

Goldsmiths Research Online

*Goldsmiths Research Online (GRO)
is the institutional research repository for
Goldsmiths, University of London*

Citation

Exarchos, Dimitris. 2019. Music's Immanent Future: The Deleuzian Turn in Music Studies. Edited by Sally Macarthur, Judy Lochhead, Jennifer Shaw. Abingdon, Oxon, Eng.: Routledge, 2016. (Review). Notes, 75(3), pp. 529-532. ISSN 0027-4380 [Article]

Persistent URL

<https://research.gold.ac.uk/id/eprint/24487/>

Versions

The version presented here may differ from the published, performed or presented work. Please go to the persistent GRO record above for more information.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Goldsmiths, University of London via the following email address: gro@gold.ac.uk.

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated. For more information, please contact the GRO team: gro@gold.ac.uk


Music's Immanent Future: The Deleuzian Turn in Music Studies
ed. by Sally Macarthur, Judy Lochhead, and Jennifer Shaw
(review)

Dimitris Exarchos

Notes, Volume 75, Number 3, March 2019, pp. 529-532 (Review)

Published by Music Library Association

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/not.2019.0028>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/721041>

keyboard fantasias, lieder, opera—Kramer captures some of the messiness of Enlightenment music, which so often straddles geographical and generic categories. In another sense, it is precisely this messiness that lies at the root of the book's main difficulty, namely that Kramer's narrative (made up as it is of short glimpses) seems to redefine the Enlightenment without clarifying the direction of this redefinition. (On a related note, Kramer's focus is undoubtedly the late German Enlightenment, although one suspects that the aesthetic tensions he identifies are not specific to the *Aufklärung*. This perhaps accounts for uneasy generalizations that crop up—for instance, one sentence that invokes Laurence Stern, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, and Denis Diderot without acknowledging this step into a much broader "Enlightenment" [p. 59].) The most pressing question for the book's readers, however, is the nature of the historiographical revision Kramer is proposing: is the "leap" we are making a leap sideways away from our constricted portrait of Enlightenment aesthetics or rather a leap forward toward German Romanticism (which Kramer unavoidably evokes by summoning Goethe and privileging the "private mind" of the composer and the musical expression of inner feeling)? Are we recharacterizing the Enlightenment from within or rather putting it into a larger teleological narrative that anticipates romanticism? One or both of these theses would make for compelling reading if our prospective convictions were clarified for us.

There is something inspiring about Kramer's implicit proposal that capturing the "private places of the [Enlightenment] mind" (p. 10) entails relinquishing our presuppositions about organized thoughts, secure connections, and defined contexts in favor of a more improvisatory and fragmen-

tary style. Strangely, Kramer seems hesitant to dislodge those tried and true patterns of argumentation that are so foreign to his project. He might take courage from the kind of candor that Scott Burnham grants his readers in *Mozart's Grace*—a book that, like *Cherubino's Leap*, tries to capture what is fleeting and strikingly beautiful through close scrutiny of an array of repertoire. Kramer could certainly count on his readers' endorsements (and relieve himself of awkward obligations) were he to undertake the kind of openly personal "search" that Burnham describes: "I have composed what might best be called an appreciation, a personal attempt to describe what is striking about the sound of Mozart" (Scott Burnham, *Mozart's Grace* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013], 4).

It is just as well that we are no more bound to Buffon's principles of scholarly style than were his patiently listening contemporaries in 1753, and yet his advice perhaps encapsulates a kind of down-to-earth, pragmatic Enlightenment that might also elicit our respect—a type of Enlightenment that rates the dim, steady light of plain commentary and context higher even than the surprise flash of inspired snapshots. Then again, as Kramer points out, the Enlightenment thrives on its "irreconcilable tension[s]" (p. 3), so perhaps we can turn the lights on and still see the sparks.

KATHARINA CLAUSIUS

University of Victoria, British Columbia

Music's Immanent Future: The Deleuzian Turn in Music Studies.

Edited by Sally Macarthur, Judy Lochhead, Jennifer Shaw. Abingdon, Oxon, Eng.: Routledge, 2016. [xx, 240 p. ISBN 9781472460219 (hardcover), \$160; ISBN 9781315597027 (ebook), \$28.98.] Music examples, illustrations, bibliography, index.

Music's Immanent Future is a kaleidoscopic collection that reflects on aspects of music studies today, drawing on concepts by Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari, Jean-Luc Nancy, Julia Kristeva, and Michel Foucault, among others. The collection, subtitled *The Deleuzian Turn in Music Studies*, includes seventeen chapters grouped into five parts that explore themes such as music studies in higher education ("The Academic Music Machine"), musical practices ("Deleuzian Encounters"), composition ("Materialities of Sounding"), listening ("Immanent Listening"), and ontology ("Deleuzian Ontologies"). In addition to an overall introduction to the book, there are introductory chapters to each part—"folding" chapters that serve to connect the different strands of the contributed chapters in each part. The Deleuzian concept of the *fold* indexes the possibility of space that is opened up each time, avoiding the single-view perspective that "leads to privileging the identity of the author." The book's main ambition is to move beyond a typical account of music, conceived to have "an essence, surface, and depth," and achieve a multiplicity of types of engagement, both by its authors and by its readers (p. 2).

Such multiplicity (a central Deleuzian concept, whereby difference is privileged over identity, and relationship *in* is privileged over relationship *to*) is evident by the editors' choice of approaches. (It should be noted that the book originates in two symposia at the School of Humanities and Communication Arts, Western Sydney University, in 2012 and 2013.) Not all chapters employ a Deleuzian approach, properly speaking. Two out of three contributing authors in part 1 make no explicit reference to Deleuze. This is also true of the entirety of part 3, in which composers discuss their approach to music making. Similarly, the

two contributing authors of part 4, and the sole contributed chapter of part 5, make no substantial Deleuzian analysis either (except for brief references). This seems to suggest that a turn to a Deleuzian mode of thought has been underway in music studies, even when scholars do not engage with Deleuzian or Guattarian concepts. The implicit conclusion might be drawn then that there is something Deleuzian in the way authors employ concepts by Nancy, Kristeva, Foucault, or others. The editors, however, do not warn readers away from concluding that these authors should be categorized as "Deleuzian." I doubt that this was the intention of the editors or contributors, and to say the least, that conclusion would have very little connection to Deleuze's thinking.

This decision to include such diverse approaches is counteracted by the introductory chapters to each part, thus providing a Deleuzian perspective (without which parts 3 and 5 would seem out of context). If a Deleuzian turn has been underway even with no explicit reference to Deleuze, then of what does this turn consist? The keyword *immanent* in the title suggests that all authors favor an approach to music that is not representational, which would entail subsuming things to the already-known. Rather, "Immanent listening . . . is a continual openness to the not-yet-known." The practice of listening is central to all activities—including composing, analyzing, and performing—as it enables thinking beyond traditional boundaries: "Immanent listening seeks to dissolve all boundaries, and the categorisations that divide the self from the other, and the self from sound object" (p. 9). All the above practices are explored in the book, including those of education and the formation of musical canons, as for example in the chapter by Susan McClary, whose pedagogical practice supersedes the dichotomies of

Western/non-Western, art/popular, and so forth. Nonetheless, the book is mainly preoccupied with Western art composition, with references in the chapters by McClary and Bruce Crossman to other kinds of music precisely as *others*. For instance, the book lacks discussion of improvised music (Western or not, jazz, traditional, etc.); one would expect a more diverse repertoire, especially given the editors' ambition of a broad Deleuzian approach, including concepts by other philosophers and musicologists.

The introduction takes care to provide basic definitions of terms by Deleuze and Guattari, but as these terms are not employed in the first two contributed chapters; any further "unfolding" of them is deferred. For instance, *machine* and *assemblage* (and *machinic assemblage*) appear first on page 3; the reader, however, apparently must immediately be able to infer relation of these to other concepts (such as *inter-textuality*). This blanket approach entails a risk: for instance, *machinic assemblage* might refer to anything that is a collection of things and bodies that are *becoming* rather than *being* something. As such, the academia is an assemblage and a machine, as is a person's identity within this assemblage, and so forth. While the two chapters by McClary and Shaw are both preoccupied with the imperative that pedagogy engages with musics beyond the canon (with only passing references to Deleuze and Guattari), the following chapter, by Joseph Williams, employs a plethora of terms (*machine*, *assemblage*, *line of flight*, *detritorialisation*, *virtual*) to discuss practice-based research in Australian academia, thus counterbalancing the prior lack of such terminology. In the introduction to his book *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze suggests that it might be more fruitful to read a book's introduction only at the end (Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, trans.

Paul Patton [New York: Columbia University Press, 1994], xix). This is certainly not the case in *Music's Immanent Future*; one would wonder if any connection to Deleuzian thought existed unless a link had been provided at the outset.

Part 2, on musical practices, discusses analysis and composition. Lochhead reworks her own analytical methodology, in which the *mapping* of emergent structurings is essential. Her analyses of works by Kaija Saariaho and Stacy Garrop are based on mappings in a Foucauldian sense (see Judy Lochhead, *Reconceiving Structure in Contemporary Music: New Tools in Music Theory and Analysis* [New York: Routledge, 2016]). Here these are recast as *chaotic mappings* of "that 'common ground' that is the material of art, philosophy, and science" (p. 73). The authors do not use these concepts, however, in the actual analyses, and they appear only in the preamble and conclusion with no direct link to the analytical work. One striking instance is the quoting of Garrop's commentary on her own composition, String Quartet no. 3 ("Gaia"): the fifth movement, she stated, "represents what so many of us hope and want both in the world, as well as for the planet itself" (p. 82). This is a representational, authorial approach, clearly opposed to Deleuzian concepts like *immanence* or *sensation*. As mentioned, the third part of the book includes self-reflexive statements by composers who refer to their own compositions. They examine these works under concepts that range from Judeo-Christian and Taoist, to Japanese *kawaii*, to portmanteau juxtapositions. These composers' accounts of their own music invoke a representational take on composition similarly foreign to Deleuzian thinking.

The two concluding parts (pts. 4 and 5) are strangely very brief (one-third the length of the other parts and containing only two and one contributed

chapters, respectively). Michelle Stead examines the presumed dominance of vision in music discourse; at moments she seems to be making generalized assumptions, such as that acousmatic music is not based on writing. Audio recording, however, is itself a form of writing, if “writing” is to be taken in the sense developed in the poststructuralist tradition to which philosophers like Nancy belong. In that regard, Stead seems also to contradict concepts of intertextuality that were developed in chapter 2. In his examination of the musical testimonies of Holocaust survivors, Joseph Toltz employs Nancy’s elaboration of listening, in particular the concept of the resonant space, or the space of relation to self—the “resonant subject,” in Nancy’s words (Jean-Luc Nancy, *Listening*, trans. Charlotte Mandell [New York: Fordham University Press, 2007], 21). The final chapter engages in a critique of representational accounts of musical ontology; Greg Hainge explores analytic philosophy’s central question of music ontology. By including music’s other—noise—in a communication system, he attempts to define music relationally. Hainge claims that this relationality links to Deleuze’s philosophy, although this link is rather indirect, especially when the chapter engages with the question of what music *is*, rather than what it *does*. If there is a connection, as is claimed, with Deleuze-inspired philosophies such as “new materialism” (p. 209), then Hainge’s approach is at odds with Lochhead’s comment that new materialism engages with asking the *how* rather than the *what* (p. 121). The chapter’s case study, Yasunao Tone’s *Solo for Wounded CD*, serves to

pose precisely the question of whether or when (aesthetic framing) such a work is or is not music, or whether its function is utilitarian or aesthetic.

Deleuzian concepts do not translate easily to those of other philosophies. For instance, *differential* does not translate to *relational*; as Lochhead points out in the introductory chapter to the final part, “relational” suggests preexisting identities, whereas in Deleuze difference preexists identity (“*dx* rather than not-*x*,” as noted by Daniel Smith and John Protevi [Edward N. Zalta, ed., *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2018 Edition), s.v. “Gilles Deleuze,” by Daniel Smith and John Protevi, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/deleuze/>, accessed 1 October 2018], quoted by Lochhead, p. 202). Thus, Lochhead’s introduction to the final part serves as a concluding section, whose central point is about an ontology of “difference, materiality and becoming”—not about “some ideal essence of music” but about “how music produces the sensations in sounding” (p. 205) that, to quote Deleuze, “render non-sonorous forces sonorous” (Gilles Deleuze, *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*, trans. Daniel Smith [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004], 48, quoted by Lochhead on p. 205). Overall, although the editors have managed to introduce and unfold Deleuzian concepts, it is not always clear how the book’s content engages with such immanent sensations, sonorous or not, according to a Deleuzian mode of thinking.

DIMITRIS EXARCHOS
Goldsmiths, University of London

