on it, Tomlinson is able to construct an alternative reading that prioritizes the role of song in the management of cannibalism and polygamous relations. The central feature at play, argues Tomlinson, is flesh exchange, an especially powerful and therefore efficacious form of giving and receiving gifts and thus of mediating social relations. In obligatory exchange systems, Tomlinson says, gifts “are not purely material goods but rather materials bearing in them a part of the giver, things imbued with some spiritual essence of their origins and thus almost animate.” Here, the animate was realized in actuality through the eating of flesh and the sharing of husbands. The role of song as distinct from

ordinary speech signaled the special and fundamental character of these flesh exchange rituals in Tupi society. The economy of strength realized through such rituals, says Tomlinson, depended “on the heightened medium of song, marking off the captive’s words from the other locutions around them.” Songs acted “as markers of the boundaries between normal and extraordinary discourse and thus as an index of a special linguistic efficacy they embody.” They were vocalizations “that could warrant the worth of a fleshly gift.”

All these essays address the role of music in negotiating between public and more private, individual worlds: between the public worlds of the production of musical commodities and the private worlds of the record collections in which they end up; between the public worlds of the relations of production underlying the performance of Hindustani music and the more intimate worlds in which, according to Qureshi, such performance is thought of as “a shared meal”; and, finally, between the public worlds of sung discourse and the intensely private experience of flesh exchange. In all these circumstances, music’s material dimensions serve as pathways and facilitators of exchange. In the case of the Tupi, however, there is one crucial difference: the material is human. As Tomlinson concludes, his reading of Montaigne’s essay “points up...the importance of song-acts in defining and even driving the economy of flesh exchange that seems to have been basic to Tupi society.” Tomlinson’s essay illustrates that people as biological organisms underwrite and make possible the constitution of people as social and cultural individuals, in this case through music.



Processes of sexuality and gender constitute a crucial, even fundamental component of the interstices between the biological and the social, between the body and constructed identity. As Philip Brett notes, sexuality has been largely foreign to the world of musicology, and still meets with strong opposition in some quarters. Citing Havelock Ellis, he revisits the constant suspicion of musicians as “inverts”—deviant and dangerous—and the constant policing within music studies to ferret out any tendencies that might confirm this suspicion, recent attempts to suppress discussion of Schubert’s sexuality being a case in point.

Brett’s way around the musicological impasse of sexuality is to describe the performative “from the inside” so as to “get at certain aspects of meaning without attributing them to some higher power”—without falling into the trap of some absolute and totalizing force. Throughout his paper, “Piano Four Hands: Schubert and the Performance of Gay Male Desire,” there is a constant alliance between musical and gendered performances, particularly in his interpretations that link two scores—musical and sexual—in intimacy.

In Brett’s essay, sexuality becomes a basis for characterizing the genre of the piano duet: a domestic kind of music making—undertaken largely in private, if not secretively (*in camera*, if not in the closet)—an intimate affair with licentious pleasures, which Schumann, in the case of Schubert’s F-minor Fantasy, D. 940, tried to straighten out as a symphonic sketch. Brett traces the implicit sexual roles of the genre: top and bottom parts, monogamy (fidelity to one duet partner) versus polygamy (duetting around), the encouraging of common pleasures like those of any sexual relationship (phrasing, tone, rhythm, and rubato) and the submerging of differences.

In the first of several analyses, harmony and form are addressed not in terms of putatively neutral tensions but rather in terms of the performance of human sexual relations—nervousness and anxiety, assertion and yearning, flirtation and consummation—and the danger of closure and exclusion that so haunts human sexuality. For Brett, the musical gesture is to be seen in light of triumph, yes, but also of catastrophe and wreckage, like that of syphilis.

The intimate alliance of music and sexuality lies at the heart of Lori Burns's "Genre, Gender, and Convention Revisited: k. d. lang's cover of Cole Porter's 'So in Love'," which turns the Schenkerian analytic model to unorthodox ends. Burns addresses the visual and aural identities in lang's video cover of Porter's "So in Love," a song originally redolent of male-dominant heterosexuality. In lang's work, Burns finds "a feminist message"—a kind of resistance—in lang's rupture of the original song's musical discourse.

To wholly adopt the Schenkerian model intact would hardly do justice to these revisions of a basic musical language. Instead, Burns revises Schenkerian analytic practice: the Schenkerian paradigms of tonal unity are used to represent lang's ruptured tonality. An orthodox Schenkerian might gloss over this rupture, subsuming it in a seamless tonality. Burns, on the other hand, treats it as essential and political, hitherto largely untrodden territory for Schenkerian analysis. As Burns reveals, only a confrontation with Schenker is a suitable foil by which to describe lang's confrontation with Porter.

With this sense of rupture in mind, Burns turns to the textual and visual content of the song and video, finding there a revision of the classic masochistic essence of Porter's song, and an illumination of the tragedy of AIDS—not only in its gay and heterosexual manifesta-

tions, but also in light of lesbian relations as a killer of women.



The preceding two sections of the volume have focused in their different ways on issues dealing with the circulation of sounds as music within public and individual worlds. The collection's final section embraces wholeheartedly issues of collective and cultural identities as made manifest through music. In pointing out that music is, like other commodities, a product of transnational practices in the service of the global market and, as such, a product that has become "culturally hybrid," George Lipsitz also argues that such hybridization retains a certain power, a certain consequence. In his words, "The globalization of popular music turns distinct communities with separate histories into unified market segments, but it also brings to the surface suppressed ethnic, regional, and national identities that give distinct local inflections for cultural forms that appear everywhere." In a formulation reminiscent of Straw's theorizations of musical commodities as complex demarcators and articulators of cultural time and space, he explains, "these permutations in global culture do not erase the experiences of time and space." In some ways, he continues, "they inflect local and historical expressions with renewed specificity because their differences from other cultural expressions appear more vividly through juxtaposition and comparison." As Lipsitz usefully reminds us, the role played in the musical history of many North American and European countries by immigrants fusing several musical elements clearly "testifies to the existence of a pre-history of what we call globalization, a dynamic all too familiar to colonized subjects but seemingly new to

citizens in formerly industrialized and colonial centers of power." This is why, he concludes, "In confronting the future that faces us, there is much we can learn from history, from people for whom globalization, low-wage labor, and political repression have been the rule rather than the exception."

Such hybridized yet specific local and historical inflections graphically raise questions about how collective cultural identities are constituted, exactly what they comprise, and the specific ways in which they are constituted through music. The tendency within established musicology has been to think of music's cultural connotations as being relatively fixed in relation to music's sounds. Once again, the tendency has been to reduce music's significance in this respect to the condition of its sounds. The subtlety and detail of Lipsitz's analysis suggest, however, a diametrically opposed line of thinking—one that makes the idea of a cultural identity as slippery and elusive to grasp as that of "music" itself.

From a similar perspective, in their essay "*Créolité* and *Francophonie* in Music: Socio-Musical Repositionings Where It Matters," Line Grenier and Jocelyne Guilbault provide a detailed, comparative account of the diverse, complex, and contradictory processes that make up constantly changing social, cultural, political, and musical identities. From two carefully situated cases of *créolité* and *francophonie*, the authors show how "socio-musical practices can make a significant and original contribution to singular political or literary movements...and how distinctive musics, when viewed not in and of themselves but rather as integral parts of complex cultural and political configurations, can be instrumental in providing means for setting in motion new social relations, networks, and alliances, thereby creating alternative yet limited fields of possibilities and prescriptions."

By way of illustration, the authors focus on the musical practices of zouk and the *Québécois* mainstream, where the two movements of *créolité* and *francophonie* have unfolded. More precisely, they examine “the narratives of alliances these musics have helped to establish, and the strategies of valorization through which their related products and producers have been positioned in international-oriented markets.” As they remark, the emergence of new alliances and strategies of valorization could be said to respond to the imperatives of the contemporary global cultural economy. Within this perspective, they suggest that the most pressing issue may thus be “circulation,” as the current and future musical development of zouk and the *Québécois* mainstream depends “not only on whether or not they will sell and how much, but perhaps more importantly, on whether they will circulate, where they will circulate, by what means, and for how long.” In their views, what needs to be addressed is how “new sets of rules are established and contested, providing criteria for defining who, where, and what matters politically and culturally within globalizing economies.”

The concluding contribution by Beverley Diamond takes this issue of circulation to another realm, engaging the “double perspective of involvement and detachment” in a manner which leads, in Middleton’s words, to “a spectrum of possibilities drawing on a range of materials and trajectories, with determinate meaning endlessly deferred.” Indeed, the first part of Diamond’s essay, “Theory from Practice: First Nations Popular Music in Canada,” is an attempt to understand what motivates the deployment of as well as resistance to essentialism. The second part of Diamond’s essay is, to use her own words, less “strategic” and more “tactical”: “an attempt, as [Rey] Chow defines it, to ‘set up a discourse that

cuts across some of our new 'solidarities.'" She suggests that the First Nations music community "might indeed offer more broadly applicable "theories" that are fundamentally rooted in concepts of historical cycles and relationship to the environment, including the global human community." By risking an essentialist representation of these processes, concludes Diamond, "the study of music might be productively framed in potentially new and useful ways." What she proposes is to replace the focus on "*borders between past/present, authentic/commercial, traditional/contemporary,*" with the discourse of aboriginal artists and producers which "tend[s] to emphasize the *wholeness within*, the total history and fundamental social or spiritual relationships that underlie musical production of whatever sort."



If, indeed, there remains a vestige of substance in post-modern cultural identities, and if this vestige is guaranteed by our relationship to the material, both environmental and human, then it is likely that music studies still have a great deal to learn from "alternative concepts of relationships" as explained by Diamond. And if, by analogy, there is a vestige of substance in an emergent critical music studies drawn from the undeniable strands of commonality that weave variously through its texts, then what the future development of critical music studies requires is less "wars of positions" than a notion of what Diamond refers to as multidisciplinary concentric circles with "'music research' at [their] center." As she argues, the notion of "relationship"—raised in different but equally apposite ways by Gramit ("involvement and detachment"), Middleton ("continuity between 'inside' and 'outside'") and Shepherd and Wicke (sounds as socially

constituted and people as socially constituted) at the beginning of this volume, and echoed in many other ways in the essays that follow—is “a critical issue” which would “encourage us to think openly about our responsibility to different audiences/readerships.” When one “considers the enormous public mistrust of academic research, which currently threatens the very survival of some of our institutions,” concludes Diamond, “would it not be responsible to encourage multiple intellectual relationships in print and other media?” The attraction of new alliances that require us to cross and continually recross the borders of the circles of multidisciplinary and difference should surely motivate the further development of critical music studies.

It should be stressed that by “critical music studies” we do not mean here a form of music studies driven solely or even primarily by a desire to “criticize” or dispense with canonical objects and canonical methods of studying them. However, criticizing canons as opposed to dispensing with them should and must form one aspect of critical music studies. We do not intend, either, to imply that the kind of work represented in this collection (in contrast to other forms of the study of music) exercises a monopoly on “the critical.” We would agree with Margaret Bent—in remarks made in her plenary address as President of the American Musicological Society to the 1985 joint meeting of the American Musicological Society, the Society for Music Theory, the College Music Society, and the Society for Ethnomusicology—that “our collective critical responsibility includes the whole spectrum of critical judgments” (Bent 1986, 5).

Critical music studies as exemplified in this collection manifest three fundamental characteristics: 1) a recanting of exclusivity in terms of objects of study, 2) a recanting of exclusivity in terms of the voices that can be

heard in the arena of criticism, and 3) a realization that theories and methods in music studies can never be fixed or privileged, but must always and inevitably be on the move as a consequence of the continual interrogation of their origins and applications. To conduct musical scholarship in this manner is not to open the door to extreme subjectivism or unqualified relativism. A clear message of this volume is that both scholarship and teaching are always shaped by specific sets of social forces, be they historical, political, cultural, economic, gender-based, linguistic, or religious. As a consequence, scholarship and teaching cannot be conducted as if "anything goes." They must be conducted in full cognizance of the specific forces which inform them.

Only by remembering that music is constituted through performative processes giving rise to particular experiences will music studies in the future be able to move the study of music from its present, somewhat peripheral and marginalized status in the arts, humanities, and social sciences to a more consequential position based on the realization that music is, indeed, a distinctive and constitutive feature of human life. It is in this sense and to this end fitting to move to the articles in this volume with the closing words of Bent's address in mind:

the community of serious musical scholarship is under sufficient pressure from other musicians who are suspicious of scholarship and from other scholars who are suspicious of music, that we cannot afford to exacerbate mutual disrespect.... Let us encourage healthy discussion and self-criticism in the interests of improving what we do, but not in such a way that we erode the fragile ecology of confidence in our varied and often lonely endeavours, lest we destroy the environment in which fruitful musical scholarship can grow (Bent 1986, 6).

References

- Bent, Margaret. 1986. *Fact and Value in Contemporary Musical Scholarship*, 1-7. Boulder, Co.: College Music Society.
- Middleton, Richard. 1990. *Studying Popular Music*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- . 1993. "Popular Music Analysis and Musicology: Bridging the Gap." *Popular Music* 12, no. 2: 177-90.
- Shepherd, John. 1994. "Music, Culture and Interdisciplinarity: Reflections on Relationships." *Popular Music* 13, no. 2: 209-22.