

Analyse und Gender (English trans.)

DRAFT do not circulate

1. Foundations (Beate Kutschke)

The comparatively young research field of gender studies in musicology (since ca. 1980 [Rieger 1979]) poses new challenges for musical analysis. Unlike the majority of music-analytical studies, feminist and gender-oriented analyzes do not primarily focus on the question of the (internal-musical) compositional structure of a piece of music (its aesthetic quality and principles of construction). Rather, the research field is dedicated to the task of proving the importance of gender roles (social gender) and different sexual orientations for music. North American musicology and music theory will be the focus of this chapter insofar as the decisive impulses for music-analytical concerns came primarily from musicological gender studies in North America.

We can observe the following trends, which have changed over the course of recent research: Since the late 1980s, music historians have been investigating the extent to which the social gender of the composer (for example Clara Schumann vs. Robert Schumann) and their socially presented gender representation (the “typically female” vs. “typically male”) influenced compositional design—consciously or unconsciously—and perhaps still influence it (for the “historical” examples of Clara Schumann and Cécile Chaminade, see Rieger 1992 and Citron 1993, Chapter 4, 120-164). Such music discourse is symptomatic of the fact that in Western societies music is by no means understood as value-free with regard to social and biological gender. For example, by using gendered metaphors to characterize the two themes of the sonata form—“male, energetic and pithy” versus “female, serving, mild and supple” (Marx 1845, 282)—Adolf Bernhard Marx initiated a musical discourse and a discussion about this musical discourse, which has lasted until very recently (see McClary 1991, 332; Hepokoski 2009, chap. 11).

The results of these studies, which reconstruct the influence of gender images on the form of musical works, are not only relevant to musicology but are socio-politically relevant. That is, music is more than “abstract” sound. It represents a sign system with which composers and performers articulate not only musical but also everyday concepts and ideas. They do this by attributing the function of specific musical configurations—similar to other, non-musical sign processes—as signifiers to refer to other musical configurations or the extra-musical, e.g. social constellations (the signifieds). (In the context of this article, the terms “significant” and “signified” do not stand for verbal language configurations, as in Saussure (1916), but also for other signs, such as musical notation.) The referential relationship between musical signifieds and various other signifieds is based here—and this is where the sign system “music” differs from that of verbal language—less on arbitrary conventions that allow the formation of an infinite spectrum of references, but rather on the similarity that composers and performers between music (as a signified) and other music or extra-musical things or phenomena observe and construct (as signifiers).

The way in which a certain musical passage refers to another musical passage or extra-musical phenomena is itself determined to a certain extent by conventions that composers and performers follow. Music listeners, if they live in a similar socio-cultural environment and are therefore familiar with the referential conventions of “creators”, make similar constructions of similarity between musical configurations and other things and phenomena as composers and performers. If this process succeeds to some extent, i.e. if composers, performers and listeners construct roughly comparable references between the signifier (sound configurations in a piece of music) and the signified (other things and phenomena), then we call the cognitive-emotive result of this process “understanding” or “understanding of meaning.” We perceive music as meaningful (for details on how music works as a sign system and musical works as sign configurations, see Kutschke 2014 and 2016).

These connections are relevant both for the meaning of gender images and music and musical analysis because composers can use their works (sign configurations), to refer to prevailing gender images and the hierarchies and power relations they manifest. Subsequently, when music is performed and/or heard, music can consolidate existing gender schemas of its listeners through the references that composers, performers and listeners ascribe to it, or—if they deviate from existing conventions—overall reshape them—similar to how we modify consolidated sign practices such as greetings by using alternative greetings (e.g., “Hello!” instead of “Good day”) with a certain consistency and persistence, hoping that they will be recognized and adopted by other participants in our communicative and social environment.

In music, such a modifying sign practice is realized, for example, when a composer chooses the sonata form for his/her composition, but at the same time subverts it by changing the conventions for the design of the first and second subject of the sonata form (1 2nd theme: major and rhythmically emphasized (= male) 2nd theme: minor and melodically emphasized (= female)) ignored. He/she challenges the conventions of sonata form that he/she assumes exist, e.g. when making both subjects “female” or “male” or—as in the first movement of Brahms’ Third Symphony—the second female subject the first male subject in development, in that the first theme adapts the characteristics of the second theme (Citron 1993, Ch. 4; McClary 1991). Whether the listener understands such an approach on the part of a composer as conscious subversion, even if this may not have been intended by the composer, or simply interprets it as a lack of knowledge of the formal traditions, depends crucially depends on the expectations and contextual knowledge with which the audience perceives the work.

In music, such a modifying sign practice is realized, when a composer chooses the sonata form for his/her composition, but at the same time subverts it by changing the conventions for the design of the first and second subject of the sonata form (1 2nd theme: major and rhythmically emphasized (= male) 2nd theme: minor and melodically emphasized (= female)) ignored. He/she challenges the conventions of sonata form that he/she assumes exist, e.g. when making both subjects “female” or “male” or—as in the first movement of Brahms’ Third Symphony—the second female subject the first male subject in development, in that the first theme adapts the characteristics of the second theme (Citron 1993, Ch. 4; McClary 1991). Whether the listener understands such an approach on the part of a composer as a conscious subversion (whether or not it was intended by the composer), or simply interprets it as a lack of knowledge of the formal traditions, crucially depends on the expectations and contextual knowledge shared by the audience perceiving the work.

Musicological gender studie also emphasized that compositional means are by no means equally available to composers in terms of music aesthetics. On the contrary, traditional music-aesthetic discourse and traditional gender discourse, both of which have developed in Western societies over the past 300 years or so, are constituted in such a way that when women compose, they inevitably fall into a classic double bind: a mental (cognitive and/or emotional) “dilemma.” So far, research has not examined in more detail what opportunities women composers had or have in non-Western societies due to the prevailing gender discourse there. It can be assumed, however, that the situation there is by no means more favorable for the acceptance and recognition of women in the composing profession.

According to the theory, the double bind takes the following form: If female composers oriented themselves towards the generally applicable aesthetic values, they were (or are) accused of adapting male characteristics and thus adapting their own betrayed (or treasonous) gender (Kertesz 1998, especially p. 65ff. But works by women composers who created (or create) their music in congruence with societal expectations of the “typically feminine” have also been devalued on the grounds that these works have less aesthetic value (see e.g. Gates 1997 , esp. 63-64, 68; similarly McClary 1991, 115). That the classification of certain compositional features or procedures as “typically male” or “typically female” is by no means codified does not mitigate the aporia created by

the double bind. The essentially arbitrary gender-specific classification of a composition or selected aspects of the composition is sufficient to set the devaluation dynamic in motion. In contrast to compositions by female composers, the risk of devaluation as a result of gender-specific classification is comparatively low in the case of compositions by composers—namely because an aesthetic discourse was developed in the 18th century according to which not only (apparently typical) male but also (apparently typical) female characteristics are understood as features of aesthetically outstanding works of genius (cf. Battersby 1989).

The fact that these connections have now been discussed in detail, and that music listeners, critics and organizers should therefore be largely familiar with them, has so far changed little in the basic situation. The awareness of how social conditions and discourses influence our thoughts and actions, contrary to our own values and imperatives for action, in no way enables us to make ourselves independent of these influences, even if we reject them. Therefore, this article uses both past tense and present tense as grammatical tense in some places.

Even if the aporetic double bind has so far been described primarily by musicologists as a discursive phenomenon in the reception of music (in music criticism, etc.), the dilemma remains relevant for musical analysis. Working hypotheses can be derived from it about compositional strategies female composers might have chosen to escape the double bind, even if this is not logically possible, and even if it is theoretically possible that no female composer ever deals with the theory. (The focus of this article is on strategies and perspectives that result from gender theories and gender discourse for musical analysis. Whether female composers have ever behaved in accordance with theories and discourse is irrelevant for the importance of theories and discourse for musical analysis .)

A comparatively small, seemingly marginal, but extremely exciting and fruitful field of research is that devoted to the musical representation of madness—in combination with “genius” and “excess”- and hysteria (as a “typically female” catch-all diagnosis). This research area is interesting for musical analysis because— as McClary has shown— composers employed the composition of madness arias long before the 19th and early 20th centuries, i.e. the era of hysteria, to test violations of musical rules and at the same time to legitimize them as resulting from the inner logic of the work (McClary 1991, Chapter 4). Studies reconstructing these transgressions include those by Lawrence Kramer (1993), Catherine Clement (1979) and Romana Margherita Pugliese (2004), in addition to that of McClary.

Another trend in gender research in musicology relevant to music analysis, is diverse sexual orientations. Since the late 1990s, musicologists, music theorists, and other humanities scholars have focused on understanding whether different sexual orientations shape the making of music. One of the central questions here is whether the specific perspective that homosexuals [Beate’s term, not mine] have on society and their own role in it, which differs from the heterosexual perspective, as reflected in compositions (on the eventual manifestation of homosexuality in the works of Tchaikovsky and Britten e.g.: see Jackson 1995 and Brett, Doctor and Haggerty 2006).

After the turn of the new millennium, the thematization of and allusions to BDSM (i.e. alternative sexual practices based on mutual consent), sadism (understood as social, sexualised violence) and masochism (as a myth of the “natural” female disposition to passivity and desire to suffer) (see Warwick 2011 and Butkus 2010) (see 3.). In this context, the idea arose that some avant-garde musical works manifest sadomasochistic conditions themselves insofar as composers such as Brian Ferneyhough and György Ligeti, for example, make demands on performers that in principle overtax the musicians’ possibilities or at least drive them to a limit (see Friedl 2002). In this context, musical analysis focuses on the degree of difficulty of its musical implementation.

What all of the mentioned trends in gender-oriented music analysis have in common is that they do not examine compositional structures as an end in themselves, but are hermeneutically oriented. They pursue the goal of (re-)constructing the relationship between musical configurations

and the real world. Gender-oriented music analysis can thus be seen in the context of musicological developments since the 1980s. At that time, a younger generation of American musicologists devalued scientific approaches to music as positivist if, as had been the case in music theory since 1945, they limited the analysis of music solely to its inner-musical contexts (“formalism”, “the music itself” (TMI)) or the reconstruction of musico-historical facts and details without the reconstruction being integrated into a more extensive one (on the critique of traditional musicology and music theory, see Kerman 1985, 12ff).

In deliberate contrast to the idea of music as an autonomous art form, the advocates of a new, critically-oriented musicology, which they called New Musicology (including Joseph Kerman, Rose Rosengard Subotnick, Lawrence Kramer and Susan McClary), cultivated a general hermeneutical access to musical works and their analysis that focused on the inner and outer meaning of music, and reconstructed(ed) the musical form as an effect of extra-musical factors. They did and do this on the basis of the sign-theoretical connections described above—albeit mostly without being aware of the semiotic foundation of their approach. In this context, gender roles, gender images and sexual practices represent an essential factor for the form of the compositions, and gender studies in musicology are therefore considered by some musicologists to be a “specialized branch of the new musicology” (Joe 1999, 483).

By pursuing specific objectives in line with its subject matter, gender-oriented music analysis encourages the development of new analytical theories and perspectives (as in section 2.). It does this because connections between gender images and musical structures cannot be reconstructed solely with conventional music-analytical instruments. The innovative function of gender-oriented music analysis is demonstrated in those academic studies that focus on the specific body and bodily experiences of women, men, hermaphrodites and transsexuals as composers, musicians and music listeners. [Again, Beate’s terms] In these studies, Voice and vocal treatment, sound characteristics and performance techniques come to the fore as essential components of music, whereas conventional music-analytical tools and objects (music text, primary musical parameters) are no longer effective. Previous research in this area has of course placed the greatest emphasis on theory formation (cf. e.g. Nieberle 2000 and Cusick 1999). In contrast, there is currently a lack of mature sound-analytical tools and elaborate terminology that spell out the connection between voice, body and gender, comparable to the tools and terminology of “classical” musical analysis. These studies therefore don’t reach the analytical depth and sophistication characteristic of traditional musical analysis.

2. Analysis (Beate Kutschke)

When Susan McClary’s monograph *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality* (McClary 1991) appeared in 1991, the essay collection was taken up by advocates of gender studies as trend-setting and paradigmatic of the most advanced state of the field. One of the anthology’s central theses was that the major-minor tonal system articulates the repressive, patriarchal order that existed alongside the oppression of the body—especially the female body—and its needs and desires, articulated by means of musical analogies (McClary 1991, 31, 79, 120). In relation to this thesis, *Feminine Endings* offered new readings of selected works from the canonical music repertoire such as Lucia’s madness aria—“Recitative and Aria No. 14”, in Act III of *Lucia di Lammermoor* (1835).

McClary’s interpretation of the scene describes Lucia gaining strength by abandoning the diatonic, formal regularity and regular melodic lines that characterize the castle’s inhabitants. By characterizing Lucia’s musical appearance as excessive and transgressive, she is linked with both Foucault and feminist theories of the 1980s (Showalter 1985, Foucault 1961 (1972)). Elaine Showalter’s research on the medical and social marginalization of women in the 19th century provided a basis for this interpretation. According to Showalter, mental illness was coded as

inherently female (and opposed to male rationality). Female insanity was closely linked to sexuality; it was determined and defined by a male society that stifled the danger posed by women.

The libretto written by Salvatore Cammarano for Gaetano Donizetti's opera portrays Lucia as a prototypical madwoman according to a nineteenth-century notion of mental illness. Similar to Elaine Showalter's history of hysteria as a typically female illness (1985), Lucia, according to Cammarano's account, evades the demands made by her family to marry the unloved Arturo for political-strategic reasons and to renounce her beloved Edgardo by escaping into madness. Referring to Showalter's studies, McClary shows that Donizetti—consciously or unconsciously—recreates through musical means the workings of “nineteenth-century female madness.” McClary shows that Donizetti's music stages “excesses,” which can be interpreted both as a manifestation of actual mental illness, i.e. pathologically abnormal behavior according to the current definition, and excessive sexual desire according to that period's explanation of the causes of hysteria, and can be understood as a subversive rebellion against the existing social constraints towards women (Showalter 1985, 5ff).

McClary identifies musical excesses in the harmonic design (deviations from the standard) and ornamentation in the cabaletta “Spargi d'amoro pianto” (T 258ff), i.e. the second, fast part of the two-part aria. According to McClary, the first excess manifests itself in the fact that a modulation from E-flat to B-flat major is properly prepared, but not consolidated. Instead what follows is a second modulation to G-flat major, through a reinterpretation of A-flat minor, based on an E-flat major, add 6th with lowered third, which forms the ii of G-flat major (bar 288f). [If you reference the analysis in McClary, the bar numbers don't add up; I think McClary started at the beginning of the aria, while Kutschke is referring to the score as a whole]. McClary relates the modulation from B-flat major to G-flat major to Lucia's socio-mental state insofar as a modulation by minor sixth is considered an established trope for reference to the fantastic (see the explanations of Taruskin and others: McClary 1991, 93; Taruskin 2010, 69-73). Both the fantastic and madness, it should be added, denote unrealistic cognitive states. McClary understands the introduction of tonal material related to the target key of G-flat major—G-flat and C-flat—as working with musical-symbolic means against the social demands directed at Lucia and the marriage of convenience. In contrast, McClary interprets the harmonically regular passages—the continuation of F9 to B-flat major (in E-flat major) and the standardized cadence progression from ii via V7 to I (in G-flat major)—as analogies to social subordination (“submissive” and “demure” behavior), interpreted to follow intersubjectively valid logic, which is of course converted into a “perverse logic” through the deviating modulation,” as Lucia's own personal logic (McClary 1991, 93).

In summary, McClary interprets the beginning of the Cabaletta as a vacillation between conformity and subordination on the one hand and revolt on the other. From McClary's analysis it can be concluded that music in Lucia's madness aria is a structural analogue to real-world conditions in two respects: first as an analogue to cognitive-emotive structures ("mental health vs. mental illness") and second to social structures ("Order, Convention and Heteronomous Adjustment vs. Deviation, Excess and Revolt"). The music operates as a signifier that refers to various signifieds. Semiotically formulated, the musical "deviation" is doubly encoded: it can be understood as mental illness from the perspective of society and as revolt and autonomy from the perspective of the "deviant." McClary relates the Cabaletta as a whole to the prevailing view at the time the opera was composed that female insanity was caused by excessive sexual desire (Showalter 1985, 132). The musicologist suggests that we understand the coloratura-like runs and jumps of this part, in which the voice operates as a synecdoche of the female sexual body, as an expression of erotic excess (McClary 1991, 96-98).

Both analogies are far from unassailable. The interpretation of harmonic deviation as "madness" and "subversive revolt" can be countered by the fact that—unlike in social associations, in which rules and legal norms often have a strong binding or even mandatory character, the selective deviation from conformity to the rules represents a basic compositional principle in the 19th century, which itself proves the mastery of the musicians. The interpretation of ornamentation as (erotic) excess can be rejected by pointing out that ornamentation (particularly in the variative sections in the second half of the Cabaletta) is not a deviation from the genre's history, but quite the contrary is typical of the genre. According to the genre tradition, cabalettas generally aim to express heightened emotionality that transcends the bounds of the normal and the mundane; in this sense they approach insanity (in the sense of a common parlance, rather than a synonym for a mental illness). If this is so, however, then madness as the "subject" of an aria should manifest itself in the excess already provided for in the Cabaletta and Stretta to allow made even more excess than usual. However, this is not the case with regard to ornamentation.

But contrary to those objections, McClary's hermeneutic analysis can be supported with regard to the design of the musical form. In contrast to McClary's analysis of harmony and ornamentation, this demonstrates a clear break with the genre tradition. The dominant form for Italian operatic arias in the early 19th century was the two-part aria form, consisting of a slow first part (*adagio*, *cantabile*) and a fast second part, the cabaletta, whose energy is further enhanced by the *stretta*, a variant of the finale or the coda in instrumental music. Both sections of the aria were framed by recitatives that drive the action forward and/or justify the singer's change of mood. It is quite common in the 19th century for composers to dramaturgically adapt the simple formal scheme to the dramatic needs. For example, in Violetta's aria "A forse lui" in Verdi's 1853 *Traviata*, the librettist/composers team Francesco Maria Piave and Giuseppe Verdi incorporate Alfredo's backstage vocal interpolations that prompt Violetta's outburst of unbridled enthusiasm in the repetition of the Cabaletta and particularly in the *Stretta*. Yet the formal excess in *Traviata* is moderate compared to that in *Lucia di Lammermoor*, composed 25 years earlier. Donizetti lets Lucia "pick apart" the two-part aria form. (The composer proceeded in a similar way in the madness aria of Anna Boleyn before her execution in the opera of the same name from 1830; Anna also escapes from social constraint—her execution as a result of an intrigue—by detaching herself from reality and then dying.)

The rupture of the two-part aria form as a paradigm of Italian aria form in the early 19th century, and as an analogue for deparating social conventions and constraints, goes so far in Lucia's madness aria that it is difficult to identify the formal scheme. The recitative preceding the slow aria section (*Larghetto*) is no less than 120 measures long. It is so melodic at the beginning that hews closer to the character of an *Arioso*. From m. 18 (with an upbeat) a melody follows constructed symmetrically from two four measure groups (2+2+2+2), which gives the impression that the slow

aria section has begun. But the symmetrical melody dissolves into coloratura from m. 25. Only from m. 27 does a formal part appear that can actually be described as a recitative. The measure of recitative/arioso that follow up to m. 119 are characterized by strong changes in mood and tempo: Allegretto (m. 42), Allegro vivace (m. 51), Larghetto (m. 89), Andante (m. 99), Allegro (m. 113). When the first slow aria section finally begins in m. 120, solo flute (or glass harmonica) plays the melody, while Lucia, accompanying it, sings only recitative-like fragments “over it.” Only in m. 134 does Lucia finally take over the melody from the flute/glass harmonica. But the regular, symmetrical melody formation does not get beyond the first eight measures. The form slips back into recitative, after which she bursts out into wild coloratura. The ambiguity of the form here continues for at least another 300 measures. The aria’s excessive length—it lasts 15 minutes, depending on the performance tempo—is in itself an excess. Both the demolition of the form and the transgression of the usual length are mutually dependent. Such a long duration can’t be realized within the standard division of the two-part aria form; it requires numerous interpolations. Conversely, demolishing the form via interpolations automatically means that the duration of the aria is significantly increased.

What can be gleaned from analysis for understanding music and for madness in the early 19th century? The cultural scientific and historical knowledge regarding madness at the time of *Lucia di Lammermoor*’s creation (see Showalter 1985, Foucault 1988 and further references therein) assigns meaning to Donizetti’s compositional technique that can’t be traced back to conventional rules. To put it bluntly, the aesthetic quality the aria, in its entire spectrum, only becomes clear from the perspective of gender. Donizetti’s compositional strategies buttress Showalter’s historical studies, according to which emotional and erotic excess, as well as deviation from structural social order represented components of the concept of madness as a female disease in the early 19th. century, which were so central and universally recognized that Donizetti could expect audiences would understand his compositional construction of female madness in music.

3. The reception of McClary’s Schubert criticism (Amy Bauer)

McClary’s essay on Schubert’s “Unfinished” Symphony answered many of her critics’s queries, and proved more influential than any single discussion in *Feminine Endings* (McClary 1992 and 2006). McClary claimed that her analysis was prompted by student reaction to what they perceived to be a “gay” approach to composition in Schubert, but the article’s publication dovetailed with renewed speculation on Schubert’s sexuality within musicology, initiated by Maynard Solomon and enshrined in a special issue of *19th-Century Music on Schubert and sexuality* (Solomon 1989, *19th-Century Music* 1993). Presenting an alternative explanation to those focusing on the socio-political context of Schubert composing the “Unfinished”, McClary’s analysis endeavors to explain harmonic and formal deviations from High Classic sonata forms in terms of a gendered notion of subjectivity (subjectivity as considered in the long tradition of subject-oriented hermeneutic criticism, but especially in feminist criticism; see Abrams 1999) . If Beethoven’s forms can be “accepted as an ideal of masculinity in music” (here she is careful to sidestep essentialism by stressing a socially-constituted ideal), then we can consider Schubert’s models as an alternative construction of self, one that disdains “goal-oriented desire per se for the sake of a sustained image of pleasure and an open, flexible sense of self” (McClary 2006, 223).

McClary says little about the first movement, citing it as one of Schubert’s victim narratives, “in which a sinister affective realm sets the stage for the vulnerable lyrical subject, which is doomed to be quashed” (McClary 2006, 225). But she limns the means by which the form and modulatory scheme of the second movement display excess, pleasure and play with an open, flexible sense of self and porous ego boundaries—a kind of subjectivity characteristic of queer culture, as cited below. This subjectivity is expressed harmonically as “pleasurable pivots ... [that] entice” the E major

theme to the keys of C# minor, G major, and E minor in the first 29 measures. When the proper subject enters in measures 33–47, it turns “grim” as it submits to the “authority” of C# minor. The second key area passes through radical changes in “affective clothing,” set to “twisting harmonies,” but cannot escape C#/Db. Tonal centrality thus represents a “prison” that traps subjectivity, until the second theme splits into two personae. The recapitulation discards the fourth and final version of the second theme by merging it with the opening materials. The fusion of themes through a “mysterious enharmonic pivot between E and Ab major” leads to transcendence through G#/Ab (McClary 2006, 215). In summary, Schubert’s secondary keys never reinforce the tonic triad; common-tone pivots to chromatic chords create new narrative structures, akin to those that produced much gay fiction, citing a narrative paradigm that literary theorist Earl Jackson calls “intersubjective narcissism” (Jackson 118–119, cited in McClary 2006, 223).

As an analysis of gay subjectivity located within the musical structure, McClary’s analysis presumes much, and leaves many questions unanswered. It rests on the assumptions laid out in *Feminine Endings* that High Classical norms rest on a gendered foundation associated with male heterosexuality. The essay’s focus on sexuality deliberately ignores the effect of class, social context, personal illness and the formal and harmonic innovations of Schubert’s contemporaries on his compositional development. And the broad analysis ignores the counterpoint between melody and bass that could explain harmonic regularities at the surface. Yet McClary’s analysis of the “Unfinished” cast a shadow over Schubert studies, long haunted by the idea that Schubert’s forms and harmonic schemes were aberrant for their time (see the literature review in Korstvedt 2016). McClary’s interpretation takes what were long considered flaws or even failures of Schubert’s harmonic language—measured time and again against Beethoven’s example—as virtues, markers of a novel, more personal approach to form and harmonic language. In one sense, her analytic approach revived a hermeneutics of subjectivity practiced by Donald Tovey in the early twentieth-century, and broached tentatively by Edward T. Cone’s account of melancholy in *Moment musical*, No. 6 and Hugh Macdonald’s analysis of “volcanic temper” in several works (Cone 1982, MacDonald 1978).

Those analysts explicitly emboldened by McClary’s example include Richard Kurth, who illuminates McClary’s notion of a “victim narrative” in the first movement with an analysis of the dialectical conflict between 3/4 and 6/8 meters, as a further exploration of “an individual subjectivity abiding in the music’s representational potentiality” (Kurth 1982, 26). Suzannah Clark accepts McClary’s main point as “incontrovertible: Schubert’s music depicts a markedly different version of masculinity from the prevailing norm of masculinity,” although she points out that this norm is a cultural construction (Clark 2011, 187). Considering the current theoretical landscape—in which third relations have been valorized and domesticated by neo-Riemannian theory—Clark notes, as did McClary, that Schubert’s thirds are not Beethoven’s thirds. To those who might critique any analysis of subjectivity in music, Clark reminds us that even Hanslick identified a subject position in the “Unfinished.” But Clark chides McClary for not noticing that Schubert’s recapitulation does not return wholly to the tonic; instead, in an *au courant* trope that was pervasive in the mid-19th century, Schubert shifts the submediant theme to the mediant (Clark 2011, 188). Because McClary eschews extended formal explanation, she misses both the harmonic richness and the tonal stability found in the second movement, in which enharmonic pivots are shaded by their new context, but each third related key is anchored by a PAC (Clark 2011, 189, 192–3).

One could argue that later analyses of the “Unfinished” not explicitly grounded in an analysis of gay subjectivity remain indebted to McClary’s account, in their explorations of subjectivity as it relates to affective states, suggestive borrowings, and social context. These include Michael Spitzer’s cognitive analysis of fear in both D. 759 and *Erlkönig*, Glenn Stanley’s mapping of the *ombre* music in *Don Giovanni* to the symphony, and the perception that Schubert’s late instrumental music, tied to a specific Biedermeier social milieu, represents the birth of a distinctly modern consciousness, as

noted by Benjamin Korstvedt and John Gingerich (Spitzer 2010, Stanley, 2016, Gingerich 2007, Korstvedt 2016, 412).

As a shock tactic intended to open up a discursive space within musicology and music theory, McClary's rhetorical feints were a resounding success. Music theory may have been defined by its gendered attributes, but McClary was careful to leave the definition of fundamental terms such as feminine or masculine open-ended, and she left plenty of questions open for debate by future scholars. She demanded that analysts accept the representational aspects of music, and consider the ethical implications of aesthetic values (see Taruskin 2009 for an account of her impact). The new musicology initiated a new era of hermeneutic criticism in Anglo-American musicology, one that drew on precise music-theoretic tools, in-depth socio-cultural analysis, and political context, alongside of considerations of gender, sexuality, ethnicity and religion. But music theorizing about music and gender—at least in its explicitly feminist form—gained little traction in ensuing decades. Kofi Agawu tried to tame the prospect of “factoring sexual politics into musical analysis” by restricting it to the poietic level of a semiotic framework. He warned that finding “iconic representation” of a composer's sexuality in his music has no force unless it is in some sense essentialized: based on rules that define the nature of homosexual creativity, a sentiment echoed by James Webster (Agawu 1993, 82–3, Webster 1993, 90).

McClary's “Paradigm Dissonances: Music Theory, Cultural Studies, Feminist Criticism” framed the issue of a gendered music theory more broadly, chiding theorists who “sustain the illusion that the objects of their study reside outside the social world” (McClary 1994, 59). Nonetheless McClary dismissed the culture war between music theory and feminist criticism with a call to meet under the umbrella of cultural studies, where we can all find common ground outside of music “just about music,” and engage in some healthy self-reflection in the form of a personalized ethnology (McClary 1994, 68, 78). McClary's analysis of Bizet's *Carmen* serves as a model of this new theoretical paradigm, although her discussion would be at home in any topic-centered analysis that included the work's reception history.

4. Recent work in feminist and queer music theory

In recent years a gendered approach to music analysis has taken several distinct forms that by necessity overlap. Most feminist music scholars identify what might constitute a feminist or gendered music theory with a more holistic approach to analysis. Marion Guck, Claire Detels, Fred Maus, Rosemary Killam and Marianne Kielen-Gilbert identify a feminist music theory with an inclusive approach to analysis that encompasses a plurality of approaches toward the work, embracing the phenomenal experience of listeners alongside social, cultural, and formal approaches (Detels 1992, Guck 1994, Killam 1993, Maus 1993, Kilian-Gilbert 1994).

One approach that follows McClary's example seeks to analyze the music of women and queer composers with a sensitivity towards how the composer's gender (or gendered expression, in the case of queer composers), may be expressed in their music. Marcia Citron broaches this question in the fourth chapter of *Gender and the Musical Canon*, published in 1993 (Citron 1993, 145–63). Her discussion of Cecile Chaminade's Sonata, Op. 21 carefully delineates its full cultural context before attempting a formal analysis. Chaminade's Sonata is unique in her output as the only sonata among more than 200 piano works (primarily character pieces), and is dedicated to Moszkowski (which may explain the choice of a “Germanic” form). Citron takes Chaminade's gender, training, intended audience, and the role of the sonata in late nineteenth-century France into account when speculating on the odd form of the first movement, in which sonata form, character piece, and prelude and fugue intermingle. The movement's clear thematicism and tonal and rhythmic stability—along with a straightforward recapitulation—map out sonata form, but a predominant tonal stasis, expected tonal confirmations that fail to arrive, and the strange proportions of the second theme (introduced as a

fughetta) fit uncomfortably within the form. Citron concludes that, if the movement can be gendered feminine, it is only in its refusal to play by the accepted rules, whether as the result of a strategy of feminine resistance or a general discomfort with sonata form (Citron 1993, 154, 158).

Two contemporary analysts follow Marcia Citron's approach, and that of the later McClary, by practicing close analytic readings informed by a fully-fleshed out cultural and social context. Francesca Draughon interrogates the sometimes conflicting associations among gender, class and modernity represented by Ländler and Waltz in the Scherzo of Mahler's Ninth Symphony (Draughon 2003). Christina Gier's close analyses of Berg are grounded in Berg's reading of the *Frauenfrage*, the texts he chose to set, his social and cultural context, and his personal relationships to Helene Berg and Frida Semler. (Gier 2005, 2007).

Such an analysis may take the form of examining masculine notions of virility, as shown by Judith Tick's work on the music of Charles Ives (Tick 1993), but has been explored most consistently in analytic work on twentieth-century female composers. Marianne Kielen-Gilbert, for instance, explores engages poetry and the performer's subjectivity in a creative, allegorical reading of feminine relational spaces in Rebecca Clarke's Sonata for Violin and Piano (1919) (Kielen-Gilbert 1999). Judith Lochhead finds a sensitive negotiation of difference in her otherwise formalist analysis of Sofia Gubaidulina's String Quartet No. 2 (1987) (Lochhead 2016). Most pathbreaking in this regard was Ellie Hisama's monograph on the music of Marion Bauer, Ruth Crawford Seeger and Miriam Gideon (Hisama 2001). As did Lochhead, Hisama employs traditional means of formalist analysis as a means towards exploring feminine subjectivity in each composer's works, with reference to biographical documents and writings as a way to avoid the epistemological issues posed by making truth claims based solely on the music itself. Her argument that complex voice crossings within the primarily four-part texture of Crawford's String Quartet (1931) represent a feminist counternarrative to the typical dynamic propulsion towards climax found in the work of male composers represents a 'space of resistance' akin to that expressed by Crawford in diary entries on her exclusion from the orbit of male composers. Such expressions are unique to each work; for instance, a song by Bauer is characterized by "contour deviance," while her discussion of Gideon's "Esther" for violin and piano examines the agency of the titular character within the biblical Book of Esther.

As shown by the work of Lochhead and Hisama, the second form of gender-based analysis is one that rehabilitates the role of formalist analysis in expressing not only gender but political critique. As Martin Scherzinger notes, the New Musicology sometimes presented a similar self-enclosed system of relations between world and work, "simply transposing those attributes formerly associated with musical form onto the world and then reading them as if they were a genuinely historical or sociological approach to the musical object" (Scherzinger 2004, 253). Model analyses in this vein by David Lewin and Poundie Burstein each begin with a singular example and well-defined issue, one that, upon examination, opens out to reveal greater implications for our gendered understanding of musical structure. Lewin's discussion of the "Transfiguration" in *Tristan and Isolde* tackles Lawrence Kramer's assertion that Isolde's near repetition of Tristan's line from the Transfiguration's first section "acts as a denial of sexual difference" (Kramer 1990, 164–5, cited in Lewin 1992, 464). Lewin begs to differ, as this line in register—like that of many other "transcendent" voices in the history of opera—could only be sung by a woman. By analogy, instrumental music that follows this model revels in a specific freedom accorded solely to the female voice, which is "typically acoustically free of what we conceive as a functional bass line— whether continuo or fundamental bass" (the final two movements of Schoenberg's Second String Quartet, Op. 10 serves as Lewin's exemplar; Lewin 1992, 473). Lewin's modest observation has far-reaching aesthetic ramifications: it suggests rethinking the hierarchical importance placed on the fundamental bass in the history of music theory, and encourages a greater appreciation for the importance of upper voices and their play with the bass—and the notions of presence and absence—in musical structure.

Burstein takes a similar approach in his examination of lyricism and gender in Schubert's G Major String Quartet (Burstein 1997). Burstein begins with a specifically *analytic* reception history of Schubert, wherein the composer's melodic gifts are given faint praise as a means of denigrating the structural soundness of his works overall. Burstein's interrogation of "the lyrical" becomes a sustained exploration of how insidious musical stereotypes persist. Gendered as feminine, "the lyrical" allowed analysts to forgo rigorous analysis, and thus perpetuate the trope that Schubert's large structures were defective, rather than pervaded by an organic logic, a logic he illustrates through linear and harmonic analysis. For instance, the resolutions of a V⁶₅ of D in measure 43 is thwarted, as the bass line descends C#-C-B in measures 43–51. The chord's harmonic implications are instead fulfilled in a more discursive manner several bars hence. And the transition section closes on F# major (the dominant of III), which "softens" the harmonic drive to the second key area, and is later "absorbed" within D major as a chromaticized III chord (Burstein 1997, 53–4). Burstein's combined historical and analytic purview uncovers the roots of what Fred Maus defined as the masculinize discourse of contemporary music theory (Maus 1993). Burstein asks whether the anxiety that afflicted the musicological community when scholars began interrogating the composer's sexuality was quite simply a reaction to long-running fears concerning the structure of Schubert's music. Schubert's style had been coded as feminine for over a century, in a binary opposition that clearly positions the feminine as defective; such hidden codes pervade our contemporary analyses, and prevent us from recognizing the structural value and logic in Schubert and similar tonally discursive, "lyrical" works.

Scherzinger offers a radical form of this critique when he suggests that the prevalence of symmetrical inversion in the work of Anton Webern may reflect the conversations prevalent in early twentieth-century Europe on gender inversion prompted by the work of Karl Ulrichs and his followers. He notes provocatively "to grant the symmetrical inversions in Webern's music a sonic quality that radically disorients the gendered accretions of habitual listening is also to unleash a new order of possibilities for ordering human life." (Scherzinger 1997, 139) Scherzinger brings the discussion back to listening, one of the primary influences on musicology in recent years with the rise of sound studies and affect theory. Hence the third trend in gender analysis is one that focuses on the analyst as listener, as first expressed in Maus 1993 and elaborated further in subsequent years (Maus 2004, Maus 2009 and Maus 2013). Such reflections have opened up a space for the discussion of what might constitute a queer music theory, such as that discussed in panels at the 2014 and 2015 meetings of the American Musicological Society and Society for Music Theory ("Queer Music Theory: Interrogating Notes of Sexuality," 2014 and "Queering Musical Form," 2015).

The most cogent expression of this trend is found in Gavin Lee's recent "Queer Music Theory" (Lee 2019). Inspired by Sara Ahmed's elaboration of a "queer phenomenology," Lee argues that the ethical connotations of queer listening can be found in analytic approaches that embody self-criticism and explorations of musical ambiguity. Lee argues that just such a "queer formalism" can be noted in David Lewin's analysis of Schubert's song *Morgengruß* in his influential paper "Music Theory, Phenomenology, and Modes of Perception" (Lewin 1986). In this paper Lewin devised a perception model for analysis meant to bridge the gap between written music theory and the listening experience. Lee hears in *Morgengruß* something disorientingly "queer about the rejected male courter, who, spurned by the one he loves, fails to enter into heteronormativity. (Lee 2019, 2). This queerness is expressed by the tonal ambiguity that occurs when C major shifts to D minor and then C minor. Lewin's analysis of this passage was also inspired by his disorientation as a listener, one who rejects a hierarchical reading—wherein D minor and C minor function as mere elaborations of C—as the only possible analysis. Instead Lewin present nine multiple perceptions of chord progressions that occur within measures 9–15, several perceptions of which rely on recursive analyses that draw on preceding or anticipated musical events. Lewin does not call his model a

“theory” per se, given that it could never fully embrace musical perception in all its varieties, but merely as a more flexible formalist approach that might be supplemented by further poetic analysis.

The disorientations introduced by Lewin’s analysis—which include Lewin’s dissatisfaction with his own model—represent for Lee a form of Ahmed’s queer phenomenology: the disorientation experienced by intersecting bodies that follow different embodiments conditioned by ethnicity or gender. Such an orientation attempts to satisfy both a sexual and political anti-normative orientation, while allowing the expression of specific experiences or racial and/or sexual marginality. As an example, Lee draws on Maus 1993 and 2013 to show how such specific experiences could include the “high camp” of Lewin’s poetic suggestion that Gb in *Morgengruß* “comes out of the closet” as F# (Lewin 1986, 390, cited in Lee 2019, 6) and the notion of the passive listener overwhelmed by the music as presenting a “gay-friendly” subjectivity. Such an approach to analysis would accommodate tenets of BDSM theory that see the gay masochist as an active agent in his subjugation. (Max Silva touches on the role BDSM theory might play in the analysis of contemporary music in Silva 2018, 82). Lee proposes queer formalism as an expansive category that would include four categories: 1. Gendered readings of particular works, such as McClary’s discussion of Tchaikovsky in *Feminine Endings* (McClary 1991, 69–79), 2. theories of musical non-normativity broadly construed, 3. theories of the relation between gender and sexual categories and general musical procedures (such as Scherzinger 1997), and theories of the relation between gender and sexuality and the practice of music theory as a field. As such, Lee’s proposed queer theory would encompass all the approaches we note above, within a larger framework that promotes anti-normativity while paying heed to the musical, gendered, sexual and racial embodiment of marginalized lives.

5. Summar and Outlook

Sections 1. und 2: New Musicology (to which McClary and Gender Studies belong) initiated a music-analytical approach to music based on Kretzschmar’s hermeneutic tradition, but did so with a much more substantive method in three respects: first, it was analytically more precise and subtle; second, it supported analytical findings through an in-depth socio-cultural and political contextualization; and third, it placed particular emphasis on issues of gender and sexuality. McClary developed the method but was analytically rather superficial.

While Susan McClary’s work in *Feminine Endings* was a founding text of the “New Musicology,” it was her analysis of Schubert’s “Unfinished” Symphony—arriving at a crucial point in Schubert studies—that spurred further gender-oriented work within Anglo-American musicology. McClary’s personalized claims left room for scholars to define their own approach to a music criticism with greater attention to social and cultural relevance. Yet few in the music theoretic community followed her lead, possibly due to the difficulty—inherent to formalist analysis—in avoiding overtly essentialized cultural claims about the music itself. The 1990s saw music theorists identify a reception-oriented, more encompassing approach to analysis as explicitly feminist, while also including the gendered identity of composers into account within a more traditional analytic framework. This may include explicit political critique as well, as suggested most recently by Gavin Lee’s embrace of the varied approaches summed up in this chapter under the umbrella of an explicitly Queer Theory that embraces all non-normative approaches to music theory analysis.

Bibliography

- Ahmed, Sarah (2006): *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Battersby, Christine (1989): *Gender and genius—towards a feminist aesthetics*, London: Women’s Press.
Brett, Philip; Doctor, Jenny; Haggerty, George E. et al. (2006), *Music and Sexuality in Britten: Selected Essays*, Berkeley.

- Burstein, Poundie (1997): „Structure, and Gender in Schubert’s G Major String Quartet“, *The Musical Quarterly* 81/1, pp. 51–63.
- Butkus, Clarice (2010): „Depraved desire: Sodomasochism, sexuality and sound in mid-1970s cinema“, in Bruce Johnson (ed.), *Earogenous zones: Sound, sexuality and cinema*. London: Equinox, pp. 66-88.
- Citron, Marcia J. (1993): *Gender and the musical canon*, Cambridge.
- Clément, Catherine (1979) : *L’opéra ou la défaite des femmes*. Paris: B. Grasset.
- Cusick, Suzanne G. (1993): „On musical performances of gender and sex“, in Elaine Barkin und Lydia Hamessly (eds.), *Audible traces: Gender, identity, and music*, Zürich und Los Angeles, pp. 25-49.
- Detels, Claire (1994): „Autonomist/Formalist Aesthetics, Music Theory, and the Feminist Paradigm of Soft Boundaries“, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 52/1, pp. 113-126.
- Draughon, Francesca (2003): „Dance of Decadence: Class, Gender, and Modernity in the Scherzo of Mahler’s Ninth Symphony“, *The Journal of Musicology* 20/3, pp. 388–413.
- Foucault, Michel (1972) : *Histoire de la folie à l’âge classique* (1961). [Paris]: Gallimard.
- Friedl, Reinhold (2002): „Some sodomasochistic aspects of musical pleasure“, *Leonardo music journal*, 12, pp. 29-30.
- Gates, Eugene (1991): „Damned If You Do and Damned If You Don’t: Sexual Aesthetics and the Music of Dame Ethel Smyth“, in *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 31/1, pp. 63-71.
- Gier, Christina (2005): „Sounding the Frauensee: Gender, Modernism, and Intertextuality in Alban Berg’s “Über die Grenzen, op. 4, no. 3”, *Women and Music* 9, pp. 51–68.
- Gier, Christina (2007): „Truth, Gender, and Sex: Berg’s Schnitzler and Motivic Processes in “Reigen,” Op. 6“, *Journal of Musicological Research* 26/4, pp. 353–75.
- Hepokoski, James (2009): *Music, Structure, Thought: Selected Essays*. Abingdon: Ashgate.
- Hisama, Ellie M. (2001): *Gendering Musical Modernism: The Music of Ruth Crawford, Marion Bauer, and Miriam Gideon*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, Timothy L. (1995): „Aspects of Sexuality and Structure in the Later Symphonies of Tchaikovsky“, *Music Analysis*, 14/1, pp. 3-25.
- Joe, Jeongwon (1999): “New Musicology”, in Murray Steib (ed.), *Reader’s guide to music: history, theory, criticism*, Chicago und London: Fitzroy Dearborn, pp. 482-484.
- Kerman, Joseph (1985): *Contemplating music: challenges to musicology*, Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.
- Kertesz, Elizabeth, „Gender and Beyond: Talking about the Critical Reception of Ethel Smyth“, in Stefan Fragner, Jan Hemming and Beate Kutschke (eds.), *Gender Studies und Musik: Geschlechterrollen und ihre Bedeutung für die Musikwissenschaft*, Regensburg: Conbrio, 1998, pp. 65-74.
- Kielian-Gilbert, Marianne (1994): „Of Poetics and Poiesis, Pleasure and Politics—Music Theory and Modes of the Feminine,” *Perspectives of New Music* 32/1, pp. 353–75.
- _____ (1999): „On Rebecca Clarke’s Sonata for Viola and Piano: Feminine Spaces and Metaphors of Reading“, in Elaine Barkin und Lydia Hamessly (eds.), *Audible traces: Gender, identity, and music*, Zürich und Los Angeles, pp. 71-114.
- Killam, Rosemary N. (1993): „Women Working: An Alternative to Gans,” *Perspectives of New Music* 32/1, pp. 230–51.
- Kramer, Lawrence (1990): *Music as Cultural Practice 1800-1900*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____ (1993): „Fin-de-siècle Fantasies: Elektra, Degeneration and Sexual Science“, *Cambridge Opera Journal*, 5:2, pp. 141-165.
- Kutschke, Beate (2014): „Music and other sign systems”, *Music Theory Online* 20/4, <http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.14.20.4/mto.14.20.4.kutschke.html>.
- Kutschke, Beate (2016): „Wann und warum ist Musik Ideologem? Vier Thesen aus semiotischer Perspektive”, in Wolfgang Auhagen und Wolfgang Hirschmann (eds.), *Bericht zur Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung in Halle, 29. September bis 2. Oktober 2015*, <http://schott-campus.com/wann-und-warum-ist-musik-ideologem/>.
- Lee, Gavin (2019): „Queer Music Theory”, *Music Theory Spectrum* 42/1, pp. 1–11.
- Lewin, David (1986): „Music Theory, Phenomenology, and Modes of Perception“, *Music Perception* 3/4, pp. 327–92.
- _____ (1992): „Women’s Voices and the Fundamental Bass,” *Journal of Musicology* 20/3, pp. 388–412.

- Lochhead, Judith (2016): „Sofia Gubaidulina, String Quartet No. 2 (1987)“, in Laurel Parsens and Brenda Ravenscroft (eds.), *Analytical Essays on Music by Women Composers: Concert Music, 1960–2000*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 102–26.
- Maus, Fred Everett (1993): „Masculinist Discourse in Music Theory“, *Perspectives of New Music* 31/2, pp. 264–93.
- (2004): „The Disciplined Subject of Musical Analysis“, in Andrew Dell’Antonio (ed.), *Beyond Structural Listening? Postmodern Modes of Hearing*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 13–43.
- . (2009) „Time, Embodiment, and Sexuality in Music Theory“, In Beate Neumeier (ed.), *Dichotomies: Music and Gender*, Heidelberg: Winter Verlag, pp. 61–73.
- (2013) „Classical Concert Music and Queer Listening“, *Transposition* 3
<http://transposition.revues.org/148> (accessed 12 November 2019).
- Marx, Adolf Bernhard (1845): *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition, praktisch theoretisch*, Bd. 3, Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.
- McClary, Susan (1991): *Feminine endings: music, gender, and sexuality*, Minnesota et al.: University of Minnesota.
- Nieberle, Sigrid (2000): „Stimme, Identität, Geschlecht: Konstruktionen in den ‚Gender Studies‘“, in Gabriele Busch-Salmen und Eva Rieger (eds.), *Frauenstimmen, Frauenrollen in der Oper und Frauen-Selbstzeugnisse*, Herbolzheim: Centaurus, pp. 19–36.
- Pugliese, Romana Margherita (2004): „The Origins of *Lucia di Lammermoor*’s Cadenza“, *Cambridge Opera Journal*, 16:1, pp. 23–42.
- Rieger, Eva (1979): “...Das aufstrebende Genie des Mädchens zurückdrücken”: Anmerkungen zur weiblichen Kreativität“, *Zeitschrift für Musikpädagogik*, 4:9, pp. 43–48.
- Rieger, Eva (1992): „Ich recycle Töne”: Schreiben Frauen anders? Neue Gedanken zu einem alten Thema“, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 153:2, pp. 14–18.
- Scherzinger, Martin (1997) „Anton Webern and the Concept of Symmetrical Inversion: A Reconsideration on the Terrain of Gender“, *Repercussions* 6 /2, pp. 63–147.
- (2004): „The Return of the Aesthetic: Musical Formalism and Its Place in Political Critique“, in Andrew Dell’Antonio (ed.), *Beyond Structural Listening*, Berkeley, University of California Press, pp. 264–93.
- Showalter, Elaine (1985): *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830–1980*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Silva, Max (2018) „Heard Utopia vs Utopian Hearing: Haas’s *in vain* and Political Ambivalence in New Music“, *Twentieth-Century Music* 15/1, pp. 75–102.
- Taruskin, Richard (2010): *Music in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tick, Judith (1993) „Charles Ives and Gender Ideology“, in Ruth A. Solie (ed.), *Musicology and Difference: Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 83–106.
- Warwick, Jacqueline (2011): ““He Hit Me, and I was Glad”: Violence, Masochism, and Anger in Girl Group Music”, in: Laurie Stras (ed.), *She’s so fine: Reflections on whiteness, femininity, adolescence and class in 1960s music*, Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 89–109.