

ON SHARING¹

SOBRE COMPARTIR

Laura Tunbridge

University of Oxford

laura.tunbridge@music.ox.ac.uk

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2081-950X>

Resumen

Este artículo, basado en una conferencia presentada en Barcelona, trata de la importancia de compartir en el ámbito de la investigación musicológica, desde la perspectiva de los intereses de investigación de la autora y por medio de una discusión sobre temas relacionados con el acceso abierto a las publicaciones académicas. Se considera la importancia de la transnacionalidad y los estudios sobre interpretación histórica como tendencias que están reflejadas también en el propio trabajo de Tunbridge sobre interpretación del *lied* de entreguerras en Nueva York y Londres y sobre el cuarteto de cuerda. También explora el significado del acceso abierto como medio para diseminar investigación y su influencia en el tipo de proyectos que se están llevando a cabo.

Palabras clave

Acceso abierto, compartir, transnacionalismo, prácticas de interpretación histórica, *lieder*, cuarteto de cuerda.

Patterns of research are changing in the humanities in response to science models imposed by funding bodies. While some projects benefit from the laboratory scheme in which senior academics lead a team, not least because they can be an important means of providing employment for doctoral and early career researchers, it is important that there remains room for individual scholars to pursue their own work. But then, the lone scholar has always been something of a myth: researching and writing may be solitary tasks but they depend on engagement with the work of others, dead and alive. In this essay I would like to explore the significance in music scholarship of sharing,

Abstract

This essay, based on a lecture given in Barcelona, considers the importance of sharing within current musicological research from the perspective of the author's research interests and through a discussion of issues surrounding open access in academic publishing. Tunbridge observes the importance of transnationalism and performance studies as trends within academia that are also reflected in her own work on interwar *lieder* performance in New York and London and on the string quartet. The significance of open access as a means to disseminate research, and its influence on the type of projects being undertaken, is explored.

Key words

Open access, sharing, transnationalism, performance studies, *lieder*, string quartet.

which I'm going to consider from various angles: at first, in terms of historical topics and methodologies, which I'll discuss in relation to my own research interests, and then looking beyond research to the pragmatics of academic life —to public musicology and issues surrounding open access. I am publishing the essay in *Anuario Musical* with some trepidation: I realise that my experience of academia is different to most people in the United Kingdom, let alone in the Spanish-speaking world, and that there are many practical issues, of funding and politics, that make the kinds of issues with which I engage in this essay seem trivial. Still, talking about how we might work together, from a personal point of view, will I hope be valuable despite our varied circumstances.

What, though, do I mean by sharing? It's not a term musicologists use much beyond referring to file-sharing; I was struck when entering the term into the library catalogue that

¹ This paper was originally presented at a meeting of the Societat Catalana de Musicologia at the Institut d'Estudis Catalans, Barcelona, on 11 June 2019.

while there were hundreds of items about sharing, there were only eleven listed, all on popular music —the same as “mass exodus”, “public libraries”, and “peer-to-peer architecture”— and none on any other type of music or music-making. Search for a term such as collaboration and the situation is rather different, so I felt duly chastised by the distant cataloguer for not recognising that sharing is about dividing spoils, about giving a part to another, to be used, occupied or enjoyed jointly with others. On sharing, you end up with a portion rather than the whole thing. I thereby finally understood the real implication of the English saying “a problem shared is a problem halved” and, having shared my problem with the term sharing with you, I can now move on to what may be some mutual benefits of the sharing process in more musicological terms.

A few years ago, colleagues at an annual conference of the American Musicological Society proposed that this was not the most exciting time for the field; that there was nothing revolutionary brewing as there had been back in the 1980s and early 1990s, with the rise of the “New Musicology”. Those battles—for the social study of music, for taking identity politics into account, for questioning the status of the musical work and with it, implicitly, music theory and analysis— had been won. Ours was, instead, the age of complacency. I was not sure then, and I’m certainly not convinced now, that this is true. Global politics have seen to that.

Pedagogical politics also play a role. Changes in school education, in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, have reduced dramatically the opportunities for children to learn music and we are feeling the effect of those cuts on the numbers applying to read music at tertiary level. Moreover, we cannot assume that students have the same kind of experience and knowledge that they had even a decade ago. Perhaps more significantly, those students, as well as their lecturers, are questioning what they should be learning at universities. Although there remains much work to be done in the archive, hermeneutics and historiography take precedence in Anglo-American programmes. There are ongoing discussions of the need to decolonise the curriculum, to ensure that we do not only teach the Western canon but instead represent diverse concerns.² The challenge of this, to my mind, lies less in how to diversify what we teach and research, but how to ensure that we can maintain dialogue across fields so that the study of music is strengthened rather than splintered.³

² Tamara Levitz, “The Musicological Elite”, *Current Musicology*, 102 (2018), pp. 9-80, pursues the issue of diversifying the curriculum with reference to the institutional politics of the American Musicological Society of the 1930s.

³ Georgina Born, “For a Relational Musicology: Music and Interdisciplinarity, Beyond the Practice Turn”, *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 135 (2010), pp. 205-243, on p. 213, points to a similar danger in her 2007 Dent Medal address, on observing that the varied chapters of Nicholas Cook’s and Mark Everist’s 1999 edited collection *Rethinking Music* put approaches such as reception analysis, to semiotics, gender, non-Western musicologies side by side, but were “barely set into dialogue”. See also Tamara Levitz, ed., “Colloquy: Musicology be-

The historical musicologist, in these contexts, can feel like an endangered species (and I say this as someone who works on the nineteenth century; music from the 1800s in British curricula increasingly is being bracketed as “early”, with the majority of young researchers working on music from the past century). One adaptive strategy, which also, rightly, questions previous practices, has been the move away from considering individual national schools to position them in transnational networks; another has been to think about the contingencies of performance and reception alongside the intrinsic qualities of musical compositions.

In my recent book, *Singing in the Age of Anxiety*, I investigated the ways in which musicians negotiated wartime politics across the North Atlantic, looking specifically at how German art-song or lieder were performed in New York and London.⁴ During the First World War, there was a “ban” on hearing the enemy’s language, even when couched in the music of Schubert and Schumann. Similar prohibitions were in place around Europe, depending on political allegiances. When lieder returned to concert stages in London and New York they were presented in translation, which in turn served to cultivate a stronger English-language song tradition. Yet once German and Austrian musicians reappeared after visa restrictions were lifted in the early 1920s, lieder were heard much more often in their original language, and sung as such by British and American artists as well. That is, on concert stages; on the radio and, at least initially, on recordings, lieder were typically presented in English so that they would be comprehensible to a large audience. This was, after all, the decade during which the term “middlebrow” was coined, in response to broadcasters’ endeavours to “improve” the minds and culture of the masses.

Improvements in transatlantic travel as well as in media technologies allowed musicians to move between continental Europe, London, and New York, with increasing ease. When the Nazis came to power in 1933, however, those who would have considered themselves economic migrants began to make one-way trips from Germany, as exiles and refugees. Yet when the Second World War broke out there was no ban on German music in London and New York, as there had been twenty-five years earlier, but instead a sense that it was important to protect aspects of German culture that could be said to hold universal value. If anything, lieder began to be taken much more seriously; heard in dedicated recitals rather than in hybrid programmes, and more “serious” stretches of Schubert, such as the complete cycles, began to be sung more regularly than crowd-pleasing individual songs. Through considering the performance and reception history of lieder from a transnational perspective, it became possible to compare attitudes to this modest musical gen-

yond Borders?”. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 65/3 (2012), pp. 821-861.

⁴ Laura Tunbridge, *Singing in the Age of Anxiety: Lieder Performances in New York and London between the World Wars* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018).

re, and thereby to understand how it came to be held in a certain regard today. It also, more broadly, illuminated the ways in which musical practices reflect social and global politics and vice versa.

There are countless examples of how transnationalism has become a crucial limb of musicology. Academic networks abound: the International Musicological Society (IMS) has just established the “Global History of Music” study group, which will liaise with an International Council for Traditional Music (ICTM) study group also called the “Global History of Music”, and the International Network for a Global History of Music (INGHM).⁵ The IMS was founded in 1927; the ICTM in 1947; the INGHM began on the back of Reinhard Strohm’s 2012 Balzan Prize for Musicology. Interwar, postwar, and millennial politics have shaped each organisation. Their political histories have determined what is meant by “international” in their titles and sets it apart from what is meant by “global”.

Of these projects, it is notable how many examine, instead of canonical composers and genres, less well-known or respected forms, or institutions, places and spaces that have typically flown below the scholarly radar. Gary Tomlinson’s observation about the need for historical musicology to recognise its position in relation to ethnomusicology rather than considering itself separate or somehow superior to it seems to have come to pass.⁶ We may not quite all be ethnomusicologists now, as Nicholas Cook proposed, but at least there is a greater reflection on the relativism of our various approaches in ways that I hope allows there to be freer and more fruitful exchanges of ideas.⁷

All that said, Jeremy Adelman has recently questioned how much “global history” has really achieved. The “rest of the world” is represented by tiny fractions of academic research and serves mostly to reinforce the hegemony of Western values as well as that of the English language:

All narratives are selective, shaped as much by what they exclude as what they include. Despite the mantras of integration and the inclusion on the planetary scale, global history came with its own segregation — starting with language. Historians working across borders merged their mode of communication in ways that created new walls; in the search for academic cohesion, English became Globish. Global history would not be possible without the globalisation of the Eng-

lish language. In a recent workshop in Tokyo, I marvelled as Italians, Chinese and Japanese historians swapped ideas and *sake* in a *lingua franca*. But this kind of flatness can mask a new linguistic hierarchy. It is one of the paradoxes of global history that the drive to overcome Eurocentrism contributed to the Anglicising of intellectual lives around the world. As English became Globish, there was less incentive to learn foreign languages — the indispensable key to bridging ourselves and others.⁸

The backlash against cosmopolitan perspectives, for Adelman, reflects the current political situation, with the rise of populism and heightened nationalism. In order “to muster meaningful narratives about the togetherness of strangers near and far, we are going to have to be more global and get more serious about engaging other languages and other ways of telling history”, he concludes. The Anglocentrism Adelman observes amongst global historians is no doubt shared by a large proportion of musicologists interested in similar themes and it is important that, through graduate programmes and our own research, there continues to be an emphasis placed on working in different languages as well as sharing findings and methodologies across national schools and borders.⁹ I am delighted that the International Musicological Society has recently allowed any language to be used for its activities as it finally allows the IMS to have a global range rather than being restricted to a handful of European languages.¹⁰ Having been working on the 1930s and seeing many parallels between the political and economic situation then and that of today, the importance of maintaining open borders, academically speaking, seems ever more vital.

Adelman, of course, is a historian, and I think there is often a feeling that musicologists lag behind other disciplines, for instance catching the coat tails of global history rather than leading the vanguard. I’ve also been told that historians think that musicologists seem unusually anxious about the state of our field. I would, though, advocate for interdisciplinarity and to feel that musicology has as much to offer other areas as they have to offer us. Mireille Gansel has likened the process of translation as akin to a shepherd and his flock moving each season to richer pastures; this *transhumance*, as she calls it, is a form of nomadism, the opposite of settling and farming.¹¹ I think academic study can be similarly nomadic; we may start in one field and then gradually graze our way elsewhere. But per-

⁵ <<https://www.musicology.org/networks/sg/global-history-of-music/>>.

⁶ Gary Tomlinson, “Musicology, Anthropology, History”, *The Cultural Study of Music*, eds. Martin Clayton, Trevor Herbert and Richard Middleton (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 31-44.

⁷ Nicholas Cook, “We Are All (Ethno)musicologists Now”, in *The New (Ethno)musicologies*, ed. Henry Stobart (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2008), pp. 48-70. See also the debate on “‘Are we all Ethnomusicologists now?’ reports and responses” that took place at City University London in 2016 available at <<https://blogs.city.ac.uk/music/2016/06/10/debate-on-are-we-all-ethnomusicologists-now-reports-and-responses/>>.

⁸ Jeremy Adelman, “What is global history now?”, *Aeon* (2 March 2017) <<https://aeon.co/essays/is-global-history-still-possible-or-has-it-had-its-moment/>>.

⁹ I realise there is some irony in me writing this in English, for which I hope you’ll forgive me; it is a privilege to be invited to contribute to a journal that is not in a language I speak.

¹⁰ The associated journal *Acta Musicologica* will still publish in the five “official” languages.

¹¹ Mireille Gansel, *Translation as Transhumance*, translated by Ros Schwartz with a foreword by Lauren Elkin (New York: Feminist Press, 2017).

haps the more sensible point to make is this: that a willingness to move, rather than stay entrenched in the same area, can be helpful. For example, recently I've been working closely with modern linguists on various art-song projects.¹² We're still obsessing over how to discuss the relationship between words and music, comparing interpretations of texts, promoting less familiar repertoire, and, perhaps most excitingly, working with performers on both the delivery of different languages in sung form and how the experience of music, in the moment, impacts scholarly understanding.

This last point connects with two important strands in recent research: explorations of musical production, sound and technology, and sometimes in tandem with them, attempts to account for musical encounters as "drastic" rather than "gnostic" (terms derived from Carolyn Abbate's 2004 article).¹³ Music, as a historical object, is being treated as something much more tangible and determined by technology —for example in the work of Ulrich Schmitt, Gundula Kreuzer, David Trippett and Gavin Williams.¹⁴ This expansion of sources and contexts is, again, an instance of engaging with other disciplines enriching the field, and demonstrates the benefits of extending what we think of as the archive beyond traditional musicological resources, although scholars such as Deirdre Loughridge and James Davies have usefully considered the implications of interrogating the "body" of the archival trace as well.¹⁵ Acknowledging such materialities necessitates, according to Abbate, a new mode of conceptualising the physical effect of an aesthetic experience, for they "resist activities like investigating, penetrating, seeking the deeper meaning, exposing, unveiling, deciphering, explaining, interpreting, accounting for, and getting beyond the surface".¹⁶ Beyond historical objects, the material

turn has allowed scholars to engage with the "here-and-now" of aesthetic experiences, though Abbate points out that "speaking about aesthetic experience prescribes embarrassment, since it means being open about one's subjective position, and allegiance to individual subjectivity can be seen as intellectually unsound or simply not acceptable".¹⁷ In some ways, Abbate's train of thought parallels the writings of literary scholar Rita Felski, who has similarly probed, as she puts it, "the limits of critique"; as she describes it, she strives "to remain on the same plane as my object of study rather than casting around for a hidden puppeteer who is pulling the strings".¹⁸ There may seem to be a risk of "oversharing" when attempting to "remain on the same plane", but we should heed Felski's call for "No more separate spheres! ... works of art cannot help being social, sociable, connected, worldly, immanent —and yet they can also be felt, without contradiction, to be incandescent, extraordinary, sublime, utterly special. Their singularity and their sociability are interconnected, not opposed".¹⁹ Allowing for the drastic need not forbid the gnostic; each enhances the other.

Musicology's relationship with performance studies is something that has also come to the forefront in recent years, and "practice as research" is rightly being taken more seriously by institutions and funding bodies, recognising the ways in which composers and performers engage with and in academic concerns. I am embarking on a new project entitled *A Social and Sonic History of the String Quartet*: in part this came about through having spent the past few years mostly producing social history and wanting to return, in some fashion, to writing about musical experience. I taught an undergraduate lecture course on the history of the string quartet a couple of years ago and realised then that the majority of literature on the subject is still focused around composers and their works, although there is beginning to be some discussion, by figures such as Marie Sumner Lott and Edward Klorman, about the "sociability" of chamber music.²⁰ That aspect of quartets interests me less than the notion that these ensembles, at least in the professional sphere, somehow establish for themselves an identity that can endure beyond changes of personnel. How is that identity forged? Is it through repertoire choices, instruments, playing style, record production, marketing? And beyond that, if I say I want to return to talking about "the music", how am I going to do that —because what I want to talk about are the sound-worlds of quartets, more than analysing the pieces they play. Our vocabulary for describing timbre remains rather limited, though recent interest about

¹² More information about the Oxford Song Network can be found here: <<https://www.torch.ox.ac.uk/the-oxford-song-network-poetry-and-performance>>.

¹³ Carolyn Abbate, "Music-Drastic or Gnostic?", *Critical Inquiry*, 30 (2004), pp. 505-536.

¹⁴ Ulrich Schmitt, *Revolution im Konzertsaal: Zur Beethoven-Rezeption in 19. Jahrhundert* (Mainz: Schö, 1990). Gundula Kreuzer, *Curtain, Gong, Steam: Wagnerian Technologies of Nineteenth-Century Opera* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2018). David Trippett, *Wagner's Melodies: Aesthetics and Materialism in German Musical Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013). David Trippett and Benjamin Walton, eds., *Nineteenth-Century Opera and the Scientific Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018). Gavin Williams, ed., *Hearing the Crimean War: Wartime Sound and the Unmaking of Sense* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019).

¹⁵ Deirdre Loughridge, "Making, Collecting and Reading Music Facsimiles before Photography", *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 141/1 (2016), pp. 27-59. James Q. Davies, *Romantic Anatomies of Performance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014).

¹⁶ Carolyn Abbate, "Overlooking the Ephemeral", *New Literary History*, 48 (2017), pp. 75-102, on p. 79; originally published as "Das Ephemere übersehen" in *Latenz: Blinde Passagiere in den Geisteswissenschaften*, ed. Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht and Florian Klingner (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), pp. 24-50.

¹⁷ Abbate, "Overlooking the Ephemeral", pp. 80-81.

¹⁸ Rita Felski, *The Limits of Critique* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), p. 6.

¹⁹ Felski, *The Limits of Critique*, p. 11.

²⁰ Marie Sumner Lott, *The Social Worlds of Nineteenth-Century Chamber Music: Composers, Consumers, Communities* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2015). Edward Klorman, *Mozart's Music of Friends: Social Interplay in the Chamber Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

the materiality of sound suggests that there are some interesting developments in that area.²¹

A brief example to illustrate the issues I have in mind might be helpful. The Mendelssohn Octet, op. 20, obviously isn't a string quartet, but a very famous example of music for a large-scale chamber group such as was popular in the early nineteenth century. In these types of pieces, great emphasis is placed on sharing thematic ideas around the ensemble and, although the first violin part of the Mendelssohn Octet is impressively virtuosic and stays somewhat in its own world, the score deftly puts players in dialogue and they constantly exchange roles, as can be heard at the start.

Typically, when the Octet is played by professional ensembles, two quartets come together. When the American Emerson Quartet were recording the complete Mendelssohn quartets, however, they decided that instead of finding another quartet to perform with, they would use the expertise of their record producer, Da-Hong Seetoo, to play all of the parts themselves.²² This was, of course, a technological feat — four of the parts were recorded with high definition microphones on fourteen tracks and then played back to the quartet as they played the other parts, also recorded in high definition on fourteen tracks. It was not straightforward overdubbing, in other words, but a method of recording that meant the imaging retained the spatialisation as if there were eight people in the room. It was also, of course, a technical feat on the part of the performers: violinist Philip Setzer recalls that “It was a lot of fun to go back into the studio once we finished recording and edited the first layer.... The second layer was like a ride in Disneyland, trying to keep up with ourselves in the fast movements”. Quick tempi emphasise the rollercoaster effect.²³

The Emersons were keen to emphasise that the attraction of doing the Octet this way was that because they didn't have to worry about matching their style with another group: as Setzer explained, “It's very difficult to get two quartets to play really well together. We've been working at that for almost 30 years, so the natural blending that we can do is there almost automatically”.²⁴ They planned interpretative details of the performance, making decisions about when particular parts should be prominent. Yet they did not simply duplicate themselves. They played eight different instruments, half made in the eighteenth century by famous figures such as Guarneri and Stradivarius, and the

other half made as “copies” of such eighteenth-century instruments by American luthier Samuel Zygmuntowicz. Despite the emphasis on “matching” vibrato and “natural blend”, the idea was that listeners would not be able to tell who was playing what, implying that what distinguishes one quartet from another is not so much playing style as that they perform on different instruments. That those different instruments in this example were copies of each other suggests that, for the Emersons at least, they nevertheless wanted to keep within a certain sonic orbit.

Although the Emersons' recording of the Mendelssohn Quartets have been warmly received, their version of the Octet has been treated with some scepticism, as a technical gimmick rather than the “natural sounding” performance which they said they hoped to achieve. There are musical reasons why it is not my favourite recording — the tempi throughout just seems too fast — but perhaps there is also a sense of investing in the performers' presence; that we, or at least I, want to hear the original, not the copy. Or perhaps, most significantly, that listeners want to know which is which. Jason Stanyek and Benjamin Piekut's influential article on “Deadness”, and Carlo Cenciarelli's discussion of Angela Gheorghiu's 2011 tribute to Maria Callas, both focus on what they call “posthumous duets”, where a living artist sings with the recording of one long past.²⁵ These examples, Cenciarelli concludes, can over-determine the boundaries between “deadness” and “liveness” and also illustrate “not so much the survival of the operatic canon, its canonical performances and canonised performers, but rather the role that media will play in their afterlife”. Perhaps a similar anxiety lies behind the negative reception of the Mendelssohn's octet recording; it is a performance that will only ever be heard from the studio and so cannot be made “live”. As such, it undermines the assumption that liveness and deadness, live performance and recordings, are interdependent. If a recording of the octet does not send us to the concert hall, what is its purpose?

In my work on lieder and on the string quartet, I have been dealing with musicians who work with others. The Schubertiade is a prime example of the importance of a community being established around music-making. Franz Schubert, history tells us, was someone for whom friends were vital. Ludwig van Beethoven, about whom I'm currently completing a book, is more often presented as a loner though, Nicholas Mathew has recently argued, collaboration, inevitably, was also fundamental to his art.²⁶ In the celebrations surrounding the 250th anniversary of Beethoven's birth, it will be interesting to see whether new academic perspectives will be allowed into discussions of his

²¹ See, for example, contributions to Emily Dolan and Alexander Rehding, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Timbre* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018).

²² I am very grateful to Fraser Riddell for telling me about this recording.

²³ The recording has been released commercially by Deutsche Grammophon, but sections can be heard on YouTube: <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pNCNX8MDgHk>>.

²⁴ Stephen Everson, “How Do Four People Play a Piece Written for Eight?”, *The Guardian* (11 March 2005); republished on <<http://www.emersonquartet.com/artist.php?view=news&nid=62>>, accessed 6 June 2019.

²⁵ Jason Stayek and Benjamin Piekut, “Deadness: Technologies of the Intermundane”, *TDR: The Drama Review*, 54 (2010), pp. 14-38. Carlo Cenciarelli, “The limits of operatic deadness”, *Cambridge Opera Journal*, 28 (2016), pp. 221-226.

²⁶ Nicholas Mathew, *Political Beethoven* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 1-17.

music, which could recast the public image of the composer as no less of a genius but also as a man of his time.

The anniversary industry, as it is tempting to call our tendency to focus on composers according to their birth and death years, also gained ground during the interwar period as it combined with new mass media to produce gramophone recordings, films, and guides to the great musicians. There has been increasing interest among musicologists recently in the concept of the “middlebrow”, a term that came into use in the 1920s in Britain in connection with the BBC, national radio broadcasting being considered a means to “inform, educate and entertain”. This democratization of culture, as it has been characterised, had as its gatekeepers scholars and critics whose purpose was to help those who “knew what they ought to like” find ways to do so. As always, issues of class run deep in these improvement missions and it is not entirely wrong to make a connection between the middlebrow and the middle classes, except that both lower and upper class people could of course be less or more “cultivated” as well. I disagree with some writers on the middlebrow who define the project as being about liking a bit of everything: it is about reifying cultural and social hierarchies, not a kind of post-modern free-for-all. My suspicion is that the current interest in the middlebrow relates in some ways to the weight placed now on “public musicology”. By reflecting on the historical precedents for scholars attempting to engage with and educate the public, there is some kind of validation of the endeavour to do something similar today. I am in favour of sharing knowledge with anyone who wants it — it is hard not to be — but I am wary of the effect that impact agenda and even the seemingly more benign imperative for knowledge exchange might have on the shape of academic disciplines. Certain funding bodies — particularly governmental ones — are mandating that each project has to include some means of making its research available publicly, which can mean that consideration about how to disseminate the work, and its use-value, takes precedence over its initial intellectual endeavour. Moreover, younger scholars are beginning to feel that they and their research topic has to engage with public interest from the very start of their career and, while they might well be better equipped to deal with the intricacies of social media than older generations, they are then at risk of not producing the kind of publications that still matter more on the academic job market; the journal articles, book chapters and monographs which need chance to develop through supervision, presentation at conferences, and, simply put, time spent investigating and thinking.

Which brings me, finally, to the question of open access. Again, I find it very hard to say that research should not be made freely available to anyone to whom it is of interest. Yet there are implications for academic infrastructure that cannot to be overlooked. Many scholarly societies fund themselves primarily through their journals. At present the compromise solution for many humanities journals is that unless an author has funding to allow for “gold” open access, all automatically are made “green” open access, which means that they stay behind a pay-wall for a certain number of years before becoming available

without a subscription. That type of open access has become mandatory for journal articles that will be submitted to the United Kingdom’s national assessment of research. It has also become mandatory for articles accepted for publication to be deposited online, at the institution, so that they can be accessed in a pre-print form. Similar stipulations about open access monographs will be established in the not-so-distant future, but at the moment the practicalities of that — not least how academic publishers might survive the loss of income from book sales — have not yet been resolved.²⁷ Almost every country and institution has a means of evaluating its researchers and every system for doing so seems to hinder as much as help, by reinforcing hierarchies or seeming to value certain topics and approaches over others. It is instructive to learn about the ways in which such restrictions shape our discipline, globally, for the perspective lends and as a means to foster international collaborations.

Journals available in print and electronic formats are also releasing articles online “early”, before they appear in print, which raises questions about the integrity of each issue, previously of prime concern to editors. Once dealing with online publication, the nature of an academic journal can change. There are not the same limitations on page length and it is possible to insert links, images and examples that can make the reading experience more interactive. On the whole, these are positive developments. However, as with online archives, they change the way in which a journal is dealt with. Few people may read an academic journal from cover to cover, but at least one can easily do so if it is in hard copy and it is possible, then, to alight on an article that might not immediately seem of interest but that certainly turns out to be. (In similar fashion, text-mining an electronic database may produce many more relevant materials more quickly, but the serendipitous discovery of the article on the facing page, or wherever, is more or less lost without returning to the original.) The nature of research, of “keeping up with the field”, in other words, is changing fundamentally. It might be possible to get updates on social media about new talks and publications in our area, but those unexpected encounters with ideas from elsewhere, paradoxically, can become more elusive.

There is no reason why open access journals cannot maintain the same academic standards as print journals if the process of peer review is kept. That is only possible if colleagues continue to agree to undertake these evaluations. There are, granted, many pressures on everyone’s time, and there is nothing really to be offered as recompense for a constructive critical response to a submission, beyond an acknowledgment of the importance of sharing expertise and engaging with the

²⁷ The University of California Press has released almost 2000 books published between 1982 and 2004 as ebooks, which are available for free to members of the University of California; some 700 are also available to the public for free: <<https://publishing.cdlib.org/ucpressebooks/>>. Other university presses are adopting “gold” and “green” open access options in a similar manner to academic journals.

work of other scholars. Once online, of course, research articles have a much wider international reach and, again, this seems wholly positive. I would advocate for more multi-lingual journals and, if there were funding available, for more translations of articles to encourage dialogue between scholars in other countries. Of the twenty-odd sources referred to in this article, only two — Georgina Born’s “For a relational musicology” and Tamara Levitz’s “The Musicological Elite” — are available via open access. Columbia University’s *Current Musicology*, in which the Levitz essay appears, is rare among musicology journals in being fully available for free; *Anuario Musical* is therefore at the forefront of the move to open access, which is an exciting opportunity to share research internationally.

Another way in which open access can expand the reach of discussion is by using blogs and other modes of social media to encourage interaction with other communities. The opportunity for putting scholars around the world, junior and senior, in touch, though, can be invaluable. Many scholarly societies have been trying to promote these kinds of online interactions, through roundtable discussions and provocations of various sorts. It can be a difficult balancing act: few apart from the most belligerent are prepared to make their comments public, which in turn deters balanced and reasoned debate. If we are to share our ideas, the environment in which we do so has to be supportive; criticism has to be constructive even if it is anonymous.

In sum, this is in no way a time to be complacent. Institutional and technological changes to the way in which we are presenting and sharing our research are not necessarily threats to standards but I think it is important to be alert to the way they can reshape what we do and to resist being pushed in directions that seem unproductive. The border crossing inherent in transnational and interdisciplinary projects, as well as between types of music and music scholarship, seems to me like a healthy state of affairs. When Gansel wrote about transhumance the notion was not that the individual shepherd loses their identity on travelling to new pastures but that they can gain by the journey, so long as they manage to keep their flock with them. In our ever-diversifying field maintaining communication is vital; sharing our ideas is the key, and it’s in that spirit that I’ve put forward some of my thoughts here.

WORKS CITED

- Abbate, Carolyn. “Music-Drastic or Gnostic?”. *Critical Inquiry*, 30 (2004), pp. 505-536.
- . “Overlooking the Ephemeral”. *New Literary History*, 48 (2017), pp. 75-102; originally published as “Das Ephemere übersehen”, in *Latenz: Blinde Passagiere in den Geisteswissenschaften*, ed. Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht and Florian Klingner. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011; pp. 24-50.
- Adelman, Jeremy. “What is global history now?”. *Aeon* (2 March 2017) <<https://aeon.co/essays/is-global-history-still-possible-or-has-it-had-its-moment>>.
- Born, Georgina. “For a Relational Musicology: Music and Interdisciplinarity, Beyond the Practice Turn”. *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 135 (2010), pp. 205-243.
- Cenciarelli, Carlo. “The limits of operatic deadness”. *Cambridge Opera Journal*, 28 (2016), pp. 221-226.
- Cook, Nicholas. “We Are All (Ethno)musicologists Now”. In *The New (Ethno)musicologies*, ed. Henry Stobart. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2008; pp. 48-70.
- Cook, Nicholas and Mark Everist. *Rethinking Music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Davies, James Q. *Romantic Anatomies of Performance*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.
- Dolan, Emily, and Alexander Rehding, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Timbre*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Everson, Stephen. “How Do Four People Play a Piece Written for Eight?”. *The Guardian*, 11 March 2005; republished on <<http://www.emersonquartet.com/artist.php?view=news&nid=62>> accessed 6 June 2019.
- Felski, Rita. *The Limits of Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.
- Gansel, Mireille. *Translation as Transhumance*, translated by Ros Schwartz with a foreword by Lauren Elkin. New York: Feminist Press, 2017.
- Klorman, Edward. *Mozart’s Music of Friends: Social Interplay in the Chamber Works*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Kreuzer, Gundula. *Curtain, Gong, Steam: Wagnerian Technologies of Nineteenth-Century Opera*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2018.
- Levitz, Tamara, ed. “Colloquy: Musicology beyond Borders?”. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 65/3 (2012), pp. 821-861.
- Levitz, Tamara. “The Musicological Elite”. *Current Musicology*, 102 (2018), pp. 9-80.
- Loughridge, Deirdre. “Making, Collecting and Reading Music Facsimiles before Photography”. *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 141/1 (2016), pp. 27-59.
- Mathew, Nicholas. *Political Beethoven*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Schmitt, Ulrich. *Revolution in Konzertsaal: Zur Beethoven-Rezeption in 19. Jahrhundert*. Mainz: Schott, 1990.
- Stanyek, Jason and Benjamin Piekut. “Deadness: Technologies of the Intermundane”. *TDR: The Drama Review*, 54 (2010), pp. 14-38.
- Sumner Lott, Marie. *The Social Worlds of Nineteenth-Century Chamber Music: Composers, Consumers, Communities*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2015.
- Tomlinson, Gary. “Musicology, Anthropology, History”. *The Cultural Study of Music*, ed. Martin Clayton, Trevor Herbert and Richard Middleton. London: Routledge, 2003; pp. 31-44.
- Trippett, David. *Wagner’s Melodies: Aesthetics and Materialism in German Musical Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Trippett, David, and Benjamin Walton, eds. *Nineteenth-Century Opera and the Scientific Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Tunbridge, Laura. *Singing in the Age of Anxiety: Lieder Performances in New York and London between the World Wars*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018.

Williams, Gavin, ed. *Hearing the Crimean War: Wartime Sound and the Unmaking of Sense*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Recibido: 02.10.2019

Aceptado: 06.10.2019