

STUDIEN ZUR MUSIKWISSENSCHAFT

BEIHEFTE DER DENKMÄLER
DER TONKUNST IN ÖSTERREICH

ZWEIUNDSECHZIGSTER BAND

HOLLITZER



STUDIEN ZUR MUSIKWISSENSCHAFT
BAND 62

STUDIEN ZUR MUSIKWISSENSCHAFT

BEIHEFTE DER DENKMÄLER
DER TONKUNST IN ÖSTERREICH

Unter Leitung
von

MARTIN EYBL
und
ELISABETH TH. HILSCHER

im Auftrag der DTÖ
(Gesellschaft zur Herausgabe von Denkmälern der Tonkunst in Österreich)

ZWEIUNDSECHZIGSTER BAND

HOLLITZER



MUSICAL PRACTICE
IN THE
LONG NINETEENTH
CENTURY
UNKNOWN EGO DOCUMENTS
FROM CENTRAL EUROPE

herausgegeben
von

LILI VERONIKA BÉKÉSSY
MARTIN EYBL
GESA FINKE

Für den Inhalt der Abhandlungen sind die Verfasser verantwortlich.
Die Wahl der Rechtschreibung (alte bzw. neue Rechtschreibung) wurde den Autoren überlassen.

Die 1913 von Guido Adler gegründete Zeitschrift umfasst Studien, die in direktem Zusammenhang mit Bänden der DTÖ (Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich) stehen, methodische Überlegungen zur musikalischen Philologie (Quellenkunde, Editionspraxis), Aufsätze zur Musikgeschichte Österreichs (in einem umfassenden Sinn) sowie Editionen entsprechender Textquellen (wie Tagebücher oder Korrespondenz).

Founded in 1913 by Guido Adler this journal comprises studies directly connected with specific volumes of DTÖ (Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich) as well as methodological considerations concerning musical bibliography (source study, editing), studies in the wider field of Austrian music history, "Austria" being defined by historical context, and editions of corresponding text sources (diaries, correspondence, etc.).

Manuskripte sind bei den Herausgebern
(E-Mail: elisabeth.hilscher@oeaw.ac.at oder eybl@mdw.ac.at)
einzureichen und werden Begutachtungsverfahren nach internationalen Standards
(peer review) unterzogen.

Abbildungen, Notenbeispiele etc. sind den Manuskripten druckfertig
mit mindestens 300 dpi Auflösung gesondert als Grafikdatei beizugeben,
die Rechte der Wiedergabe von den Autoren vorab zu klären.

© HOLLITZER Verlag, Wien 2024
www.hollitzer.at

Lektorat: Maximilian Böhm, Johannes Fiebich, Marc Brooks
Umschlag und Satz: Gabriel Fischer
Hergestellt in der EU

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Die Abbildungsrechte sind nach bestem Wissen und Gewissen geprüft worden.
Im Falle noch offener, berechtigter Ansprüche wird um Mitteilung des Rechteinhabers ersucht.

ISBN 978-3-99094-186-7
ISSN 0930-9578

INHALT

Vorwort	7
GESA FINKE (KÖLN) Ego Documents as Sources for Writing Music History	9
MARTIN EYBL (WIEN) Musical Practice and Music Historiography	17
MARKO MOTNIK (MARIBOR) Eine Stadtchronik oder ein Ego-Dokument? Die Schilderungen des Musiklebens im Laibach der 1830er Jahre in den Berichten von Franz Franz	25
ELEONORE KINSKY (PRAHA) Memories of the Musical Life in Bohemia in the 1840s: Antonín Dvořák's Interview in the <i>Sunday Times</i> , May 1885	49
EMESE TÓTH (BUDAPEST) Between Rotterdam and Pest: József Ellinger's Letters to Ferenc Erkel	65
LILI VERONIKA BÉKÉSSY (BUDAPEST) “... a son of our country asks for the patronage of your esteemed journal.” Sen. Kornél Ábrányi's Network	85
VJERA KATALINIĆ (ZAGREB) Franjo Ks. Kuhač in the Culture of Letters: Between Micro- and Macrohistory	119
TOMASZ PUDŁOCKI (KRAKOW) Ego Documents as Sources for Musical Activities in the Galician High Schools, 1867–1914	137
JANA LASLAVÍKOVÁ (BRATISLAVA) Conducting at the Municipal Theatre in Pressburg: Bruno Walter Reports to his Family	155
ZSOMBOR NÉMETH (BUDAPEST) The Violinist Imre Waldbauer's Acquaintance with Béla Bartók	175

VORWORT

Die folgenden Aufsätze gehen auf einen Workshop zurück, der auf Initiative von Martin Eybl im September 2022 an der Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst in Wien stattfand. Unter dem Titel „Musikalische Praxis im langen 19. Jahrhundert“ stellten Forscherinnen und Forscher aus Polen, Deutschland, Tschechien, der Slowakei, Österreich, Ungarn, Rumänien, Slowenien und Kroatien unbekannte oder erst teilweise aufgearbeitete Ego-Dokumente aus Zentraleuropa vor. Etliche dieser Beiträge gingen in den vorliegenden Sammelband ein. Vier Schwerpunkte wurden bei dem vorwiegend auf Englisch abgehaltenen Workshop nacheinander behandelt: „Urban Cultures“, „Urban Life Meets Rural Practices“, „Performers’ Careers“ und „Gatekeeper“. Diese Felder prägen auch die folgenden Beiträge, die hier chronologisch angeordnet sind und nach zwei Aufsätzen zu den zentralen Begriffen „Ego Documents“ und „Musical Practice“ von Laibach in den 1830er Jahren ausgehen und bis nach Budapest in den Jahren vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg führen.

Wir danken den Veranstaltern des Workshops, der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft, der Gesellschaft zur Herausgabe von Denkmälern der Tonkunst in Österreich und dem Institut für Musikwissenschaft und Interpretationsforschung an der Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien, für die organisatorische und finanzielle Unterstützung, weiter dem zuletzt genannten Institut für die Finanzierung des englischsprachigen Lektorats durch Marc Brooks sowie der Gesellschaft zur Herausgabe von Denkmälern der Tonkunst in Österreich für die Unterstützung der Drucklegung.

Lili Veronika Békéssy
Martin Eybl
Gesa Finke

Gesa Finke (Köln)

EGO DOCUMENTS AS SOURCES FOR WRITING MUSIC HISTORY

EGO DOCUMENTS AND MUSICOLOGICAL RESEARCH

The essays in this volume not only introduce ego documents of various types from Central European musical cultures, but also raise the question of how they may be treated methodologically. The following remarks aim to open a discussion about the opportunities offered as well as the challenges posed by integrating ego documents into musicological research. The term “ego document” was coined in 1958 by Jacques Presser when referring to “those documents in which an ego [i.e. a ‘self’] intentionally or unintentionally discloses, or hides itself”¹. It was then adopted by the Dutch historian Rudolf Dekker who focused on finding and editing sources like autobiographies, memoirs, letters and diaries from early modern history.² In the 1990s, Winfried Schulze introduced the term to the German research community, defining it as follows:

Texts can be defined as ego documents if they contain statements or parts of statements that, even though rudimentary or concealed, either give information about a person’s deliberate or accidental self-awareness within his or her family, community, country or social class, or reflect upon their relationship to these systems and its changes. Such documents might justify individual human behaviour, reveal anxieties, present specific knowledge, highlight personal values and biases, or reflect experiences and expectations.³

1 Jacques Presser, *Memoires als geschiedbron*, in: *Winkler Prins Encyclopedie VIII*. Amsterdam 1958, pp. 208–210. Translation by Rudolf Dekker, in: *Egodocuments and History: Autobiographical Writing in its Context since the Middle Ages*, ed. by Rudolf Dekker. Hilversum 2002, p. 7. Cf. Volker Depkat, *Ego-documents*, in: *Handbook of Autobiography/Autofiction*, vol. 1: Theory and concepts, ed. by Martina Wagner-Egelhaaf. Boston–Berlin 2019, pp. 262–267, at p. 262.

2 Cf. *ibidem*, p. 262.

3 “Gemeinsames Kriterium aller Texte, die als Ego-Dokumente bezeichnet werden können, sollte es sein, daß Aussagen oder Aussagenpartikel vorliegen, die – wenn auch in rudimentärer und verdeckter Form – über die freiwillige oder erzwungene Selbstwahrnehmung eines Menschen in seiner Familie, seiner Gemeinde, seinem Land oder seiner sozialen Schicht Auskunft geben oder sein Verhältnis zu diesen Systemen und deren Veränderungen reflektieren. Sie sollten individuell-menschliches Verhalten rechtfertigen, Ängste offen-

Ever since, the term has been more widely discussed among Dutch and German historians, although it has been less in evidence in English academia or German-language musicological research. One explanation may lie in traditional German musicology's scepticism towards ego documents as reliable sources; it has disparaged them as subjective and urged they be handled with caution. One example demonstrates that this tendency is still active: the student handbook *Musikwissenschaftliches Arbeiten. Eine Einführung* from 2014 lists autobiographies, memoirs, recollections, travelogues, diaries, private correspondence, Stammbücher, conversation books and notes/notebooks under the term "documents from the private sphere" ("Dokumente aus dem privaten Umfeld"⁴). These sources are not disqualified as research sources altogether, but the short two-page chapter offers no advice about how to use them. If we turn to musicological handbooks and encyclopedias, the term "ego documents" is missing and a general methodology seems to be absent. However, interest in ego documents has been strong when musicologists have attempted to fathom the link between the life and the work of "great" composers. Ever since the nineteenth century, editions of musical works have been accompanied by volumes of ego documents, especially letters. These large editorial projects, for example on Wolfgang Amadé Mozart, Ludwig van Beethoven or Richard Wagner, not only span several decades,⁵ but have also expanded in size due to the possibilities offered by digital editions.⁶ Letters, it seems, constitute the most important musicological source type after musical works.

In the 1990s, a surge in interest in the concept of ego documents coincided with the proclamation of the cultural turn.⁷ In musicology, ego documents were an important factor in opening musicology to cultural studies, especially in the field of Gender Studies, which compelled scholars to revise methodologies and reflect upon source types.⁸ According to Susanne Rode-Breyman's concept of

baren, Wissensbestände darlegen, Wertvorstellungen beleuchten, Lebenserfahrungen und -erwartungen widerspiegeln." Winfried Schulze, *Ego-Dokumente: Annäherung an den Menschen in der Geschichte? Vorüberlegungen für die Tagung "Ego-Dokumente"*, in: *Ego-Dokumente: Annäherung an den Menschen in der Geschichte*, ed. by Winfried Schulze. Berlin 1996, pp. 11–30, at p. 28. My translation.

4 Matthew Gardner – Sara Springfeld, *Musikwissenschaftliches Arbeiten. Eine Einführung*. Kassel 2014, p. 121.

5 Cf. Sophia Gustorff, *Musikerbriefe vor und um 1800*, in: *Handbuch Brief: von der frühen Neuzeit bis zur Gegenwart*, vol. 2, ed. by Maria Isabel Matthews-Schlinzig – Jörg Schuster. Berlin 2020, pp. 1006–1020.

6 Cf. "Digitale Mozart Edition" der Stiftung Mozarteum Salzburg, <https://dme.mozarteum.at/briefe-dokumente/>, accessed Jul. 21, 2023.

7 Cf. V. Depkat, see note 1, p. 263.

8 Nina Noeske, *Gender Studies. 2. Musikwissenschaftliche Gender Studies*, in: *Lexikon Musik und Gender*, ed. by Annette Kreuziger-Herr – Melanie Unseld. Kassel 2010, pp. 234–236;

“kulturelles Handeln” (cultural agency), musicological research was to turn towards exploring a variety of cultural agents and activities.⁹ This would shift the focus to writing about music in daily practices and routines, away from a history of heroes and masterpieces.¹⁰ As women’s documents had lower chances of being included in collections and archives, institutions were founded to preserve these documents and enable research based on them.¹¹

The discussion around ego documents is therefore closely connected to aspects of canon formation and memory culture. Some composers’ ego documents have reached a high degree of fame and popularity. Additionally, they have been collected in detail, so the findings from an unknown personal source regularly causes excitement around what seems to be no more than a tiny piece of the (biographical) puzzle. In contrast, the personal material of many other musicians remains unknown. New ego documents therefore allow research into all kinds of musical agency besides composing music, such as questions regarding musical practice and performance history, musical spaces and musical discourses. By shifting the focus towards Central Europe, as this volume does, ego-document-focused research expands our knowledge about music history geographically. Jana Laslavíková presents a case concerning the recently discovered collection of letters that Bruno Walter wrote to his family during his short employment at the Municipal Theatre in Pressburg. They revise Walter’s own harsh judgment on his stay in Pressburg, while also revealing many details about the musical practice at the theater. Emese Tóth, in her study of the letters the tenor József Ellinger sent to the composer Ferenc Erkel, shows how the singer struggled with both his voice and the harsh criticism in the press, thereby revealing the high demands theaters made on performers in the nineteenth century. Lili Veronika Békéssy’s essay concerns the role of the musician and writer Kornél Ábrányi as gatekeeper to Hungarian musical life at the end of the nineteenth century. Békéssy outlines Ábrányi’s various activities and shows how he profoundly shaped the nationalist discourse in music at the time.

Melanie Unseld, *Musikwissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft* (Oldenburger Universitätsreden 195) Oldenburg 2011, pp. 9–33, at p. 28–29, <http://oops.uni-oldenburg.de/1097/1/ur195.pdf>, accessed Jul. 21, 2023.

- 9 Susanne Rode-Breymann, *Wer war Katharina Gerlach? Über den Nutzen der Perspektive kulturellen Handelns für die musikwissenschaftliche Frauenforschung*, in: *Orte der Musik. Kulturelles Handeln von Frauen in der Stadt* (Musik – Kultur – Gender 3) ed. by Susanne Rode-Breymann. Köln–Weimar–Wien 2007, pp. 269–284.
- 10 Susanne Rode-Breymann, *Orte und Räume kulturellen Handelns von Frauen*, in: *History | Herstory. Alternative Musikgeschichten* (Musik – Kultur – Gender 5) ed. by Annette Kreuziger-Herr – Katrin Losleben. Köln–Weimar–Wien 2009, pp. 186–197, at p. 194.
- 11 For example the Forschungszentrum Musik und Gender (fmg) at Hochschule für Musik, Theater und Medien Hannover, Germany.

MOVING TOWARDS A METHODOLOGY

How then can we read ego documents as sources? This question demands a larger discussion about a methodology for ego documents. I will address two points: the aspects of narration and memory. Volker Depkat elaborated on the challenges of reading autobiographies as historical sources when they are used to extract factual information. He suggests instead scholars “examine autobiographies as narrative texts in which a subject constitutes himself as an ‘I’ through the process of narration, describes himself as an ‘I’ and relates himself to past and future through narration. Historians should therefore turn towards the narrative rules of autobiography as a genre when starting their study.”¹² This approach works for other kinds of ego documents as well: the point is to read them *as texts*, paying attention to their mode of textuality with its specific narrative strategies.¹³ This relates to questions of individual or collective identity (such as class, race, gender, age, nationality) of the ego document’s author. Besides the subject position, autobiographies, and other ego documents, must be analyzed as acts of communication.¹⁴ Whom do they address, and with what intent? What do we know about the context of the ego document? Are there other sources we can use to confirm the information we find in the source? These sorts of questions are usually associated with issues regarding the credibility or reliability of the source. However, this does not have to be a matter of distrust or caution: “confirming” is not designed to “countercheck” the ego document, but rather to put it *into perspective* by viewing it in the context of other sources.

This brings us onto the second aspect of how to read ego documents as sources: Ego documents need to be approached via memory theory. While the history of memory studies reaches back to Maurice Halbwachs and Aby Warburg in the 1920s, the works of Jan and Aleida Assmann as well as Harald Welzer and Astrid Erll have strongly influenced German cultural studies since the turn of the twenty-first century.¹⁵ In memory studies, the strict boundary between history as objective

12 “Autobiographien als narrative Texte zu untersuchen, in denen sich ein Subjekt im Prozess der Erzählung überhaupt erst als ‘Ich’ konstituiert, sich als ein ‘Ich’ selbst beschreibt und sich durch seine Erzählung zu Vergangenheit und Zukunft in Beziehung setzt. Deshalb sollten Historiker die narrativen Eigengesetzlichkeiten des Genres Autobiographie zum Ausgangspunkt ihrer quellenkundlichen Anstrengungen machen.” Volker Depkat, *Zum Stand und zu den Perspektiven der Autobiographieforschung in der Geschichtswissenschaft*, in: *BIOS – Zeitschrift für Biographieforschung, Oral History und Lebensverlaufsanalysen* 23/2 (2010), pp. 170–187, at p. 175, <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ss0ar-355686>, accessed Jul. 21, 2023. My Translation.

13 Cf. *ibidem*.

14 Cf. *ibidem*, p. 176.

15 For an introduction to the field of memory studies and an extensive bibliography see

and individual memories as subjective versions of history dissolves. All historical narrations are inevitably selective reconstructions of the past.¹⁶ As Erll points out: “Despite the unavoidable heterogeneity of the terminology, there are two generally agreed-upon central characteristics of (conscious) remembering: its relationship to the present and its constructed nature. Memories are not objective images of past perceptions, even less of a past reality. They are subjective, highly selective reconstructions, dependent on the situation in which they are recalled.”¹⁷ Some of the essays in this volume address ego documents with a sensitivity to their specific memorial context: Thomas Pudłocki analyzes the memoirs of Galician high school students, written after the first World War for reunions or celebrations at the schools, and elaborates on how the descriptions of musical life functioned in these memoirs. Eleonore Kinsky explores Antonin Dvořák’s childhood memories in his interview with the *Sunday Times* in 1885 against the background of certain stereotypical images of Bohemia and Bohemian musicians. Zsombor Németh introduces violinist Imre Waldbauer’s memories of his friend Béla Bartók, which were also written *ex post* in 1950 after Waldbauer had emigrated to the USA. Waldbauer tried not only to preserve his knowledge of the vast network surrounding himself and Bartók, but also to reconsider his attitude towards Hungarian nationalism around 1900.

As a consequence, it is not the scholar’s task to judge ego documents as “right” or “wrong” but to peel away the layers of memory that surround them. Memories are based on patterns of perception (“Wahrnehmungsmuster”) or *topoi* – such as self images, career models, role models or (auto-)biographical models – which significantly influence narrations of the self.¹⁸ Working with ego documents therefore requires a methodology which incorporates what Melanie Unseld calls “memoriksensible Quellenkritik”: scholars should, that is, treat historical sources with an awareness of memorial processes.¹⁹

Christian Gudehus – Ariane Eichenberg – Harald Welzer (eds.), *Gedächtnis und Erinnerung. Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch*. Stuttgart 2010; Astrid Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen: Eine Einführung*. Stuttgart 2005; English translation: Astrid Erll, *Memory in culture*. Basingstoke 2011.

16 This continues the debate around the fictionality of historiography which had been initiated by Hayden White, *Tropics of discourse. Essays in cultural criticism*. Baltimore 1978.

17 A. Erll, see note 15, p. 8.

18 Cf. Martina Wagner-Egelhaaf, *Autobiographie*, 2nd ed. Stuttgart 2005, p. 12; Melanie Unseld, *Biographie und Musikgeschichte: Wandlungen biographischer Konzepte in Musikkultur und Musikhistoriographie*. Köln 2014, pp. 59–68.

19 Melanie Unseld, *Die Kulturwissenschaften als Herausforderung für die Musikwissenschaft – und was sich daraus für die Historische Musikwissenschaft ergibt*, in: *Historische Musikwissenschaft: Grundlagen und Perspektiven*, ed. by Michele Calella – Nikolaus Urbanek. Stuttgart 2013, pp. 266–288, at p. 281.

OUTLOOK: READING EGO DOCUMENTS

While many of the essays in this volume address the challenge of how to make use of ego documents, many also raise the question of what counts as an ego document. Depkat emphasized that the term “ego document” remains contested. And in Winfried Schulze’s definition cited at the beginning of this essay, it has a wide-ranging meaning that refers not only to personal documents but also to institutional sources.²⁰ Additionally, it is not clear how to distinguish ego documents from “autobiographies” or “self-narratives”.²¹ Letters, autobiographies and diaries would probably be among the first to be named as ego documents in musical culture, partly as a result of “the formation of a culture of inwardness that genuinely constitutes itself through the medium of writing”²² in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. In musicology, letters that reveal the subjectivity and aesthetic principles of the composer as well as their intimate relationships have greatly affected the musicological understanding of letters as ego documents. However, the epistolary culture of the eighteenth and nineteenth century is much more diverse, and musicians contributed significantly to it.²³ Letters present many different kinds of relationships, and not all of them explicitly reveal a “self”, as Marko Motnik shows through the example of Franz Franz who was employed by Baron Josef Kalasanz von Erberg to report news from the town of Laibach (Ljubljana). Another striking example are the letters of the Croatian musicologist Franjo Ks. Kuhač, which Vjera Katalinić presents in her essay. Kuhač copied his letters conscientiously into books (“Briefkopierbücher”) which span across decades, resulting in a collection of more than 3000 letters. Due to its sequentiality and materiality, the collection shares various characteristics with autobiographical writing, especially the diary. The examples of both Franz and Kuhač seem to stretch the limits of ego documents as sources. But they actually turn the question of “how to read ego documents as sources” into one of “how to read sources as ego documents”. By so doing, we move away from an essentialist view of ego documents to one of them as *a method of reading certain sources* – including those we would not usually class as ego documents in the first place.

This method of reading certain sources as ego documents would then concern genuinely musical sources as well. The debate about whether musical works can or should be read (auto)biographically reaches back into the nineteenth century and

20 V. Depkat, see note 1, p. 263.

21 Ibidem.

22 Davide Giuriato, *Letter, E-mail, SMS*, in: *Handbook of Autobiography/Autofiction*, vol. 1, ed. by Martina Wagner-Egelhaaf. Berlin–Munich–Boston 2019, pp. 617–625, at p. 617.

23 Cf. S. Gustorff, see note 5.

has been a highly contested issue ever since.²⁴ From the viewpoint of cultural studies, the line between (auto)biography and music is flexible and depends on how the scholar conceives the music. If music is analyzed as daily practice, it automatically raises the question of its involvement in personal settings and its role as communication. Cornelia Bartsch offered the letters between Fanny Hensel and her brother Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy as an example of how music can itself become a medium of correspondence.²⁵ By including types of ego documents that go beyond texts, i.e. scores as well as audio or audiovisual sources, musicology can make a substantial intervention in an interdisciplinary discussion about ego documents. Such perspectives suggest that ego documents need not only be supplemental, but can be central to musicological research.

24 Cf. Mark Evan Bonds, *The Beethoven Syndrome: Hearing Music as Autobiography*. Oxford 2019.

25 Cornelia Bartsch, *Fanny Hensel geb. Mendelssohn Bartholdy: Musik als Korrespondenz*. Kassel 2007.

Martin Eybl (Wien)

MUSICAL PRACTICE AND MUSIC HISTORIOGRAPHY

How music history is told and written varied throughout history. In the past and in the present, different perspectives and approaches are at work. Music history can be conceived as a *history of works*, indeed of “masterpieces”, if you will. The relationship of the works to each other is the focus, as are those who created these works and those who perform them. Music history might also be understood as a *history of discourses*. This is about how music was thought and spoken about, about its foundations in the tonal system, its effect on listeners and the meaning attributed to it. Such a perspective of music history thus brings music theory, music aesthetics and music philosophy into focus. The process of canonization of works falls into the category of discourses, too.

Provided that a score of musical notes is also a ‘text’ in an extended sense, both a history of works and a history of discourses refer to texts. In addition to these two options, a third possibility can be mentioned, a *history of musical practices* in which all possible ways of *doing* music (or *musicking*) – performing and distributing music, listening to it, writing and reading music, dancing and marching with music etc. – are brought into focus. Works, discourses, and practices thus mark three perspectives that may come to the forefront of interest in music historiography to varying degrees.

In their definition of music history, however, the two major musicology encyclopedias place surprisingly little importance on the practices of participants. In her definition of music history, only recently published in *MGG Online*, Melanie Wald-Fuhrmann groups the discipline around three other terms: repertoires, meaning, and contexts:

Music history includes the philological-editorial, analytical, hermeneutic, and critical examination of musical repertoires of the past, the attempt to determine their aesthetic meaning and historical significance, and the identification of the intellectual, cultural, and social contexts that shaped and were shaped by them.¹

1 “Die Musikgeschichte umfasst die philologisch-editorische, analytische, hermeneutische und kritische Auseinandersetzung mit musikalischen Repertoires der Vergangenheit, den Versuch der Bestimmung ihrer ästhetischen und historischen Bedeutung sowie die Identifikation der für sie prägenden und durch sie mitgeprägten ideen-, kultur- und sozialhistorischen Kontexte.” Melanie Wald-Fuhrmann, *Musikwissenschaft*, III.1 Musikgeschichte, in: *MGG Online*, ed. by Laurenz Lütteken. New York et al. 2016 ff., publication date

This definition of music history focuses on works and discourses, while the practices of participants are not directly addressed – although it does leave room for their inclusion. So one can include a history of the distribution of music, the music market, the market for recorded music, or the culture of patronage under “identification of contexts”; one can subsume the care of estates, commemorative work, such as the establishment of monuments, and even music historiography under the “determination of aesthetic meaning and historical significance”; and finally, one can understand a history of composing (which is different from a history of composition or works!) as an “examination of repertoires”, since one can find many sources for such an examination in the field of music philology (such as compositional sketches). However, the classifications are not completely unambiguous or without contradiction, since, for example, a history of composing also involves aspects of the history of ideas and social history. But where should a history of listening be placed in Wald-Fuhrmann’s categories, or questions that illuminate the interplay between orality and writing, as happens in improvisation and performance practice?

Relatively early on, the article continues, notation assumed the character not only of a compositional medium and a performance specification, but also of a medium of memory and transmission. Wald-Fuhrmann concludes:

The music-historical approach, which is often accused of being fixated on works and texts, is thus an appropriate reaction to the nature and form of transmission of the object of interest, at least if one wants to pursue music history not only as a social, cultural, and intellectual history of music, but also as a history of the creative shaping of and thinking through sound in spatio-temporal structures in a comprehensive sense.²

A similar opposition of viewpoints is also described by Glenn Stanley in his article “Historiography” for the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (2001). The two points of view can perhaps be summarized as follows: Music encompasses more than just a repertoire of works, they say on the one hand; apart from the context of music, musical works still remain the central object of research, they say

Juni 2022, <https://www.mgg-online.com/mgg/stable/404605>, accessed Jul. 21, 2023. Translation by the author.

2 “Die dem musikgeschichtlichen Ansatz oft vorgeworfene Werk- und Textfixiertheit ist insofern eine angemessene Reaktion auf Wesen und Überlieferungsform des interessierenden Gegenstandes, jedenfalls sofern man Musikgeschichte nicht nur als Sozial-, Kultur- und Ideengeschichte der Musik betreiben will, sondern auch als Geschichte des kreativen Gestaltens und Denkens in und mit klanglichen bzw. zeiträumlichen Strukturen im umfassenden Sinn.” Ibidem.

on the other. In his comparison of work and context (“the greater cultural processes”), Stanley brings the question of the autonomy of music into play, but makes no attempt to clarify or reconcile the two positions, as if he considered making a decision between the “competing philosophies of history” superfluous.

A highly significant consequence of the work-orientation of art histories has been the question of autonomy, which extends from general historiographical areas to those specific to the arts. Because musical works, for example, possess uniquely musical material, does it follow that music (1) develops according to its own laws and (2) is understood phenomenologically, or is it so highly conditioned by the greater cultural processes to which it undeniably belongs that (1) explanations of its development should not emphasize its autonomy and (2) formal explication is incomplete and insufficient? In all its phases music historiography has encompassed both approaches, supported by the often competing philosophies of history to which every music historian consciously or unconsciously subscribes.³

The discussion about work and context draws a boundary between music and its environment, while the distinction between works, discourses, and practices is based on the intimate entanglement of the domains: Works are the result and the trigger of discourses, but they are also part of it. Likewise, they emerge from and are involved in practices for as long as they are remembered.

The accent on musical practice has its methodological and philosophical foundations in practice theory or “praxeology”. Practice theory is not a single coherent concept, but rather a family of similar concepts that have been developing over about fifty years and are now established as a significant approach in sociology and philosophy, even initiating what was called a “Practice Turn”.⁴ The development of practice theory has been driven by Pierre Bourdieu, Anthony Giddens, Judith Butler, Theodore Schatzki and Andreas Reckwitz, to name a few.⁵

3 Glenn Stanley, *Historiography* (2001), in: *Grove Music Online* <https://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/grovemusic/display/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000051674>, accessed Jul. 21, 2023.

4 Cf. *The practice turn in contemporary theory*, ed. by Theodore R. Schatzki – Karin Knorr Cetina – Eike von Savigny. London 2001.

5 Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge–New York 1977; idem, *The logic of practice*. Cambridge 1990; idem, *Pascalian meditations*. Stanford 2000; Anthony Giddens, *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analyses*. London 1979; idem, *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge 1984; Judith Butler, *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York 1990; Theodore R. Schatzki, *Social Practices: A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and*