



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Pace, I. (2019). Modernist Fantasias: The Recuperation of a Concept. *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 144(2), pp. 473-493. doi: 10.1080/02690403.2019.1651512

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/22548/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02690403.2019.1651512>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

MODERNIST FANTASIAS: THE RECUPERATION OF A CONCEPT

Ian Pace

Review of Björn Heile and Charles Wilson (eds.), *The Routledge Research Companion to Modernism in Music* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2019)

On 16 October 1955, in the final concert in that year's Donaueschinger Musiktage (the fifth festival since it had been relaunched by the head of music at the radio station Südwestfunk (SWF)), the SWF orchestra, conducted by Hans Rosbaud, gave the world premiere of Iannis Xenakis's *Metastaseis* (1953-4).¹ The work embodied a revolutionary approach to composition, arguably anticipated in some of the music of Edgard Varèse, but never taken so far by him. It eschewed any type of motivic or thematic working (or serial composition, about which Xenakis published a critique that year),² or any obvious use of functional harmony, in favour of morphing, statistically derived masses of sound with copious use of string glissandi. The concert also featured works extending interwar dodecaphonic idioms by Giselher Klebe and Luigi Dallapiccola, but also Paul Hindemith's *Konzertmusik* for string orchestra and brass, op. 50 (1930).³

¹ Josef Häusler, *Spiegel der Neuen Musik: Donaueschingen. Chronik – Tendenzen – Werkbesprechungen* (Kassel, Stuttgart and Weimar: Bärenreiter and J.B. Metzler, 1996), 439.

² Iannis Xenakis, 'La crise de la musique sérielle', *Gravesaner Blätter* 1 (1955), 2-4; repr. in Xenakis, *Kéleütha: Écrits*, with preface and notes by Benoît Gibson (Paris: L'Arche, 1994), 39-43.

³ While 1955 was a relatively radical year, the 1956 Musiktage began with a whole concert of music by Honegger, then in 1957 there was a whole concert of jazz. See Häusler, *Spiegel der Neuen Musik*, 440-41.

Four years later, on 25 November 1959, the Utrechts Stedelijk Orkest, conducted by Paul Huppers, gave the world premiere of Matthijs Vermeulen's esoteric yet tonal Sixth Symphony (1956-8), *Les minutes heureuses*, dominated by continual motivic 'developing variation'.⁴ This was also performed, together with works by Karl Amadeus Hartmann and B. A. Zimmermann, and the première of György Ligeti's *Apparitions* (1958-9), by the Norddeutscher Rundfunk-Sinfonieorchester at the ISCM World Music Days in Cologne on 19 June 1960.⁵ This festival featured premières or performances of what are now considered landmark modernist works, such as the first version of Pierre Boulez's *Pli selon pli* (1957-60), Karlheinz Stockhausen's *Kontakte* (1958-60), Luigi Nono's *Cori di Dione* (1958), and Mauricio Kagel's *Anagrama* (1957-8), set alongside Milhaud's Eighth Symphony and works of Wolfgang Fortner, Klebe, Boris Blacher, Roger Sessions, Arthur Berger and others.⁶ Not all radical composers were enamoured of the ISCM's selections, and a group of composers and artists around Mary Bauermeister organised a special Contre-fest in her studio on 15-19 June (the ISCM took place on 10-19 June), in which iconoclastic works, actions and happenings of John Cage, Toshi Ichiyanagi, Sylvano Bussotti, George Brecht, La Monte Young, Christian Wolff and Nam June Paik were presented, and Heinz-Klaus Metzger read out his Kölner Manifest, entailing a Marxist and post-Adornian reading of Cage in opposition to most of existing musical culture.⁷ Similar motivations

⁴ Matthijs Vermuelen, 'Notes on my Sixth Symphony' (1961), <<https://www.matthijsvermeulen.nl/en/compositions/symphony/sixth-symphony-les-minutes-heureuses>> (accessed 2 July 2019); Ton Braas, 'Matthijs Vermeulen's Symphonies', *Key Notes*, 25 (1988-9), 18-24; 'Matthijs Vermuelen (1888-1967)', <<https://www.matthijsvermeulen.nl/leven-en-werk/>> (accessed 28 June 2019).

⁵ Anton Haefeli, *IGNM. Die Internationale Gesellschaft für Neue Musik. Ihre Geschichte von 1922 bis zur Gegenwart* (Zurich: Atlantis Musikbuch-Verlag, 1982), 518; Richard Toop, *György Ligeti* (London: Phaidon Press, 1999), 224.

⁶ Haefeli, *IGNM*, 517-18.

⁷ Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln (ed.), *intermedial – kontrovers – experimentell. Das Atelier Mary Bauermeister in Köln 1962-62* (Cologne: Emons Verlag, 1993), 24-39.

underlay the creation in the same year of the series *Neue Musik München* by Josef Anton Riedl.⁸

Other works composed during the period 1955-60 include Dieter Schnebel's *für Stimmen (... missa est); dt 31,6* for 12 vocal ensembles (1956-8), using serial procedures applied to obscured vocal fragments using a text from The Book of Deuteronomy,⁹ Tadeusz Baird's mixture of dodecaphony and free atonality entitled *Four Essays* (1958),¹⁰ Bruno Maderna's tape work *Continuo* (1958)¹¹ and Roman Haubenstock-Ramati's indeterminate graphic score *Mobile für Shakespeare* (1958), as well as Shostakovich's Symphony no. 11, *The Year 1905* (1957) (performed in the Warsaw Autumn Festival in 1958, as was the Baird),¹² Francis Poulenc's *Gloria* (1959) and Benjamin Britten's opera *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1959-60).

I would consider all of these to be 'modernist', though some employ modernist idioms developed earlier in the century. As a cross-section of work created during this often-mischaracterised period, they represent a more pluralist picture than is often assumed. Programming dominated by serial music and a few other things can be found in the programmes of Boulez's *Domaine Musical* series from its foundation in 1956.¹³

However, the programmes of the Darmstädter Ferienkurse from this period show a

⁸ Josef Anton Riedl, '*NEUE MUSIK München*, Siemens-Studio für elektronische Musik und *musica viva* (1953-1963)', in "*Eine Sprache der Gegenwart*". *musica viva 1945-1995*, ed. Renate Ulm (Mainz: Piper Schott, 1995), 65-74.

⁹ See Gisela Nauck, *Dieter Schnebel. Lesegänge durch Leben und Werk* (Mainz: Schott, 2001), 82-8, 348.

¹⁰ Cynthia E. Bylander, 'The Warsaw Autumn International Festival of Contemporary Music 1956-1961: Its goals, structures, programs, and people', (PhD thesis: Ohio State University, 1989), 195-6

¹¹ Angela Ida de Benedictis, 'Bruno Maderna e lo Studio di Fonologia della Rai di Milano: musica d'arte e d'uso tra creazione, ricercar e invenzione', *Musica/Realtà* XXX/91 (2010), 44-75 (pp. 52, 58).

¹² Bylander, 'The Warsaw Autumn International Festival', 468-9.

¹³ For more information on programming in this series, which featured the Second Viennese School, Messiaen, Stockhausen, some works of Berio, Kagel, Maderna, Nono and even Henze, as well as Stravinsky, see Jesús Aguila, *Le Domaine Musical: Pierre Boulez et vingt ans de création contemporaine*, (Paris: Fayard, 1992), 159-206, 219-22.

more varied repertory than is often imagined; if in 1956 and 1957 dodecaphonic or serial music accounted for around half the works performed (unlike in previous years), the visit of Cage and David Tudor the following year changed the balance and aesthetic direction significantly.¹⁴ A similar pattern can be found in the programmes of the Musik der Zeit series in Cologne (where various electronic works, Stockhausen's *Gruppen* (1955-7), and Nono's *Il canto sospeso* (1955-6) were premièred),¹⁵ while at the Festival Internazionale di Musica Contemporanea della Biennale di Venezia, the programming was far more slanted towards music from interwar traditions.¹⁶

This picture contrasts with the prevailing accounts of modernism within anglophone musicology published during the 1980s and 1990s. After Joseph Kerman, writing in 1985, portrayed a somewhat homogenous world of serial and electronic music in 'young Europe' in the 1945-60 period, dominated by *Die Reihe*,¹⁷ a whole range of increasingly monolithic and largely negative views followed, by scholars self-identifying with postmodernism and/or the 'new musicology', of whom Susan McClary, Rose Rosengard Subotnick, Lawrence Kramer, Georgina Born and in some

¹⁴ Gianmario Borio and Hermann Danuser (eds.), *Im Zenit der Moderne. Die Internationalen Ferienkurse für Neue Musik Darmstadt*, 4 vols. (Freiburg: Rombach, 1997), iii, 572-606.

¹⁵ Westdeutscher Rundfunk (ed.), *Zwanzig Jahre Musik im Westdeutschen Rundfunk. Eine Dokumentation der Hauptabteilung Musik 1948-1968* (Cologne: Westdeutscher Rundfunk, 1968), 102-210.

¹⁶ 'Festival Internazionale di Musica Contemporanea della Biennale di Venezia: Programmi 1930-1972', at <http://www-5.unipv.it/girardi/2015_DM1/1930-1972_BiennaleMusica.pdf> (accessed 28 June 2019).

¹⁷ Joseph Kerman, *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), 20-21. For a critique of Kerman's view and historical inaccuracies, see Martin Iddon, 'Darmstadt Schools: Darmstadt as a Plural Phenomenon', *Tempo* 65/256 (April 2011), 3-5.

ways Richard Taruskin are just a few.¹⁸ McClary and Subotnick portrayed a world in which taste and prestige are determined by elite traditions of specialists (drawing upon a long tradition of populist anglophone attacks on ‘experts’, which at the time of writing have a new immediacy),¹⁹ leading to the alleged marginalization (in terms of academic curricula rather than concert programming) of more ‘mainstream’ composers and especially popular music – which flourishes in the ‘American marketplace’ rather than the ‘European elitist tradition’, according to Subotnick. Kramer portrayed modernist music as self-referential and relatively oblivious to ‘extramusical’ considerations.²⁰ (Where this would leave Messiaen’s *Vingt regards* (1944) or Stockhausen’s *Hymnen* (1966-7) is anyone’s guess.) Born’s polemic on the IRCAM continues to be evoked by some as an exemplary model, but has been severely criticized for some of the simplistic dualisms upon which it is founded, as well as its use of secondary literature and the institution’s own self-aggrandizing

¹⁸ Susan McClary, ‘Terminal Prestige: The Case of Avant-Garde Music Competition’, *Cultural Critique* 12 (Spring 1989), 57-81; Rose Rosengard Subotnick, ‘The Challenge of Contemporary Music’, in *Developing Variations: Style and Ideology in Western Music* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), 265-93; Lawrence Kramer, *Classical Music and Postmodern Knowledge* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA, and London: University of California Press, 1995); Georgina Born, *Rationalizing Culture: IRCAM, Boulez, and the Institutionalization of the Musical Avant-Garde* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Richard Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*, 6 vols. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), iv: *The Early Twentieth Century* and v: *The Late Twentieth Century*.

¹⁹ For historical views of this phenomenon in the Britain and the USA, see Stefan Collini, *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), especially 15-44, 69-89; Duncan Stone, ‘Deconstructing the gentleman amateur’, *Cultural and Social History*, <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14780038.2019.1614284>> (accessed 5 July 2019); and Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York; Alfred A. Knopf, 1963). For recent examples relating to Donald Trump and the 2016 Brexit referendum campaign: see Walter Moss, ‘The Crassness and Anti-Intellectualism of President Donald Trump’, *History News Network* at <<https://historynewsnetwork.org/article/168305>> (accessed 4 July 2019); and Henry Mance, ‘Britain has had enough of experts, says Gove’, *Financial Times*, 3 June 2016. For a rigorous, nuanced treatment of the subject for general readers, see Tom Nichols, *The Death of Expertise: The Campaign Against Established Knowledge and Why It Matters* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

²⁰ Kramer, *Classical Music and Postmodern Knowledge*, 6-14.

rhetoric rather than engagement with the music produced there.²¹ In his *Oxford History of Western Music*, Richard Taruskin presented at least certain types of ‘high’ modernism as essentially historical aberrations and cited the growing body of scholarly opinion arguing that the alleged success of much post-1945 modernist repertoire was a direct result of covert actions and funding as part of the cold war.²² Several scholars including myself have addressed these and related claims elsewhere (in particular the false and unevicenced allegation that the CIA funded the Darmstädter Ferienkurse),²³ and I will not repeat the arguments here, other than to note that recently in this very journal one writer recently cited a scholarly source as

²¹ See in particular Björn Heile, ‘Darmstadt as Other: British and American Responses to Musical Modernism’, *twentieth-century music*, 1/2 (2004), 161-78 (pp. 167-9), and Richard Hermann, ‘Reflexive Postmodern Anthropology Meets Musical “Modernism”: Georgina Born’s *Rationalizing Culture: IRCAM, Boulez and the Institutionalization of the Musical Avant-Garde*’, *Music Theory Online* 3.5, a<http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.97.3.5/mto.97.3.5.hermann_frames.html> (accessed 23 June 2019). A wider critique of Born’s methods and influence will be Joan Arnau Pàmies, ‘Listening as Precondition, or Musicology with Ears’, *Rethinking Contemporary Musicology: Perspectives on Interdisciplinarity, Skills and Deskillling*, eds. Ian Pace and Peter Tregear (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, forthcoming 2020).

²² Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*, v, 6-22. A comprehensive critique of Taruskin’s ideas and methods can be found in Franklin Cox, ‘Review: Richard Taruskin’s *The Oxford History of Western Music*’ (two parts), <http://www.searchnewmusic.org/cox_review.pdf> and <http://www.searchnewmusic.org/cox_taruskin_part2.pdf> (accessed 28 June 2019).

²³ See my ‘The Cold War in Germany as Ideological Weapon for Anti-Modernists’, available at <<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/6482/>> (accessed 24 June 2019); and on the specific claim, from Frances Stonor Saunders, that the Darmstadt courses were initiated by the US occupying forces, see Amy Beal, *New Music, New Allies: American Experimental Music in West Germany from the Zero Hour to Reunification* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2006), 38; Michael Custodis, *Traditionen – Koalitionen – Visionen. Wolfgang Steinecke und die Internationalen Ferienkurse in Darmstadt* (Saarbrücken: Pfau, 2010), 48-9; Martin Iddon, *New Music at Darmstadt: Nono, Stockhausen, Cage, and Boulez* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 19-22; and Ian Pace, ‘The Reconstruction of Post-War West German New Music during the Early Allied Occupation (1945-46), and its Roots in the Weimar Republic and Third Reich (1918-45)’ (PhD thesis: Cardiff University, 2018), 4, 168-73, 342-8.

saying the very opposite of what it actually does, in order to bolster Taruskin's point.²⁴

A comprehensive history of anti-modernist tendencies in critical discourse about music has yet to be written; such a history would, I believe, reveal plenty of common ideologies, tropes, and conspiratorial thinking. The tradition would include Hans Pfitzner's frenzied attacks on Ferruccio Busoni and Paul Bekker in the 1910s and 1920s and associations of new music with 'Russian Jewish criminals' whom Pfitzner claimed had sold out Germany at the end of the First World War;²⁵ the stoking of the concept of *Musik-Bolschewismus* in the 1920s;²⁶ Richard Eichenauer's 1932 text *Musik und Rasse*, which associated atonality, microtones and other tendencies with Jewish musicians following a 'law of their race' to destroy 'harmonious polyphony';²⁷ and the attacks by the Russian Association of Proletarian Musicians and their fellow-travellers on a new musical 'left wing' (viewed in Leninist terms as an 'infantile

²⁴ Marina Frolova-Walker, 'An Inclusive History for a Divided World?', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 143 (2018), 1-20. Frolova-Walker writes (p. 3) that 'Taruskin showed how the advance of ultra-modernism after the Second World War had been conditioned by cold-war ideology and that it was ultimately financed by the CIA' whilst conceding that Taruskin's work was dependent upon the secondary literature of others, including that of Frances Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London: Granta, 2000), as well as Ian Wellens, *Music on the Frontline: Nicolas Nabokov's Struggle against Communism and Middlebrow Culture* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002). Taruskin does not cite Wellens, who on the basis of intense study of the archives of Nicolas Nabokov, secretary-general of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, argues against Stonor Saunders, and concludes that there is no evidence that Nabokov 'could see some sort of political advantage in promoting serialism', and that 'a close study of Nabokov, his writings and his CCF work simply does not support that [Stonor Saunders' thesis]' (p. 122). Nabokov's various letters make clear his indifference to post-war serialism (presumably Frolova-Walker's 'ultra-modernism'), in contrast with his huge enthusiasm for Stravinsky, and contain no reference to Cage. Wellens thus concludes that 'the New Music was no CIA plot' (p. 125) and 'Nabokov's project was probably too peripheral within the contemporary music world to force a wholesale revision of music history' (p. 126). Wellens' book thus undermines Frolova-Walker's claims rather than bolstering them.

²⁵ Hans Pfitzner, *Futuristengefahr. Bei Gelegenheit von Busoni's Ästhetik* (Leipzig: Süddeutsche Monatshefte, 1917), reproduced in Pfitzner, *Gesammelte Schriften*, 3 vols (Augsburg: Benno Filser-Verlag, 1926-9), I, 185-223; Pfitzner, *Die neue Aesthetik der musikalischen Impotenz. Ein Verwesungssymptom?* (Munich: Verlag der Süddeutschen Monatshefte, 1920).

²⁶ See Eckhard John, *Musik-Bolschewismus. Die Politisierung der Musik in Deutschland 1918-1938* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1994) for a comprehensive study of this Weimar era term.

²⁷ Richard Eichenauer, *Musik und Rasse* (Munich: Lehmanns, 1932), 273-4.

disorder’).²⁸ It would also engage with the hardening of official Soviet attitudes against many varieties of modern music as epitomizing bourgeois and Western tendencies;²⁹ the various censures of ‘formalism’ in the 1930s and 1940s, culminating in the 1948 Zhdanov decree;³⁰ the conservative 1955 creed *The Agony of Modern Music* by Henry Pleasants (himself a CIA agent), bemoaning the chasm between lay audiences and contemporary composers, and evoking Gershwin and jazz instead as the only real heir to the classical tradition;³¹ and later critiques from Samuel Lipman and Roger Scruton,³² as well as those from postmodernists and new musicologists. While it would be simplistic to elide the distinctions between these traditions of writing, there are common ideological tropes, including anti-intellectualism, a preference for music rooted in the singing or dancing body as against the overly ‘cerebral’ modernism, disdain for ‘unnatural’ approaches to composition, and populist appeals to large ‘masses’ of listeners who supposedly reject such work, combined with attacks on the elites who supposedly impose it upon them.

In response, it is not surprising that many of those sympathetic to and knowledgeable of such music would want to respond with a more nuanced and pluralistic view.

Scholars including Joseph Straus, Björn Heile and Martin Iddon have addressed

²⁸ “‘Leviy’ flang sovremennoy muziki’, *Muzyka i revolyutsiya* 1 (January 1927), 3-7; translated Marina Frolova-Walker and Jonathan Walker as ‘The “Left” Wing of Contemporary Music’, *Music and Soviet Power, 1917-1932*, eds. Frolova-Walker and Walker (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012), 188-92.

²⁹ See for example Yuriy Keldish, ‘Balet “Stal’noy skok” i yego avtor – Prokof’yev’, *Proletarsiy muzikant* 6 (1929), 12-19; translated Frolova-Walker and Walker as ‘The Ballet *Steps of Steel* and its Composer, Prokofiev’, *Music and Soviet Power*, 243-52.

³⁰ See the full transcript of the proceedings leading up to the 1948 Zhdanov decree on music in Alexander Werth, *Musical Uproar in Moscow* (London: Turnstile Press, 1949), 47-103.

³¹ Henry Pleasants, *The Agony of Modern Music* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955). Pleasants was head of the CIA branch in the West German capital of Bonn, from 1950, and very close to the West German intelligence chief Reinhard Gehlen, but this fact has never to my knowledge been employed in arguments about US/Western cultural policy. See James H. Critchfield, *Partners at the Creation: The Men Behind Postwar Germany’s Defence and Intelligence Establishments* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2003), 102, and for more detail, Agilolf Keßelring, *Die Organisation Gehlen und die Neuformierung des Militärs in der Bundesrepublik* (Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag, 2017).

³² Samuel Lipman, *Music after Modernism* (New York: Basic Books, 1979); Roger Scruton, *The Aesthetics of Music* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

directly issues and misrepresentations in various research since Kerman,³³ but perhaps the most encouraging result has been the growth of a new and variegated body of scholarship on modernist music. A concomitant decline in writing on postmodernism³⁴ is a key observation in Heile and Charles Wilson's penetrating introduction to their new edited collection *The Routledge Research Companion to Modernism in Music* (pp. 1-30).

This book is a major addition to this new body of work on musical modernism, which has developed in parallel with the area-known as 'The New Modernist Studies' in literary and cultural scholarship, which emerged around 1999, with the establishment of the Modernist Studies Association, a range of major forums and many related publications.³⁵ Writers in both fields emphasise conceptual expansion of the field, to encompass work not previously categorised as modernist and to incorporate modernist artists from a wider range of demographics, , as well as often challenging an earlier

³³ Joseph N. Straus, 'The Myth of Serial "Tyranny" in the 1950s and 1960s', *Musical Quarterly* 83 (1999), 301-343; Heile, 'Darmstadt as Other', 161-178; Martin Iddon, 'Darmstadt Schools: Darmstadt as a Plural Phenomenon', *Tempo*, 65/256 (April 2011), 2-8 and 'Spectres of Darmstadt', *Tempo*, 67/263 (January 2013), 61-7.

³⁴ From the period from the late 1980s until the early 2000s in which anglophone scholarship on postmodernism flourished, there were certainly some extremely significant publications, especially those relating to musical borrowing, including Joseph Nathan Straus, *Remaking the Past: Musical Modernism and the Influence of the Tonal Tradition* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1990); and Glenn Watkins, *Pyramids at the Louvre: Music, Culture, and Collage from Stravinsky to the Postmodernists* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1994). For a wider critical overview of scholarship on borrowing, including earlier work in German, see Ian Pace, 'Negotiating borrowing, genre and mediation in the piano music of Finnis: Strategies and aesthetics', *Critical Perspectives on Michael Finnis: Bright Futures, Dark Pasts*, ed. Ian Pace and Nigel McBride (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2019), 57-103.

³⁵ This phenomenon is chronicled by Douglas Mao and Rebecca L. Walkowitz, in 'Introduction': Modernisms Bad and New', *Bad Modernisms*, ed. Mao and Walkowitz (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006), 1-18; and 'The New Modernist Studies', *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 123 (2008), 737-48. This school of thought has been criticised on grounds of adherence to antiquated liberal notions of freedom unaffected by changing historical circumstances, in Max Brzezinski, 'The New Modernist Studies: What's Left of Political Formalism?', *Minnesota Review* 76 (Spring 2011), 109-25; similar arguments were given a more rigorous Marxist theorisation by Perry Anderson in his critique 'Marshall Berman: Modernity and Revolution' (1983, with postscript 1985), in *A Zone of Engagement* (London and New York: Verso, 1992), 25-55.

orthodoxy which maintained that modernism was a historical movement whose time had passed.³⁶

Two of the most oft-cited earlier anglophone studies of modernism – the collection edited by Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, and Peter Nicholls’ monograph – were overwhelmingly dominated by literature and drama.³⁷ In 1994, however, Christopher Butler did much to marry the study of European literature, music and painting from 1900 to 1916, by tracing the manifestation of various themes – (dissatisfaction with ideas of a common culture, the development of new languages, new conceptions of the self, and so on) – then considering the embodiment of such themes in various artworks.³⁸ Another important new development was Arnold Whittall’s theorization, primarily from the late 1990s, of the idea of a ‘moderate mainstream’ or ‘modernist mainstream’ of composers (including Britten, Copland, Hindemith, Poulenc, Prokofiev, Shostakovich and others) who wished to avail themselves of many of the surface features of the avant-garde but without jettisoning a sense of line or other forms of more traditional coherence and continuity.³⁹

³⁶ As was evident just from the titles of Harry Levin, ‘What Was Modernism?’, *The Massachusetts Review*, 1/4 (Summer 1960), 609-630; or Raymond Williams, ‘When Was Modernism?’ (1987), in *The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists* (London: Verso, 1989), 31-6. A key text associated with New Modernist Studies, Marjorie Perloff’s *21st-Century Modernism: The “New” Poetics* (Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), argues that at the beginning of the new century, ‘the modern/postmodern divide has emerged as more apparent than real’ (p. 164), though appears to accept that in literature, the previous few decades represented something of a break, so she is calling essentially for a type of revival. On the other hand, Michael Levenson, in his *Modernism* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), continues to adhere to a view of modernism as a phenomenon of an earlier era, declaring at the very outset that ‘Modernism may have disappeared as a living cultural force’ (p. 1), and focusing almost entirely on the earlier half of the twentieth century.

³⁷ Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane (eds.), *Modernism* (London: Penguin, 1976); Peter Nicholls, *Modernisms: A Literary Guide* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995).

³⁸ Christopher Butler, *Early Modernism: Literature, Music and Painting in Europe 1900-1916* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

³⁹ See Arnold Whittall, ‘Tippett and the Modernist Mainstream’, *Michael Tippett O.M.: A Celebration*, ed. Geraint Lewis (Tunbridge Wells; Baton Press, 1985), 109-15; Whittall, *Musical Composition in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 286-324, 388-9, and especially Whittall, ‘Individualism and accessibility: the moderate mainstream’, in *The Cambridge History of Twentieth Century Music*, eds. Nicholas Cook and Anthony Pople (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 364-94.

But the book which, more than any other, injected new life into the study of musical modernism was another cross-disciplinary work, Daniel Albright's *Untwisting the Serpent*, published in 2000.⁴⁰ With highly detailed individual engagement with specific works in different media, Albright also took a fresh thematic approach, via a range of highly individual and distinctive *artistic* categories, organised into two large groups labelled Marsyas (for expressionism, hyperreality and neo-barbarism) and Apollo (for new objectivity, abstractionism and neoclassicism), thus communicating simultaneously both a sense of art's relative autonomy and also intertextuality. Arguing that the modernist age began around 1907-9, and could be defined as '*the testing of the limits of aesthetic construction*',⁴¹ Albright could write originally on distinctive choices of musical examples such as Stravinsky's *Renard*, Weill's *Der Jasager*, Ezra Pound's opera *Le testament* and Kurt Schwitters' *Ursonate*, though with a heavy bias towards texted or programmatic works.

Albright followed this with an invaluable collection of primary sources on music and modernism,⁴² and soon afterwards a steady stream of new book-length publications on modernism began to appear. In 2005 Walter Frisch published an important new study on German modernism from the death of Wagner until the end of the First World War in the context especially of philosophy and the visual arts,⁴³ after which a range of authors and editors of collected essays concentrated on modernism in specific regions

⁴⁰ Daniel Albright, *Untwisting the Serpent: Modernism in Music, Literature, and Other Arts* (Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 29 (italics original).

⁴² Daniel Albright, *Modernism and Music: An Anthology of Sources* (Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

⁴³ Walter Frisch, *German Modernism: Music and the Arts* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA and London: University of California Press, 2005). Three years previously, Carol A. Hess published another regional study, *Manuel de Falla and Modernism in Spain, 1898-1935* (Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

of Europe, including Matthew Riley and later Philip Rupprecht on Britain, Barbara Kelly on France, Ben Earle on Italy and Stephen Downes on Central and Eastern Europe.⁴⁴ A 2008 collection edited by Dejan Despić and Melita Milin featured articles on lesser-known varieties of modernism from Eastern Europe, especially Serbia (the site of the conference leading to the volume), as well as various considerations of the meaning of the term modernism, centres and peripheries, and other conceptions of ‘moderate’ or ‘moderated’ modernism which appear to have developed independently of Whittall.⁴⁵

A 2009 volume edited by Heile included a series of essays examining aspects of post-1945 music and aesthetics from positions broadly sympathetic to modernism,⁴⁶ while a monograph by David Metzger argued for a continued presence of modernist concepts – purity, silence, fragmentation, lamentation, sonic flux – in music from around the turn of the twenty-first century, focusing on works of Jonathan Harvey, György Kurtág, Helmut Lachenmann, Kaija Saariaho and Salvatore Sciarrino, and relating back to older works of Stockhausen and Nono.⁴⁷ Two further edited collections, *Musik in der Moderne/Music and Modernism* and *Transformations of Musical Modernism*, feature varying degrees of direct engagement with modernism as an

⁴⁴ Matthew Riley (ed.), *British Music and Modernism, 1895-1960* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010); Philip Rupprecht, *British Musical Modernism: The Manchester Group and their Contemporaries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Barbara L. Kelly, *Music and Ultra-Modernism in France: A Fragile Consensus, 1913-1939* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013); Ben Earle, *Luigi Dallapiccola and Musical Modernism in Fascist Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Stephen Downes, *Music and Decadence in European Modernism: The Case of Central and Eastern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

⁴⁵ Dejan Despić and Melita Milin (eds.), *Rethinking Musical Modernism* (Belgrade: Institute of Musicology, 2008).

⁴⁶ Bjorn Heile (ed.), *The Modernist Legacy: Essays on New Music* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

⁴⁷ David Metzger, *Musical Modernism at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

aesthetic concept and its history.⁴⁸ A more iconoclastic perspective was provided by J.P.E. Harper-Scott, whose ferociously argued and intellectually uncompromising *The Quilting Points of Musical Modernism*, made the case for musical modernism's centrality, vital importance, and potential to point beyond the experienced present, via scathing critiques of what he describes as 'crypto-capitalist work' in the form of ethnomusicology, empirical musicology, popular music studies and the work of Taruskin.⁴⁹ Harper-Scott extends the concept of modernism to include the totality of twentieth-century music (as no music can be untouched by modernity),⁵⁰ and proposes that the study of 'faithful' and 'reactive' modernisms (see below) be extended right back to the French Revolution. No less ambitious, and somewhat related, is Tobias Janz's large-scale study *Zur Genealogie der musikalischen Moderne*, also taking a very broad view of 'Moderne' which draws at length upon the thought of Hegel, Niklas Luhmann and Max Weber, to derive a concept founded upon rationalisation, subjectivity in the context of bourgeois society, and autonomy as a communicative principle, worked through examples of self-reflection and metatextuality in Beethoven, Chopin and Hugo Wolf, while testing the limits of the concept through examples from Wagner, multiple settings of Kipling's *The Jungle Books*, and John Cage's collaboration with Sonic Youth.⁵¹

The *Routledge Research Companion to Modernism in Music* belongs in this recent tradition and is in many ways an impressive achievement. There is a high level of

⁴⁸ Federico Celestini, Gregor Korz and Julian Johnson (ed.), *Musik in der Moderne/Music and Modernism* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2011); Erling E. Guldbrandsen and Julian Johnson (eds.), *Transformations of Musical Modernism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

⁴⁹ J.P.E. Harper-Scott, *The Quilting Points of Musical Modernism: Revolution, Reaction, and William Walton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

⁵⁰ Just as some New Modernist Studies scholars have chosen to use the term to refer to any writing published in the first half of the twentieth century, stripping the term of any stylistic or evaluative meaning. See Mao and Walkowitz, 'Introduction', 1-2.

⁵¹ Tobias Janz, *Zur Genealogie der musikalischen Moderne* (Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, 2014).

intellectual rigour from the majority of the contributors, almost all of whom are professional musicologists (although every one of these is currently working in an anglophone institution). It constitutes a series of perspectives upon aspects of musical modernism, rather than presenting an overview of the subject, divided by region, aesthetic tendency, compositional technique, period, and so on, and as such would not really be an ideal book for readers relatively new to these areas of music (though it is hard to think of a volume which does provide such a role).⁵²

In the remarkable Introduction (pp. 1-30), Heile and Wilson explore the question of what ‘modernism’ means, though without settling on any single answer which might inform the volume as a whole. Beyond the more familiar candidates for the term, they also allude a tradition which has claimed the likes of Bridge, Britten, Elgar, Nielsen and Sibelius for modernism.⁵³ Harper-Scott’s all-inclusive view is a ‘strong’ application of this tradition bolstered by Whittall’s concept of the modernist mainstream. But when does modernism start, and how much continuity or discontinuity is there between it and the body of work commonly categorized as ‘Romanticism’?

⁵² I am imagining something similar to Peter Brooker, Andrzej Gasiorek, Deborah Longworth and Andrew Thacker (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modernisms* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), or Vincent Sherry (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Modernism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), but focused exclusively on music. This would be a different thing from a simple history of twentieth-century music.

⁵³ Heile and Wilson (p. 3) claim James Hepokoski’s *Sibelius: Symphony No. 5* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) as the beginning of this tradition, followed by J.P.E. Harper-Scott, *Edward Elgar, Modernist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Daniel M. Grimley, *Carl Nielsen and the Idea of Modernism* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010); Christopher Chowrimootoo, “‘Britten Minor’: Constructing the Modernist Canon”, *Twentieth-Century Music* 13 (2016), 261-90; and Ben Earle, ‘Modernism and Reification in the Music of Frank Bridge’, *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 141 (2016), 335-402.

Whittall cited late Beethoven as the beginning of ‘an emergent musical modernism’,⁵⁴ as Harper-Scott had proposed the French Revolution, while Julian Johnson has also proposed a single modernist period from the mid-eighteenth until the late twentieth century.⁵⁵ Leonard B. Meyer had argued in 1989 for a continuity between Romanticism and modernism (until around 1930, the ‘end of historic optimism’),⁵⁶ and this idea was taken up in part by Taruskin, who theorised a period of ‘maximalism’, an intensification and expansion in resources of Romanticism, in the period 1890-1914 (in the work of Mahler, Schoenberg and Strauss, and to varying degrees in Bartók, Debussy, Ives, Janáček, Skryabin, early Ravel and Stravinsky, and others (later extended in the work of Messiaen), with ‘the “real” twentieth-century’ beginning only in the 1920s with Stravinsky’s *Octet* (1923)).⁵⁷

Other models for periodization exist in wider artistic fields, the most fruitful of which I believe to be the quadripartite formulation of Art Berman for art and literature: (1) Early Modernism up to 1905, characterized by transcendentalism, spiritualism, artistic autonomy, aestheticism; (2) Midmodernism, c. 1905-1920 with a weakening of transcendentalism and a greater concentration on the everyday; (3) High Modernism, from the 1920s, including Dada, surrealism and other forms of eclecticism, away from any vestiges of German idealism after Germany has lost the war, but instead incorporating a new focus on abstract form and formalist criticism; (4) Late

⁵⁴ Arnold Whittall, *Exploring Twentieth-Century Music: Tradition and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 189.

⁵⁵ Julian Johnson, *Out of Time: Music and the Making of Modernity* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 7-8.

⁵⁶ Leonard B. Meyer, *Style and Music: Theory, History and Ideology* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 337-52; Meyer, ‘Postlude’, in *Music, the Arts, and Ideas: Patterns and Predictions in Twentieth-Century Culture*, rev. ed. (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 317-49 (p. 331).

⁵⁷ Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*, iv, especially pp. 1-58, 131-363, 447-93.

Modernism, after 1945,⁵⁸ in which there is an institutionalization of experimentation and iconoclasm, including in universities.⁵⁹ Modernism would then come to an end with the advent of Postmodernism from the mid-1970s. For music, I would add further modernist sub-categories after the mid-1970s, and include an earlier transitional period from the late 1840s until around 1890, focused upon *Zukunftsmusik*. Furthermore, a concept such as ‘interwar modernism’ (to do with style rather than literal period) is also useful as a way of distinguishing composers whose music after 1945 continued in these traditions without radical changes from the avant-garde (for example Britten, Copland, Dallapiccola, Ernesto Halffter, Hartmann, Shostakovich), without simply labelling the former as traditionalists or conservatives.

The most common historical conceptualization of modernism locates its origins in Charles Baudelaire’s *Les fleurs du mal* (1857), and the use of the term *modernité* in *Le Peintre de la vie moderne* (1863) (which receives its most obvious successor in J.-

⁵⁸ This is distinct from an earlier model found in such texts as David Lodge, *The Modes of Modern Writing: Metaphor, Metonymy, and the Typology of Modern Literature* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977); Christopher Butler, *After the Wake: An Essay on the Contemporary Avant-Garde* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980); and somewhat later Tyrus Miller, *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction and the Arts between the World Wars* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1999), in which modernism is essentially seen as bounded by the Second World War. Miller draws upon Brian McHale, *Postmodernist Fiction* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), and allows for a type of transitional period represented in a literary context by such writers as Samuel Beckett, Alain Robbe-Grillet, Vladimir Nabokov and Thomas Pynchon, before the advent of postmodernism, while the earlier writers tend towards postmodernism as an immediate post-1945 phenomenon (which for Butler includes the music of René Leibowitz, Boulez, Stockhausen, Nono, Cage and Henze), which refocuses, recontextualises and otherwise modifies earlier modernism rather than placing itself in direct opposition to it. This view was anticipated in Ihab Hassan, *The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Toward a Postmodern Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971; second edition 1982). Butler however moved to a different periodization in his *Postmodernism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), in which Boulez, Henze and Stockhausen from the 1950s are ‘late modernist music’ (p. 84), although Nono and Henze (presumably later works) are ‘leftist versions of postmodernism’ (p. 76). Berio’s *Sinfonia* (1968-9) and works of Schnittke, Takemitsu, Ligeti, are linked by Butler to postmodernist art, though contrasted with operas of Birtwistle, Turnage, Adès and Adams in which Butler finds ‘a loyalty to a coherent, ontologically relatively stable world’, themselves in contrast to Glass’s *Einstein on the Beach* (1975-6) (pp. 73-6).

⁵⁹ Art Berman, *Preface to Modernism* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 27-88. I am grateful to Franklin Cox for recommending this text to me some time ago, whose arguments on the importance of sub-periodisation of modernism can be related to those of Perry Anderson on the heterogeneity of the different stages of capitalism (*A Zone of Engagement*, 30-31, 46-7), but are sharply at odds with the relatively ahistorical New Modernist Studies.

K. Husymans' *L'art moderne* (1883)). Jonathan Swift had written back in 1737 of the 'quaint modernisms' of various writers,⁶⁰ while Jean-Jacques Rousseau had used the term *moderniste* in 1769, in a manner which has been claimed as the first use to indicate a response to modernity,⁶¹ but the concept did not become more common until mid-century in both English and French.⁶² It then took on a new meaning with the publication of Charles Périn's *Le modernisme dans l'église* (1881),⁶³ after which it was used in the French and Spanish press to signify urbanity, sophistication, cosmopolitanism and the adoption of technological and industrial life,⁶⁴ also fuelling a long theological debate leading to a denunciation by Pope Pius X in 1907.⁶⁵ As a literary term in English, 'modernism' emerged in the early twentieth century,⁶⁶ but was only rarely applied to music before the end of the 1970s⁶⁷ (although the term *ultramodern* had some currency in Britain, France and the USA in the interwar

⁶⁰ Jonathan Swift to Alexander Pope, 23 June 1737, in *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, ed. David Woolley, 4 vols. (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2007), iv, 446.

⁶¹ Jean-Jacques Rousseau to M. de Franquières, 15 January 1769, *Correspondance générale*, ed. Théophile Dufour, 20 vols. (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1923), xix, 55; Marshall Berman, *All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity*, rev. ed. (New York and London: Penguin, 1988), 17-18.

⁶² Sean Latham and Gayle Rogers, *Modernism: Evolution of an Idea* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 20-1. Nathaniel Hawthorne wrote on 8 August 1842 of 'such modernisms as astral lamps, card-tables, gilded Cologne-Bottles, silver taper-stands, and bronze and alabaster flower-vases', in *Passages from the American Note-Books of Nathaniel Hawthorne*, 2 vols. (Boston: James R. Osgood & Co., 1875), ii, 72.

⁶³ Charles Périn, *Le modernisme dans l'église* (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1881).

⁶⁴ Teresa Cascudo, 'Adesso ci vuol altra cosa: Primeros usos de los neologismos modernism y modernista en el discurso periodístico sobre música en España (ca. 1890-1910)', *Revista de musicología*, 40 (2017), 513-42 (pp. 517-18).

⁶⁵ A good overview of the debates around Catholic modernism can be found in Charles Palermo, *Modernism and Authority: Picasso and his Milieu Around 1900* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2015), 69-88.

⁶⁶ It first appeared in a book title in Rolfe Arnold Scott-James, *Modernism and Romance* (London; John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1908), and was firmly established by the time of publication of Laura Riding and Robert Graves (eds.), *A Survey of Modernist Poetry* (London; William Heinemann, 1927). See Matei Calinescu, *Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-Garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1987), 80-5.

⁶⁷ One prominent exception was Cyril Scott and A. Eaglefield Hull, *The Philosophy of Modernism – Its Connection with Music* (London; Waverley, c. 1925; originally published 1917).

period),⁶⁸ while *modernisme* is even rarer in French, especially in writing on music.⁶⁹ The German concept of *die Moderne* has its roots in the writings of Hermann Bahr from 1890 onwards, where it denotes a mixture of aestheticism and cosmopolitanism, as distinct from naturalism, and was applied to music from around 1900 by Arthur Seidl, Paul Moos and Leopold Schmidt,⁷⁰ although some of these incorporated Wagner, *Zukunftsmusik* and the *Neudeutsche Schule*, a view which continues to divide opinion.⁷¹ *Moderne* was practically superseded by *Neue Musik* after Paul Bekker's 1919 essay (favouring developments such as microtones, the splintering of tonality, non-Western allusions, and especially an emphasis on line and counterpoint over vertically-orientated composition),⁷² generating a major debate in the first half of the 1920s before splitting into wider factions, including the *Neue Sachlichkeit* and the Stravinsky-Schoenberg polarization.⁷³ The Cuban writer Ramón Perés published a polemic calling for 'un arte esencialmente *modernista*' in a Barcelona journal in

⁶⁸ This was employed at least as early as 1909 to describe Ravel's *Gaspard de la nuit*. See Gurminder Kaur Bhogal, *Details and Consequence: Ornament, Music, and Art in Paris* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 161. The major source texts are Edmondstone Duncan, *Ultra-Modernism in Music: A Treatise on the Latter-Day Revolution in Musical Art* (London: Winthrop Rogers, 1915), and Katherine Ruth Willoughby Heyman, *The Relation of Ultramodern to Archaic Music* (Boston, MA: Small, Maynard & Co, 1921), while the use of this archaic term is also explored in Jenny Doctor, *The BBC and Ultra-Modern Music, 1922-1936; Shaping a Nation's Tastes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), Kelly, *Music and Ultra-Modernism in France*, 5-6; Carol J. Oja, *Making Music Modern: New York in the 1920s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 23; Rita H. Mead, 'Henry Cowell's New Music Society', *The Journal of Musicology*, 1/4 (October 1982), 449-63 (p. 450).

⁶⁹ Latham and Rogers, *Modernism*, 223. There has been a recent revival of *modernité*, for example in Célestin Deliège, *Cinquante ans de modernité musicale: de Darmstadt à l'IRCAM, contribution historiographique à une musicologie critique* (Sprimont: Mardaga, 2003), or Sylvain Caron, François de Medicis and Michel Duchesneau (eds.), *Musique et modernité en France (1900-1945)* (Montreal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2006).

⁷⁰ Arthur Seidl, *Moderner Geist in der deutschen Tonkunst* (Berlin: Harmonie, 1900); Paul Moos, *Moderne Musikästhetik in Deutschland. Historisch-kritisch Uebersicht* (Leipzig: Hermann Seemann Nachfolger, 1902); Leopold Schmidt, *Die moderne Musik* (Berlin: Simion, 1905).

⁷¹ Carl Dahlhaus, by contrast, viewed Wagner as a 'neo-Romantic' composer who managed to mediate between early Romanticism and the *Kulturkritik* of the end of the century. See Dahlhaus, *Between Romanticism and Modernism*, trans. Mary Whittall (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA and London: University of California Press, 1980), 4-11.

⁷² Paul Bekker, 'Neue Musik' (1919), in *Gesammelte Schriften*, 3 vols. (Berlin; Schuster & Loeffler, 1921), i. *Kritische Zeitbilder*. 85-118.

⁷³ This is traced in detail in Christoph von Blumröder, *Der Begriff "neue Musik" im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich and Salzburg: Emil Katzschler, 1981).

1884,⁷⁴ then the Nicaraguan poet Rubén Darío initiated the Hispanic term *modernismo* in 1888, indicating a gravitation towards French influences (Parnassianism, aestheticism, symbolism, decadence) as against those from the former colonial power of Spain.⁷⁵ Barcelona critics linked the concept with the music of Wagner, Franck and the Catalan composer Enric Morera in the 1890s, and later that of Strauss, Debussy, de Falla and Stravinsky.⁷⁶ If these manifestations differ, all can, I believe, be viewed as outgrowths of the early nineteenth century concept of *l'art pour l'art*,⁷⁷ asserting art's autonomy from morality, utility, simple representation, and so on (via the huge influence of the leading protagonist Théophile Gautier upon Baudelaire and then Walter Pater, who in turn inspired a group of Austrian writers including Bahr and Hugo von Hofmannsthal).⁷⁸ Wagner, on the grounds of his resistance to *l'art pour l'art*,⁷⁹ is best considered a transitional figure in this context, though it is possible to conceive Liszt as an early or proto-modernist.⁸⁰

⁷⁴ Cascudo, 'Adesso ci vuol altra cosa', 518.

⁷⁵ Calinescu, *Five Faces of Modernity*, 71-80; for more detail see Ned J. Davison, *The Concept of Modernism in Hispanic Criticism* (Boulder, CO: Preutt Press, 1966), and Kelly Comfort, *European Aestheticism and Spanish American Modernismo: Artist Protagonists and the Philosophy of Art for Art's Sake* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

⁷⁶ Cascudo, 'Adesso ci vuol altra cosa', 521-6; Carol A. Hess, 'Manuel de Falla and the Barcelona Press; *Modernismo*, *Universalismo*, and the Path to Neo-classicism', *Multicultural Iberia: Language, Literature, and Music*, ed. Dru Dougherty and Milton Azevedo (Berkeley, CA: International and Area Studies Press, 1999), 212-29; Hess, *Manuel de Falla and Modernism in Spain*, 15-16, 96-8, 132, 142, 242. I am grateful to Eva Moreda Rodríguez for some pointers on this subject.

⁷⁷ This term may have first been used by the philosopher Victor Cousin in 1818 and was developed by Benjamin Constant, but also had roots in the aesthetics of Lessing, Kant, Schiller and others. See Rose Frances Egan, *The Genesis of the Theory of "Art for Art's Sake" in Germany and in England* (Northampton, MA and Paris: Smith College, 1921).

⁷⁸ Robert Morris Seiler, 'Introduction', in *Walter Pater: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Seiler (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 1-45 (pp. 6-8).

⁷⁹ Richard Wagner, 'Art and Revolution' (1849), *The Art-Work of the Future and Other Works*, trans. W. Ashton Ellis (Lincoln, NE and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 21-68 (p. 31).

⁸⁰ On the possibility of Liszt as a modernist, see Michael Saffle, 'Liszt and the Birth of the New Europe: Reflections on Modernity, Wagner, the Oratorio, and "Die Lgeende von der heiligen Elisabeth"', *Liszt and the Birth of Modern Europe: Music as a Mirror of Religious, Political, Cultural, and Aesthetic Transformations*, ed. Saffle and Rossana Dalmonte (Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2003), 3-24; and especially Shay Loya, *Liszt's Transcultural Modernism and the Hungarian-Gypsy Tradition* (Rochester, NY and Woodbridge: University of Rochester Press and Boydell & Brewer, 2011), 17-57, 118-53.

But the different branches of the concept from around the turn of the century (compare early Satie with Strauss, Mahler or Scriabin, let alone with mid-twentieth-century developments) and the general lack of coherent and meaningful definitions frustrate attempts to make sweeping judgments on modernism in music. In the *Routledge Research Companion to Modernism in Music*, Harper-Scott ('Reactive modernism', pp. 155-74) and Whittall ('Foundations and fixations', pp. 353-78) have their own solutions to this, but few of the others really engage the issues (with the major exception of Sarah Collins, to whom I will return below), and so their modernisms and modernities really require more qualifying terms relating to time and/or place. Edward Campbell's otherwise very interesting chapter on aesthetics ('Musical Modernity, the Beautiful and the Sublime', pp. 133-52) gives no rationale for the choice of composers (Debussy and Schoenberg, Stockhausen, B.A. Zimmermann, Lachenmann, Wolfgang Rihm, Morton Feldman, Sofia Gubaidulina, Georg Friedrich Haas, Raphaël Cendo). His conclusions might have been very different if an alternative pantheon had been used (say Satie, Stravinsky, Varèse, Poulenc, Shostakovich, Harry Partch, Tippett, Christian Wolff, Steve Reich, Chaya Czernowin).

I will deal here relatively briefly with a range of chapters before focusing on larger issues raised by others (space does not permit the important contributions of Eva Moreda Rodriguez, Amy Bauer and Mark Berry). Arnold Whittall, building upon earlier articles, considers recent British modernism, focusing on the music of James Clarke, and to a lesser degree Morgan Hayes. Recalling how it became clear to him by the 1960s that atonality was not going to displace other varieties of tonal music, Whittall frames this work in terms of an overview of his own attempts to theorize the

intersections between more radical and conservative developments, concentrating upon the subjection of elements of the common-practice past subject to new compositional technique in a manner somewhat akin to that of Straus.

Harper-Scott's chapter is a distillation of some of the arguments and paradigms in his *Quilting Points* volume applied to different repertory, in particular the conception that various elements which can be categorised as tonal or non-tonal must be understood in light of the new reality engendered by modernism. A key example of such 'reactive modernism' (as opposed to 'faithful modernism', more thoroughly permeated by radical elements) is the allusion to 'O du lieber Augustin' in Schoenberg's Second String Quartet (1907-8). Harper-Scott uses this as a lens to view deliberate pitch distortions and consequent harmonization in Alfred Schnittke's *Stille Nacht* (1978), and a moment of apparent bitonality in the first of Poulenc's *Trois mouvements perpétuels* (1918, rev. 1939, 1962).

Liam Cagney ('Vers une écriture liminale', pp. 400-426) writes in considerable detail on transitional works of Gérard Grisey, all contextualized in terms of international musical influences (including Stockhausen and La Monte Young), and aspects of the technological and musico-ideological background in which Grisey interacted, in the process problematizing a common dichotomy between serialism and spectralism, further substantiated through examination of sketch materials.⁸¹ This contrasts with a rather more basic treatment of Grisey in a disappointing chapter by Alistair Williams ('Between Modernism and Postmodernism', pp. 327-52), placing the composer alongside John Adams, Saariaho and Thomas Adès as examples, in the context of

⁸¹ I must declare an interest here, as the supervisor of Cagney's PhD dissertation, 'Synthesis and Deviation: New Perspectives on the Emergence of the French *courant spectral*, 1969-1974) (City, University of London, 2015), from which much of the material in this article is taken.

rather hackneyed dualisms which were regularly posited 20 years ago, with claims that postmodernism ‘has equipped modernism to communicate more widely’ (p. 328), resembling arguments in a recent essay by McClary.⁸² M.J. Grant (‘The Composer as Communication Theorist’, pp. 287-306) comes from a position more sympathetic to the avant-garde, but it is hard to imagine her chapter convincing anyone who does not already believe in the communicative dimension of this work. She presents an outline of various avant-garde compositional developments, rather than a sustained focus on the possibilities of communication (notwithstanding relatively brief mentions of ideas from information theory taken up by Werner Meyer-Eppler and Abraham Moles). Especially problematic is the assumption of a narrow positivistic role for a musical score, with performers simply as ‘executants’⁸³ (except in the case of indeterminate scores), an approach which has had only limited application in the performance of Western art music at least since the late eighteenth-century.

Speaking personally, I experienced a huge communicative dimension upon first hearing many major works of Boulez, Stockhausen, Henri Pousseur, Jean Barraqué, Franco Evangelisti, Maderna and others associated with ‘high’ post-1945 modernism, long before knowing anything about their technical workings. I also know of very many others with similar experiences, and continue to be drawn to such work. When a June 2018 performance of Stockhausen’s *Gruppen* at Tate Modern, London was announced in February of that year, tickets sold out within days. It would be miserly

⁸² These are here married to an even cruder rendition of post-war modernism, and an anecdotal dismissal of Straus’s careful collection of data. See Susan McClary, ‘The Lure of the Sublime: Revisiting the modernist project’, *Transformations of Musical Modernism*, ed. Guldbrandsen and Johnson, 21-35.

⁸³ This is of course the term used by Stravinsky in the *Poetics of Music in the Form of Six Lessons* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947), 121-35, though this is not referenced by Grant.

and supercilious in the extreme to suggest that such a palpable group of listeners had no interest in the music, only in the institutional prestige of the late composer.

Stefan Knapik's final chapter in the volume ('The Modernism of the Mainstream', pp. 475-96) is a superb and long overdue revisionist reappraisal of the 'modernist/vitalist' dichotomy of performance presented by Taruskin,⁸⁴ through examination of a range of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century violin teachers and pedagogues in relation to wider musical and philosophical thought of the time. Knapik problematizes many common assumptions about nineteenth-century pedagogy, the relationship between 'historicist' and 'modernist' approaches to performance, and much else. However, this chapter does draw attention to the relatively paltry role that performance plays in the volume.⁸⁵ There is still much research to be undertaken concerning all types of twentieth-century performers, whether playing contemporary or historical art music (not to mention those in other musical traditions), and about the conception of a 'modernist' style of performance from around the 1930s onwards, which has been presented often quite negatively by Bruce Haynes, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson and Nicholas Cook.⁸⁶ Important counter-evidence exists in some areas from Dorottya

⁸⁴ Knapik extends the critique of John Butt in *Playing with History: The Historical Approach to Musical Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 14-24.

⁸⁵ As compared to *Transformations of Musical Modernism*, ed. Guldbrandsen and Johnson, which includes three substantial contributions on the subject.

⁸⁶ Bruce Haynes's *The End of Early Music: A Period Performer's History of Music* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, 'Recordings and Histories of Performance Style', *The Cambridge Companion to Recorded Music*, eds. Nicholas Cook, Eric Clarke, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, and John Rink (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 246-62; Nicholas Cook, *Beyond the Score: Music as Performance* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013). For the beginnings of a critique of some of this work, including its highly partial use of limited evidence, see Ian Pace 'The New State of Play in Performance Studies', *Music and Letters*, 98/2 (2017), 281-92.

Fabian,⁸⁷ but there is much more left to do for a period with such a huge range of recorded evidence available.

It should be uncontroversial now to argue that the production, dissemination and reception of modernist music depends upon the functioning of a range of institutions: new music festivals and concert series, radio stations, companies producing recordings to be bought and sold, institutions for teaching composition and performance, studios for the use of specialized equipment, publishers of new music, publicity outfits, and so on, all of which may serve as agents of influence as significant as the musicians. Proper scholarly studies of institutions and their role in the wider picture are still relatively sporadic, or overly agenda-driven (whether those produced by the institutions themselves which can resemble promotional literature, or those like Born's), though there have been notable studies of the Darmstädter Ferienkurse, the Munich Musica Viva series and the Warsaw Autumn in particular.⁸⁸

The primary chapter in the volume on this subject, by Martin Iddon ('Institutions, Artworlds, New Music', pp. 86-107) is rather problematic. Rather than comparatively evaluating a range of institutions and their effect upon music-making, Iddon spends the majority of the chapter on an attempt to create a theoretical framework about

⁸⁷ Dorottya Fabian, 'The Meaning of Authenticity and the Early Music Movement – A Historical Review', *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music*, 32 (2001), 153-67; *Bach Performance Practice 1945-1975: A Review of Sound Recordings and Literature* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003); 'Is diversity in musical performance truly in decline?: The evidence of sound recordings', *Context: A Journal of Music Research* 31 (2006), 165-80.

⁸⁸ Antonio Trudu, *La "scuola" di Darmstadt. I Ferienkurse dal 1946 a oggi* (Milan: Ricordi, 1992); Rudolf Stephan, Lothar Kessel, Otto Tomek, Klaus Trapp and Christopher Fox (eds.), *Von Kranichstein zur Gegenwart* (Darmstadt: Daco, 1996); Borio and Danuser, *Im Zenit der Moderne*; Iddon, *New Music at Darmstadt*; Barbara Haas, *Karl Amadeus Hartmann 1905-1963. Zietzeugen und Dokumente zum 100. Geburtstag des Komponisten* (Wilhelmshaven: Florian Noetzel Verlag, 2004); Carola Arlt, *Von den Juryfreien zur musica viva. Karl Amadeus Hartmann und die Neue Musik in München* (Frankfurt et al: Peter Lang, 2010); Lisa Jakelski, *Making New Music in Cold War Poland: The Warsaw Autumn Festival, 1956-1968* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2017).

institutions in general, using theories from Arthur Danto, George Dickie and Howard Becker, interspersed with passages about actual post-1945 institutions (just a few, of a particular type: Darmstadt, IRCAM and the Warsaw Autumn), supposedly to exemplify the theoretical points being made. But these special passages are unremarkable and do not really demonstrate how Iddon's theoretical framework offers particular illumination. For example, he notes how the locations employed at Darmstadt have changed at various times, that few go to the main administrative headquarters, and that some tutors remain for an extended period, while others change, all at the end of two pages of musing on the precise meaning of 'institutions' such as the Church of England or the British Constitution. And is it really necessary to spend much time laying out 1990s theories of different types of 'institutionalism' to explain that one software developer at IRCAM had their own wishes, but that the director, Boulez, had somewhat different priorities, with an emphasis on what had a tangible musical result? More significantly, Iddon almost wholly neglects the financial dimension of institutions, save for a tangential mention of an issue in the city budget at Darmstadt in the early 1970s.⁸⁹ There is no mention of the extent to which such institutions are funded privately or publicly (which was very different in Western or Eastern Europe during the cold war, and took on a particular complexion through the 'semi-state' funding of many German new music festivals provided by the sponsorship of the radio stations, through their licence fees), what demands those who fund them might place upon decision-making, who would benefit from profits, and so on. This appears to present culture and cultural institutions as if they were independent of state or private capital; as such, like its precursors, the theoretical language could be said to entail a neo-liberal mystification of such considerations.

⁸⁹ This contrasts with a very rigorous and impeccably researched engagement with the vexed questions of the funding of the Ferienkurse in Iddon's *New Music at Darmstadt*.

Considerations of differing possibilities of funding provided through government or broadcasting would be one way to consider why, for example, there have been relatively few significant and durable international new music festivals in the United States.

After what I consider the *Ur*-new-music festival, the Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein (ADMV, founded in 1861 by Liszt and Franz Brendel),⁹⁰ and then the range of new institutions founded in Germany in the aftermath of the First World War (in particular the Donaueschinger Musiktage),⁹¹ one of the most important and influential of all new music organisations was the International Society for Contemporary Music (entitled the Internationale Gesellschaft für Neue Musik in German), founded in 1922 in Salzburg. In a fascinating chapter ('What Was Contemporary Music?', pp. 56-85), Sarah Collins focuses upon the concept of the 'contemporary' as it informed debates around the founding of this institution in particular and later ones. From the outset, aspirations to reflect ideas of modernist progress (which were already there at the outset of the ADMV) were set against alternative desires simply to represent what was 'contemporary' in many places. For some this latter term is more neutral and purely chronological than modernism, *Neue Musik*, and so on, but Collins, drawing upon the work of Georgina Born on IRCAM and Anne Shreffler on Stravinsky's *Threni* and the Congress for Cultural Freedom

⁹⁰ No comprehensive scholarly history yet exists of this institution, However, an archived web resource on the organization, James Deaville, 'Allgemeiner Deutscher Musikverein', may be found at <<https://web.archive.org/web/20050307085106/http://www.humanities.mcmaster.ca:80/~admvmv.htm>> (accessed 1 July 2019). Despite its title, the Musikverein programmed composers from a range of countries, generally those in accordance with the aesthetic outlook of the Neudeutsche Schule.

⁹¹ See Pace, 'The Reconstruction of Post-War West German New Music', 20-30 for an overview of these; and for a massive and comprehensive study, Martin Thrun, *Neue Musik im deutschen Musikleben bis 1933*, two volumes (Bonn: Orpheus-Verlag, 1995).

(CCF),⁹² maintains that “‘contemporary’ has a pretence of neutrality while in fact being intensely ideological’ (Collins’s italics). As mentioned earlier, I cannot view Born’s book as a reliable source, while Shreffler follows others in overestimating the impact of the CCF, primarily on the basis of conjecture. Collins’s formulation is certainly valid in particular circumstances, but not necessarily as a general principle.

She argues that the concept of the ‘contemporary’ has three characteristics: 1. a quality of lateness, or ‘coming after’; 2. value pluralism; 3. association with internationalism and forging transnational alliances. In many cases some or all of these characteristics undoubtedly hold, although I am unsure in the case of the *Ensemble Intercontemporain* (unless this title might be considered a modification of the concept). Peter Osborne’s argument, cited by Collins, that the contemporary is both a historical and a geopolitical fiction, because of the non-existence of a shared subject position from which to survey it in its totality,⁹³ already assumes a more specific and subjective definition than the purely chronological. Others, including David Clarke comparing ‘Elvis’ with ‘Darmstadt’,⁹⁴ critique the implied pluralism of the concept of the ‘contemporary’ because of its inability to capture major aesthetic incongruities which are chronologically similar. But I would identify Clarke’s as another ‘crypto-capitalist’ argument, as presented by Harper-Scott, through its privileging of chronology and aesthetics, but not economics, thus making the role of capital invisible: any comparison of Elvis or other popular artists with subsidized

⁹² Born, *Rationalizing Culture*; Anne Shreffler, ‘Ideologies of Serialism: Stravinsky’s *Threni* and the Congress for Cultural Freedom’, in *Music and the Aesthetics of Modernity*, eds. Karol Berger and Anthony Newcomb (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Music, 2005), 217-45.

⁹³ Peter Osborne, ‘The Fiction of the Contemporary: Speculative Collectivity and Transnationalism in The Atlas Group’, *Aesthetics and Contemporary Art*, eds. Armen Avanesian and Luke Skrebowski (Berlin: Sternberg, 2011), 101-23, cited in Collins p. 60.

⁹⁴ David Clarke, ‘Elvis and Darmstadt, or “Twentieth-Century Music and the Politics of Cultural Pluralism’’, *Twentieth-Century Music* 4 (2007), 3-45.

contemporary work which disregards their different relationship to capital has limited value. Nonetheless, Collins' foregrounding and interrogation of this term is extremely valuable.

Is modernism fundamentally a European/North American phenomenon, or something wider? In Heile's own chapter ('Musical Modernism, Global', pp. 175-98), he proclaims at the outset his aim 'to imagine musical modernism as a global phenomenon'. The first section is a rather severe set of denunciations and broad statements, with exaggerated claims for the global reach and domination of modernist Western art music, trivial in comparison with the neo-imperial hegemony of Anglo-American popular music. Heile then gives overviews of the new music cultures in four countries: Argentina (focusing on the opposing factions represented by Juan Carlos Paz and Alberto Ginastera), Mexico (above all through Carlos Chávez), Finland (described as 'a musical backwater until at least the 1960s', here focusing on the work of Erik Bergman) and Japan (from the earliest influence of European models, through to the work of Tōru Takemitsu, Toshi Ichiyanagi and Toshio Hosokawa). In each case there were composers engaging with advanced European or North American developments, some of them, such as Chávez, also drawing upon 'native' traditions. But Heile does not really convince that any of these traditions are other than relatively peripheral, or simply (as in Finland and Japan) 'later developments' which begat a range of composers who became important parts of international scenes. A case like Julio Estrada from Mexico, cited by Heile in this respect, is really about a particular individual; the same applies, for example, to Vinko Globokar from Slovenia, Horatiu Radulescu from Romania, or Isang Yun from South Korea. One role of such strong compositional personalities was as mediators between

the national and international scenes, and this might be the most straightforward explanation for the relative marginalisation of some nations lacking such figures.

Heile chooses countries which all have particular kinds of histories of interactions with the West. It would be considerably harder to derive a global picture of musical modernism if the focus were on Trinidad, French Guiana, Bolivia, Mauritania, Syria, Kenya, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Laos and Fiji (similarly, I suspect that Iddon's theories might have come out quite differently if his case studies were the Aldeburgh Festival, the East German Festival des Politischen Liedes, the Tokyo Summer Festival and the Bang on a Can Festival in New York). Furthermore, Heile essentially categorizes as modernist those composers who adopted dodecaphony/serialism or other techniques associated with the post-1945 avant-garde. But other approaches with distinct pre-1945 histories, not least neo-classicism, have as much reason to be conceived as 'modernist', and so I would interpret Heile's dichotomy between Ginastera and Paz in Argentina in the 1950s as being between two different wings of modernism. A more far-reaching global model might have a stronger focus on ways in which Western music modernism has drawn upon ideas, materials, and more from non-Western cultures (and not just from other music),⁹⁵ or where there are considerable aesthetic and technical commonalities between Western modernists and those in other traditions.

⁹⁵ George Yúdice argues that 'The unwritten history of the avant-garde is the history of these "peripheries" ['so-called primitive works brought to western Europe from Africa, America, Oceania, the Near and the Far Orient'], in 'Rethinking the Theory of the Avant-Garde from the Periphery', *Modernism and Its Margins: Reinscribing Cultural Modernity from Spain and Latin American*, ed. Anthony Geist, Jose B. Monleón (New York and London: Garland, 1999; reprinted Routledge 2015), 52-80 (p. 54), though Yúdice seems primarily concerned to appropriate such peripheries in order to charge Western modernists with domination and imperialism, rather than consider anything fruitful which might have come from such interactions.

Can some popular idioms or manifestations thereof be considered modernist, or do they simply engage in dialogue with modernist music, which itself remains a distinct entity? Stephen Graham ('Modernism for and of the Masses? On Popular Modernisms', pp. 239-57) extends considerably the work of other scholars who have explored the interactions of modernism and popular culture,⁹⁶ together with leftist writers such as Ben Watson and Mark Fisher, to develop a conception of 'popular modernism'. This type of modernism lies between the two, evinces in a critical relationship with the social/cultural context it inhabits (theorized in terms of specific aspects of the musical material in examples from Kurt Weill, through the 'no wave' movement of late 1970s New York, through to Kanye West), but inevitably operates within the particular commercial conditions common to much popular music. This is powerful, though may overstate the socially 'critical' aspect of modernism. The broad conception of modernism of Harper-Scott may need to include almost all popular music as well; even without going this far, there is a case for incorporating a good deal more (especially amongst jazz) than is encompassed by Graham's 'underground' aesthetic.

As mentioned earlier, many have criticised the alleged elitism and even disdain towards democracy in general on the part of many modernist artists. Robert Adlington ('Modernism: The People's Music?', pp. 216-38) draws upon Rachel Potter's model of dual genealogies of modernism within early twentieth-century American

⁹⁶ Such as Andreas Huyssen, *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (London: Macmillan, 1986); Steven Whiting, *Satie the Bohemian: From Cabaret to Concert Hall* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Bernard Gendron, *Between Montmartre and the Mudd Club: Popular Music and the Avant-Garde* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2002); and Ronald Schleifer, *Modernism and Popular Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

literature,⁹⁷ whereby one of these, represented by T.S. Eliot and Ezra Pound, is presented as hostile towards a mass public, believing thinking artists should have a legislative role, while the other, associated with Virginia Woolf, Gertrude Stein and Mina Loy, supposedly champions less authoritarian values, self-expression and the popular voice. Potter problematizes these tendencies, but others have done so more cogently: Raymond Williams in particular asked whether modernism implied an art which stood outside money and commerce, or a revolutionary force for popular consciousness.⁹⁸ Adlington believes that many commentators on the first of Potter's genealogies, including Peter Franklin, Taruskin and Ben Earle, tend to erase democratizing and popular-revolutionary tendencies within modernism, but his examples are mixed. He cites Luigi Russolo's view of music singing of the 'tides of revolution in the modern capitals', but without registering Russolo's proximity to Filippo Marinetti or that of futurism to fascism (despite elsewhere alluding related issues for Alfredo Casella), still often bracketed out from consideration of this movement,⁹⁹ not least by Russolo scholars who have falsely claimed him to have been an anti-fascist.¹⁰⁰ Constructivism declared 'unconditional war on art', Tristan Tzara argued that the Cabaret Voltaire was bringing 'new art to the greatest number of people', German Dada was linked to Communism, the Bauhaus rejected an esoteric, socially disengaged role for the artist, while post-1945 experimental activities of *dérive* (defined by Guy Debord as 'rapid passage through varied ambiances')¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ Rachel Potter, *Modernism and Democracy: Literary Culture 1900-1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁹⁸ Raymond Williams 'When was Modernism?', in *The Politics of Modernism*, 34.

⁹⁹ See Anne Bowler, 'Politics as Art: Italian Futurism and Fascism', *Theory and Society* 20 (1991), 763-94.

¹⁰⁰ See Luciano Chessa, *Luigi Russolo, Futurist: Noise, Visual Arts, and the Occult* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA, and London: University of California Press, 2012), 8-10, 225-9. This is one of a range of recent books considering some of the occult interests of leading modernists, a type of scholarship which has not yet really been explored for music.

¹⁰¹ Guy Debord, 'Theory of the Dérive' (1958), *Situationist International Anthology*, revised and expanded edition, ed. and trans. Ken Knabb (Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets, 2006), 62-6 (p.

and *happening* sought to abolish the separation of art from everyday life. Depending upon one's perspective, these may have been laudable aims, but here Adlington does not ask the extent to which they succeeded: how many people came to the Cabaret Voltaire, compared to other artistic events in war-time Switzerland? Similarly, when the free jazz musicians of the New York Black Arts Movement claimed that their work was a 'reflection of the negro people as a social and cultural phenomenon' which would 'liberate America aesthetically and socially from its inhumanity', did these achieve such an end any more than Motown, say, with which this movement was contemporary?

Claims for the inseparability of musical and social revolution have been commonplace throughout the twentieth century, as have revolutionary or anti-hegemonic claims for music such as those cited with a healthy scepticism by Adlington from Boulez and Cage to Lachenmann and Eddie Prévost. A tradition of work by Lachenmann, N.A. Huber, Mathias Spahlinger and others has been identified with 'critical composition'.¹⁰² He asks whether the declared prerequisite of 'critical listening', and other demands made of listeners, might actually make the work most exclusionary of all except to those with highly advanced educational backgrounds, and draws attention to the lack of evidence of the work achieving its self-declared ends. He also is not prepared simply to take some of the anti-bourgeois shock tactics of various modern art at face value, citing Williams again on how these can as often

62). Debord adds that 'In a *dérive* one or more persons during a certain period drop their relations, their work and leisure activities, and all their other usual motives for movement and action, and let themselves be drawn by the attractions of the terrain and the encounters they find there.' (ibid.)

¹⁰² Nicolaus A. Huber, 'Critical Composition', translated Petra Music and Philipp Blume, *Contemporary Music Review* 27/6 (December 2008), 565-8; Claus-Steffen Mahnkopf (ed.), *Critical Composition Today* (Hofheim: Wolke Verlag, 2006).

be the product of aristocratic disdain as entail a commitment to the cause of the proletariat.

For Adlington, strategies of resistance are better pursued through some engagement with rather than complete rejection of mass culture. Examples he gives are bebop, which maintained a degree of autonomy from the entertainment industry and the racial stereotypes it imposes upon black musicians, without operating wholly outside this industry (somewhat akin to Graham's 'popular modernisms'). The Chicago jazz collective AACM sought a popularity outside industry manipulations, although it is not clear that it did or could achieve the latter, rather than simply working with more niche sections of that industry. Free improvisers and their acolytes have regularly touted emancipatory claims for their work, such as that 'it can't be bought and sold by capitalism', but as Adlington points out, when concert tickets and recordings are bought and sold, or publicity and circulation achieved through global corporations, this is also an impossible ideal.

There are more generous interpretations to be considered if one is prepared to consider alternatives to stark categories of revolutionary/'democratic' art versus ivory-tower elitism. Composers of highly advanced modernist music such as Lachenmann, Huber and Spahlinger were never likely to have a mass impact without deep changes in the majority of listeners' musical education, but their work, alongside that of many others in different art forms, may have played some small part in a wider pluralist critical intellectual culture in post-war Germany as a vital alternative to the corrosion of this under fascism, a culture which might play some part in making fascism less likely to grow again. Other modernist art may not change the world, but

can add to the range of experiences, ideas, sensations available in that world and thus cement a more pluralistic culture than if all such things were at the mercy of market forces. A mature democratic culture allows minority voices to be heard, in comparison with right- or left-wing populism which allows only a singular voice of ‘the people’, all else dismissed as the view of ‘elites’, as mentioned earlier in this article.¹⁰³ Jacques Rancière, cited by Adlington, dismisses the idea of an ‘original “people”’ or ‘original popular will’, but still maintains the notion of some anti-hegemonic ‘power of anybody’. Intellectual and cultural pluralism are themselves antidotes to hegemonic culture, and their democratic value should not be underestimated.

A thoroughgoing re-examination of the concept of modernism, its application, intellectual history, periodisation (not to mention associated historiography, which space has not allowed me to touch upon here) opens up the possibility of further writing which might address historical and aesthetic questions in surprisingly new ways. The *Routledge Research Companion to Modernism in Music*, together with other recent work on modernism in music, goes some way towards preparing the ground for this, although because of the inevitable limitations of large multi-authored volumes, it entails differing degrees of critical questioning of inherited assumptions. Beyond attempts to nuance and enrich the concept of modernism, some fearless scholars might consider whether the concept itself is necessarily worth preserving in such a form or whether some modified terminology (or reversion to autonomous and

¹⁰³ The study of populism is at the time of writing a flourishing area of political science, but has made little headway in musicology. Important texts summarising common findings on populism include Margaret Canovan, *The People* (Cambridge, and Malden, MA: Polity, 2005); Jan-Werner Müller, *What is Populism?* (London: Penguin, 2017); and Cas Mudde, *Populism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017). An older text which remains highly relevant to the issues above is Jim McGuigan, *Cultural Populism* (London: Routledge, 1992), as is Catherine Liu, *American Idyll: Academic Antielitism as Cultural Critique* (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press, 2011).

often antagonistic subcategories, as implied by Perry Anderson in his critique of Marshall Berman)¹⁰⁴ might prove more enlightening.

¹⁰⁴ Anderson, *A Zone of Engagement*, 31-3, 44-5. Anderson, who believes most movements conventionally categorised as modernist are outgrowths of a handful of antithetical movements such as symbolism, expressionism, cubism, futurism, constructivism, surrealism, also observes sharply that in the leading capitalist country through the nineteenth-century, England, there was little of a homegrown modernist movement (as opposed to modernists such as Eliot, Pound or Joyce who came from abroad), unlike in France, Germany, Italy, Russia or the United States, which frustrates Berman's attempts to present modernism as an outgrowth of modernity.