

Article received on September 30<sup>th</sup> 2018

Article accepted on November 5<sup>th</sup> 2018

UDC: 78.01

781

*Valentina Radoman\**

University of Novi Sad

Academy of Arts

Department of Musicology and Ethnomusicology

## NEW CRITICAL THINKING IN MUSICOLOGY

### **What ideologies do contemporary musicologists speak from and for whom do they speak**

**Abstract:** New critical thinking in musicology has been new for at least thirty years and yet it is still opposed by many musicologists or composers or performers who Adorno-like (Theodor W. Adorno) remain devoted to the idea that the function of art in society is to be without a function. The fact is, however, that even today such an attitude is legitimate, just as much as interdisciplinary, critically oriented musicological research, which points out that music, like other arts, often hides some inappropriate reverse behind its sensuous seductiveness. Today musicologists can, based on their intellectual, educational, sensuous, class, ethical and other potentials choose the position from which to talk about music. Unlike traditional musicology which, according to some musicians, mostly addresses musicologists themselves, and only in ideal cases performers and listeners, today's interdisciplinary critical musicology, in its good examples, is indispensable to everybody: art

---

\* Author contact information: [vradoman@yahoo.com](mailto:vradoman@yahoo.com)

financiers (patrons or taxpayers), composers who are often victims of the market or serve as masks behind which oligarchs hide today, performers who choose what musical works to play and affirm and how to do it, and all listeners who are not professional musicians, but they need to be informed about various aspects of music art.

**Key words:** contemporary musicology, critical theories, critical potential of musicology, ideologies of interpretation of music, ideologies of the perception of music.

The subject of this paper could equally 'have a dialogue' with the themes, i.e. the contents of the books such as the book *Hémisphère gauche Cartographie des nouvelles pensées critiques* published five years ago by French sociologist and philosopher Razmig Keucheyan,<sup>1</sup> or with the contents of the book *The Literary Theory* published thirty-five years ago by Terry Eagleton, a literary theorist, and similar books of a more recent date,<sup>2</sup> or with numerous books by aestheticians and art theorists such as Miško Šuvaković and others,<sup>3</sup> as with the contents of those influential books and texts from the field of musicology which examine and show, using examples, the methodological challenges and critical potential of contemporary musicology.<sup>4</sup> Today's even wider opening of the borders of mu-

---

<sup>1</sup> Razmig Keucheyan, *Hémisphère gauche: Cartographie des nouvelles pensées critiques*, Paris, La Découverte, 2013. (Razmig Kešejan, *Leva hemisfera; Kartografija novih kritičkih mišljenja*, Beograd, Fakultet za medije i komunikacije, Univerzitet Singidunum, 2016.)

<sup>2</sup> Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, University of Minnesota Press, 1983. (Terry Eagleton, prev. Mia Pervan-Plavec, Zagreb, Liber, 1987.)

<sup>3</sup> Among the numerous books by Miško Šuvaković, it might be enough to mention here his capital work *Pojmovnik teorije umetnosti* (Beograd, Orion Art, 2011) which lists and explains in detail over a thousand concepts that make up the contemporary theory of art.

<sup>4</sup> When it comes to musicology books, it is perhaps enough to note that ever growing multinational company which has acquired many famous publishing house—the publishing house Routledge—started in 2006, in the edition *Ashgate Contemporary Thinkers on Critical Musicology*, re-publishing the selected books of leading musicologists in the field of critical musicology. Among those names are: Robert P. Morgan, Annegret Fauser, Derek B. Scott, Richard Leppert, Lawrence Kramer, Susan McClary and others. See: <https://www.routledge.com/music/series/ACTCMS>

Within the national framework one should recall the text from 1998, "Contextuality of musicology" by Mirjana Veselinović-Hofman, in a special edition of the *New Sound* journal, under the title *Poststructuralist science of music*. Unlike the short, but meaningful and important correspondence about so-called New musicology which was led, among others, by Lawrence Kramer, one of the representatives of the New musicology, and Charles Rosen, who criticized the New Musicology in the text "Music à la Mode" (*The New York Review of Books*, June 23, 1994), there was no criticism (written, substantiated) on the article "The contextuality of musicology" at the national level. Contrary to Rosen, his complaining reactions and certain types of futile attempts to change the course of the inevitable transforma-

sicology as a scientific discipline to other scientific fields than was the case with the real openness of musicology to the social sciences and philology from its beginnings,<sup>5</sup> has been providing the musicologist for a long time, since the 1980s, with the opportunity to achieve dialogue with the authors of scientific works from a wide range of scientific disciplines and critical theories created or implemented in them.<sup>6</sup> This wide opening of musicology borders makes contemporary musicology the scene of various, often conflicting, contradictory thinking that is in a constant, more or less visible, struggle for supremacy in musicology or in a wider context. Using Deleuze's words, it could be said that this consideration of the inevitable transformation of musicology, with all the stimulating criticism, including unpleasant derision<sup>7</sup> that these transformations have endured during

---

tion of musicology just four years earlier and Kramer's friendly but somewhat patronizing response to criticisms made against him, Veselinović-Hofman in this article states in a very calm way changes in contemporary musicology, caused, as it was explained, "by deconstructive inherence of music", and supports the observation of Rose Rosengard Subotnik, which still proves to be correct, that she couldn't see "a fatal contradiction between accepting autonomy (of music), as a sort of paradigm for interpreting the structure, and the rejection of autonomy, as epistemological ideology".

<sup>5</sup> Although Guido Adler, as one of the founders of music science, imagines that openness to other disciplines as a full openness to all disciplines in the future that would help achieve the scientific task of unraveling all social, economic and political links between music and culture (Guido Adler, "Musik und Wissenschaft", Akademische Antrittsrede, gehalten am 26. October 1898 an der Universität Wien, *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters*, 5, according to: Ivana Ilić, *Epistemologija savremene muzičke analize*, doktorska disertacija (rukopis), Katedra za muzikologiju, Fakultet muzičke umetnosti, Beograd, 2016, 60).

<sup>6</sup> And indirect dialogue with the books author, and direct with contemporary authors—when joint works on the same subject can arise—seen from the angles of two or more scientific disciplines.

<sup>7</sup> On the one hand the ridicules are sent by mature scientists who, in the words of Robert S. Nelson from another context, "challenged by change, resist it and reassert the past by calling for a return to standards, usually defined as the state of the discipline that existed when they were students." On the other hand, ridicules are sent, not only to musicology, but critical theories and application of critical theory in various scientific disciplines, by scientists who have no great scientific impact like authors being written about, such as François Cusset, the author of the book *French Theory: How Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze, & Co. Transformed the Intellectual Life of the United States (French Theory: Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze & Cie et les mutations de la vie intellectuelle aux États-Unis*, Paris, La Découverte, 2003), and also those who are opponents of critical theories, in general, and for a variety of reasons: because they represent different political ideas from the majority of post-Marxist and neo-Marxist ideas that soak the field of poststructuralist critical theories, because they oppose certain attainments or defeats of critical theories, in spite of this, they are generally perceived from the negative angle, because they can use critical theories, especially French critical theory, as a

four decades, is already a “tired thought”. Nevertheless, judging by the topics from musicological symposiums, dissertations and books, this subject still requires intellectual debate, thus showing that musicology as a discipline does not have or does not want to have a scientifically stable or acceptably fluid platform, i.e. contemporary research procedures and protocols designed by scientific consensus.

Therefore, this text could talk about one kind of a reminder, a systematic overview of the various streams of thoughts that have influenced musicology from its beginnings in the 19th century to the present day. However, it is possible, but more appropriate, to achieve it in a book than in a short text. In that case, it might especially be argued about what the term ‘new critical thinking’ means, and particularly what the notion ‘new’ implies in all its layers. Because the problem of the ‘new’ is a special theoretical problem, while in the title of this text this notion is used more simply, in terms of something current – that critical thinking that is already an unavoidable part of the intellectual maturing of the youngest generations of scientists.<sup>8</sup> Or, this text could make a selection and overview of the most influential critical thoughts which echoed most in musicology and contributed to significant musicological insights which could not have been reached with the means of so-called traditional musicology. Also, a negative thesis could be set and examples of musicological applications of various critical theories could be chosen, i.e. their concepts whose inadequate transition into the area of talks about music brought musicology into an awkward situation or we could talk about the methodology and concepts of newly-formed fields of research, musicological or trans-musicological, such as: popular music studies, postcolonial music studies, iconology studies, gender studies, radio studies, media and communication studies, body studies, body studies in the social context, etc.

Out of many possibilities an approach has been chosen for this paper which examines only a few concepts (*Other* and *Ideology*) which are crucial for certain

---

good means for placing cynicism without charm, like Christopher Butler in the book *Post-modernism: A very short introduction* (Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.) and others.

<sup>8</sup> Middle-aged and the older generations of scientists with their rich experiences and a horizon on which they can see achievements of both “traditional” and contemporary musicology (“contemporary” in the sense of “today” that inevitably had to undergo certain changes over time), or different institutions with their mechanisms of preserving the “stability” of scientific disciplines, have, unlike younger generations of scientists, the option to choose, or they may foster the still ambivalent relationship towards the transformations of musicology thereby producing either negative or stimulating tensions between “traditional” and contemporary musicology.

critical theories and at the same time common for several scientific disciplines and which come to musicology from 'outside', whether the musicology of today can survive without those concepts or has to take them over and to whom the science of music serves today: the students of music, composers, performers, audience, the scientific community, a particular social class or certain social groups. It was difficult to choose, out of an impressive number of very inspiring concepts which can be used in musicology from various disciplines,<sup>9</sup> a few that would be good as models of the changing of musical thinking since the last decades of the 20th century to the present day, and as indicators of the critical potential of musicology. Nevertheless, the mentioned choice has been made, although some other selection would be equally appropriate.

When 'critical potential' is mentioned in this text, that expression, contrary to its use in many other musicological works, is used in two meanings only.<sup>10</sup> The first meaning of the critical potential refers to the possibility, that is, the obligation of musicology, to reconsider its established means of music research over and over again, while staying in the domain of speech about music only. The review of the effects and achievements of various types of formal analysis, or transfer/translation of the formal analysis results, expressed by harmonic and formal or structural codes, into a written narrative of a spoken language and the narrative of the history of music, the consideration of the very narrative of history or the theory of music, their fiction for example,<sup>11</sup> or the establishment of new

---

<sup>9</sup> See Tables No. 1 and No. 2. Concepts have been taken over from various scientific areas in which they have been either produced or applied and carry critical potential.

<sup>10</sup> One shouldn't forget the fact that these two meanings can branch into many other meanings. But in this text these two meanings have been chosen as the most important ones knowing that in that way variety of shades which are characteristic of today's critical musicology in the world will be lost. However there are a lot of regions where the question of shades hasn't got its turn because there are a lot of old musicological problems to be solved.

<sup>11</sup> Edward Said and Hayden White, among others, have reflected on the question of interpreting the facts in the field of the history of society and art in the light of the learning that the meanings are the effects of the kind of a selected narrative and therefore the discourse of the history of society or art has much more in common with fictional storytelling than the historians are ready to admit. See, for example: Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, London – New York, Routledge – Kegan Paul, 1978. (Edvard Said, *Orijentalizam*, prev. Drinka Gojković, Beograd, Biblioteka XX vek, 2000.); Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism*. New York, Vintage Books, 1993. (Edvard Said, *Kultura i imperijalizam*, prev. Vesna Bogojević, Beograd, Čigoja štampa/Beogradski krug, 2002.); Hayden White, *The Content and the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987. In the national musicology the question of formal analysis and possibilities of its different interpretations or different language translations of the same formal musicological analysis into the language of music history has been shown, for example, in: Valentina Ra-

forms of analysis and interpretation, especially the meaning of music works, are such a kind of self-reflection, critical preoccupation of musicology with its own means, i.e. effects and music itself.

Another meaning of the term 'critical potential' of musicology refers to the fact that the critical ability of musicology is wider than the mentioned one, while the term 'critical theory' no longer has to, as it used to, refer only to the work of the Frankfurt School. Today it is possible to talk in the plural about critical theories as a comprehensive critique of the social order. Musicology, as it has been well known for three decades,<sup>12</sup> does not have to deal with music alone, remaining within the limits of music itself, but can show how music is set in the world, or in a wide context of diverse social groups, and what effects music can have in this context. There will be a little more about this in this text.

Various and numerous critical theories<sup>13</sup> became, says Razmig Keucheyan, especially topical in the 1990s due to the defeat of former rebel social movements that were aimed at the emancipation of the subject.<sup>14</sup> "It all starts with one defeat," writes Keucheyan. "Whoever wants to understand the nature of contemporary critical thought must take this statement as a starting point."<sup>15</sup> With this, Keucheyan refers to the fact that numerous critical discourses were created or strengthened at the moment when a new political cycle symbolically appeared in the world with the demolition of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Whether

---

doman, *Elementi impresionističkog stila u srpskoj muzici prve polovine XX veka*, magistarska teza, (rukopis), Katedra za muzikologiju i etnomuzikologiju, Fakultet muzičke umetnosti, Beograd, 2006.

<sup>12</sup> Under the condition that the following books, for example, are taken as a symbolic turning point in musicology: Susan McClary, and Richard Leppert, eds., *Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception*, Cambridge – New York, Cambridge University Press, 1987; Rose Rosengard Subotnik, *Deconstructive Variations: Music and Reason in Western Society*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1996 and others.

<sup>13</sup> For many theories that Razmig Keucheyan names as "critical theories" Miško Šuvaković uses the term "post critical theory" or "anti-critical theory". According to such a division, Šuvaković argues that not all poststructuralist theories are "revolutionary, interventionist or emancipatory practices because they do not advocate for critical intervention and transformation of society and culture", while some theories, post-critical theories or anti-critical theory have changed their role over time. See: Miško Šuvaković, „Kritička teorija“, in: *Pojmovnik teorije umetnosti*, op. cit., 386–387.

<sup>14</sup> At that time, as it has been said, these critical theories became especially actual, though they originated much earlier, during the 60s, 70s and 80s of the 20th century. The Thesis on Defeat is not the original Keucheyan's thesis. It is obvious to all scientists (and not only to scientists), and it is mentioned in many scientific papers, although not as a foundation around which the whole construction of a scientific piece is built, as is the case in Keucheyan's work.

<sup>15</sup> Razmig Keucheyan, op. cit. 19.

this demolition symbolically marked the defeat of the May rebellion of 1968, or the defeat of those ideas that failed to prevent the outbreak of the Great War in 1914, or the defeat of the ideas which conceived modernism that began at the moment of the French Revolution of 1789, is not as important in this text<sup>16</sup> as Keucheyan's conclusion saying that "critical theories develop in circumstances marked by the defeat of the left wing striving for the transformation of society."

Being so, one cannot forget the fact that the *recovery* from the defeat and the transformation of a society can be more easily and effectively imagined and explored from political activism, political philosophy, from economic or legal sciences, critical instead of populist media of information, referential arts, and other areas, than from contemplation over, for example, bar 8 of string quartet *...hold me, neighbor, in this storm...* by Aleksandra Vrebalov or some other composition of another music artist from any period of music history. To consider the recovery from defeat and the possibility of transformation of society is not an easy task, but such a review from the music, which is the least referential of all arts, is almost unthinkable.

But what if in that bar 8 of composition *...hold me, neighbor, in this storm...* the strange HM exclamation in a string quartet is performed by a man who has left the violin aside and is beginning to play the *tapan*, or it is performed by a woman playing the *tapan*, then a listener at a concert of art music faces a marker that points to a world beyond the known "world of art music"?<sup>17</sup> What if, in one

---

<sup>16</sup> In this short text it is not possible to consider what defeat is in question here but all the time one may have in mind Keucheyan's perception of possible periodization of political cycles or may think of what contemporary critical theory is the answer to which defeat, conditionally speaking.

<sup>17</sup> In this text, the expression "the world of art" (*artworld*) and its derivatives such as "the world of music art" and the like are used in the meaning given by the philosophers Arthur Danto and Richard Wollheim and which are well explained by Šuvaković (in the text „Изузетност и сапостојање: *Gesamtkunstwerk*, интертекстуално и појам разлике“, у: Мишко Шуваковић (ed.), *Изузетност и сапостојање*, V Међународни симпозијум *Фолклор, Музика, Дело*, Београд, Факултет музичке уметности, 1997, 30) by the following words:

Following Arthur Danto it can be said that the artwork is not only what is seen by the eye or heard by the ear, but also our knowledge of the history of art, culture, philosophy, social super-determinants and the mode of perception (the skill of rhetorical placement or transfer of watching, listening, understanding, interpretation, mental, manual or behavioral work). Artwork is not only a mere object (painting, sculpture), a situation (ambience, architecture, scene) or an event (music work, performance, ballet, film), but it always an *interpreted object* – an object that we see stranded in a network of interpretations. The first interpreter is an artist (according to Richard Willheim) who interprets the structure or order of sounds, words or body acts as an artwork creating it or placing

performance, imagined or real, that exclamation comes from a harsh-sounding middle-aged man who powerfully performs the instrument on the concert podium, and in another performance it comes from a young man, or an anxious middle-aged or young man, or from an African, Arab, Dutch performer or from a woman or a girl or from a sickening (for example, a mildly cold) woman? And what if a Serb or a Syrian, or a 'Yugonostalgic' Serb or an Albanian or a Bulgarian or an American woman political activist or a Senegalese woman philosopher hears that exclamation? What if that exclamation, which can mean a lot, compromises the expected effect of the protocol of traditional musicology as a scientific discipline by which music is heard—knowing the skill of making music; analyzed—knowing the skill of making music; explained/interpreted by the language (alphabet or speech) to someone who is familiar or not with the knowledge of making a piece of music?

In the traditional—meaning modernist—perception of art and talks about art, that explanation is not even necessary either to the artist or to the aesthete-listener,<sup>18</sup> because music is an autonomous area with its own laws which are not subject to examination, for example, for veracity or usefulness and the like, but it serves (supposedly) the universal, direct sensuous experience, or more sharply and poetically speaking, this explanation is not necessary because music, as claimed by philosopher and musicologist Vladimir Jankélévitch, "... is magic".<sup>19</sup> Music should not be analyzed, understood or explained because its wisdom does not last for more than an afternoon,<sup>20</sup> and it does not have to last because, according to Jankélévitch, music is what overwhelms us (despite the fact or precisely because it is short-lived wisdom) with a passionate admiration, music is what subjugates us using unpermitted ploys to suggest, create an illusion, deceive.<sup>21</sup>

Yet, how can we think, when we want or like or have to think, about that HM exclamation, after something has been suggested to us, to our senses? The traditional (modernist) musicology, despite the aforementioned artist and aesthete-listener, counts on the expected effect of its traditional protocol, and the

---

it in *the world of art and art history*. All other interpreters participate in that game by producing differences in the effects, meanings, significance and values.

<sup>18</sup> Miško Šuvaković has written about this. See: Miško Šuvaković, *Epistemologija umetnosti ili O tome kako učiti učenje o umetnosti*, Beograd, Orion Art, 2008.

<sup>19</sup> Vladimir Jankélévitch, *La Musique et l'Ineffable*, Paris. Armand Colin, 1961. (Vladimir Jankelevič, *Muzika i neizrecivo*, prev. Jelena Jelić, Novi Sad, Književna zajednica Novog Sada, 1987.)

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, 138.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, 28.



expected effect is to ensure that 'almost conventional continuum between a creator, the creation of work, work, and the reception of work and potential discourses on artistic work', which Miško Šuvaković talks about in the *Epistemology of Art*.<sup>22</sup> When such an expected effect is missed because musicology has faced a single HM for which there are no means by which it will be analyzed and explained, the creator of the work, the music work and the listener can simply remain connected only by 'magic,' 'affect,' 'sensuous sensation'.<sup>23</sup>

But the composition has the title *...hold me, neighbor, in this storm...* and the listener, who concentrates to hear only the sound, surrendering to the 'skill' of music and exclamation 'to be likeable', and despite the fact that the sound is 'passionately skillful' so that its various 'puzzles' subdue the listener, yet he knows, as it is pre-suggested to him, that the sound of the exclamation means something longer than 'an afternoon'. What if the HM exclamation suggests to the listener – any listener, it means to a listener who is a political activist or a philosopher or a listener who is a taxpayer who has to pay for a piece of music or a listener performer who needs to consider why to play a particular piece of music, or a musicologist who should write arguments about the significance and meaning of this exclamation, and others – something that is aggressive or something that is powerless, or something that is offensive to someone, or suggest a whole range of options that can be fulfilled from performance to performance or only in the imagination of a music score reader?<sup>24</sup> When, along with this exclamation, the listener, in other bars, also hears other sounds that clearly mean something (the sound of another archaic instrument – the gusle, besides the aforementioned tapan, mixed with the sounds of classic string instruments, the sound of church bells, stomping the feet on the floor, and other), regardless whether he recognizes them as easily understandable, extremely simplified stereotypes or not, he, in fact, enters the sphere of listening to the work that requires the pursuit of new means other than the immediate sensuous experience. Expressed in Jankélévitch words, in addition to the sensuous submission to the magic of music, the listener must also understand such music and reach for its conceptualization.

---

<sup>22</sup> Miško Šuvaković, op. cit.

<sup>23</sup> Any phrase used by philosophers and musicians thinking that music does not have to be understood, and that it is enough to feel it directly with the senses, can be used here.

<sup>24</sup> About the interpretation of the piece *...hold me, neighbor, in this storm...* from the point of view of the politics of identity and logic of liberal capitalism in the context of musical creativity, see: Валентина Радоман, „Политика идентитета, музика и говор о музици у доба глобализације“, *Музикологија*, 2012, 12: <http://www.doiserbia.nb.rs/img/doi/1450-9814/2012/1450-98141200006R.pdf>

The semiotics of music, as a musicological and musical-theoretical scientific field, created by the appreciation of the scope of linguistics, which precisely deals with the meaning of music, in its first steps, and in some of the most influential works of today,<sup>25</sup> has remained / remains deeply bound to formalistic analysis and aesthetics, and perceives the meaning of music when it is clear that some musical 'solutions' (from the simplest choice of timbre, certain intervals or motives, articulations, and the like, to more complex musical creations) have eventually become conventions, artificial agreements in the world of music that these or similar musical 'solutions' represent / mean something specific to a certain community of listeners which also belongs to the world of music, because it is more or less familiar with the norms of this world. As long as the new meanings of music, such as this unusual HM, occur in the context of well-known musical norms, i.e. at least in the hints of conventional musical structure, musicology and music theory, that is, music semiotics can find a way to interpret a new musical signifier as an emerging convention and put it in traditional analytical and interpretative frameworks.

But when it is impossible to do so, then, the musical semiotics and other potential analytical and interpretive musicological discourses need to reach out for new concepts, often for those that are devised to deal with problems or dilemmas or aporias that do not belong to the world of art.

It is especially interesting that in quite opposite cases – when it seems that the significance of a musical signifier or order has, over time, acquired the characteristic of something immediately understandable, and therefore 'natural', by reaching out for new concepts and new angles of consideration, this supposedly natural meaning can be questioned.

So, for example, when the literary theorist Edward Said expressed astonishment after discovering the fact that most of the British or French writers of the 19th and 20th centuries, whom he had always admired, actually supported in their prose works – perhaps only respecting the usual conventions of making a literary work, rather than with deliberate intention – the political ideology of racism, actually, expressed astonishment over the fact that some of the meanings of a reference art, literature, were accepted as 'knowledge' because, over time, they had become so common and conventional that they began to act as 'natural' or became 'invisible' because they were so implicit.<sup>26</sup> Many of these 'natural' meanings in literature hid horrible opposites – such as the mentioned racist ideology – that were discovered when these meanings were subjected to different, new analytical methodologies and conceptual means of research.

---

<sup>25</sup> For example in the works of Robert S. Hatten.

<sup>26</sup> Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, op. cit.

This was the case when the concept of the Other which, according to certain interpretations, originated from the ecclesiastic discourse, in the speeches of Pope Pius II during the 15th century,<sup>27</sup> was accepted in the scientific discourse. In his official church speeches, in a specific narrative process, the Pope made a clear boundary between 'We,' thinking of Christians and Europeans and 'They,' 'The Other,' thinking of Muslims, Ottoman Turks as absolute enemies who, after the conquest of Constantinople, could have conquered Rome.<sup>28</sup> In the scientific discourse, this division "We – Other", which could include various representatives of 'Us' and 'Other', became especially topical in the domain of psychology during the 19th century, and was applied in works by German authors under the name *Völkerpsychologie*. During the 20<sup>th</sup> century, however, this division became important in other scientific disciplines such as, for example, comparative literature. Then it was used in a comparative sub-discipline, the so-called Imagology, for the purpose of exploring the ways in which some nations 'see' / perceive / describe in literature other nations. So, in 1978 Edward Said wrote a book, now globally famous and assailed, *Orientalism*, in which he exposed to a new angle of observation and criticism the orientalist discourse, the way that Western nations see, describe, not only in literary prose, but in all texts (media, artistic or scientific), discuss in political reports, paint, extol in canonical poetry, and so on, nations in the East, in the so-called Orient. Musicology is just one of many scientific disciplines that have recognized the significance of Said's discovery which was deeply political.

If attention is now returned to the HM exclamation, it can be noticed that imagology in this case opens the possibility for all listeners, who know the concepts and methods of imagology, to rationally emerge from the frame / experience of the sensuous perception of music only. Similarly, imagology in this case provides an opportunity for musicology to emerge from its autonomous position, from the kind of analysis of the music score or sound by which it would be determined that in the first sentence of the string quartet *...hold me, neighbor; in this storm...* a melody line is exposed in the part of the gusle, which is in the second sentence accompanied by the melodic-rhythmic motif of the tapan, so that these two sentences together could make a musical period. Imagology in this case provides musicology with the possibility to talk about issues that are political, which, for example, concern the relationships between those individuals-representatives of the communities playing the gusle, those playing the tapan

---

<sup>27</sup> More about it: Tomaž Mastnak, *Evropa: med evolucijo in evtanazijo*. Ljubljana, Studia humanitatis, Apes 8, 1998. (Tomaž Mastnak, *Evropa; Istorija političkog pojma*, prev. Milan Đorđević i Dušan Đorđević Mileusnić, Beograd, Beogradski krug, 2007.)

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, 55–69.

and those playing classic string instruments, instead of with pseudo-tautological repetition and verbalization of what is written in notes.<sup>29</sup>

But why would musicology, and for whom, except for its own needs, for the self-examination of its methods, deal with it at all, when political issues are the domain of political activism, state policy or political philosophy? One of the known answers is because it is an immanent feature of music art itself. Because it has always been a feature of art, of creation, and all other human practices. Or, for example, because, according to the French philosopher Jacques Rancière, 'political' and music (and other arts) share one common feature – the power to redistribute the sensible in public life, the redistribution of what and who can be heard, seen, felt in public.<sup>30</sup> But, according to Mirjana Veselinović-Hofman, some *perceptions* of works of art do not have to be socially, ideologically or scientifically acceptable at all times in history.<sup>31</sup> Susan McClary reviewed the question: why was it once considered blasphemous to talk about Bach's music in the context of the politics of his time just like in 1950 and 1985?<sup>32</sup> The answer is simple at first sight. At one point in history, in the 18th century, or even since the time of ancient Greece, according to McClary, the ideology of the autonomy of art excluded not only Bach's but the whole art from the field of public speaking about society.<sup>33</sup> Thus, the musicology remained closed in the bar 8 of the mentioned composition or any other part of any other musical piece.

But the 'ideology' or 'view' of musicology – which are two more essential concepts of critical theory – as a scientific discipline that in certain periods of history with its results must remain in the autonomous world of art separated from other spheres of society (for example, from the political sphere) today is,

---

<sup>29</sup> It is already said in footnote 11 that what is written in the notes and then analyzed and translated into the narrative of music history does not coincide, although it is a scientific goal to leave such an impression.

<sup>30</sup> Jacques Rancière, *Le Partage du sensible: Esthétique et politique*, Paris, La fabrique, 2000. (Žak Ransijer, *Sudbina slika; Podela čulnog: estetika i politika*, prev. Olja Petronić, Beograd, Centar za medije i komunikacije, Fakultet za medije i komunikacije, Univerzitet Singidunum, 2013; Jacques Rancière, „Raspodjela osjetilnog – estetika i politika”, prev. Leonardo Kovačević, *Up&Underground*, 2006, 09/10)

<sup>31</sup> Mirjana Veselinović-Hofman, “The Position of an Object of Art in an Interdisciplinary Scientific Environment: Questions of Interpretation”, *Зборник Матице српске за сценску уметност и музику* бр. 41, 2009, 76.

<sup>32</sup> Susan McClary, “The blasphemy of talking politics during Bach Year“, in: Richard Leppert and Susan McClary (Eds.) *Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception*, Cambridge – New York – Melbourne, Cambridge University Press, 1996 [1987], 13–62.

<sup>33</sup> Susan McClary claims that autonomy dates from Pythagorean times. Op. cit, 15.

if we bear in mind the statement said by Mirjana Veselinović-Hofman, and the mentioned question (and answer) of Susan McClary, only one of the possible, permissible, acceptable ideologies, one of the possible perceptions of musicology. A different ideology is the one that draws both art and talking about art out of the framework of their (common) autonomy and places them, for example, in the world of turmoil, contradictory ideas, proposals, demands from various spheres of life, to transform societies according to needs and the rights of humans, animals, the whole of nature, instead of, for example, according to the dictation of today's capital and the logic of the consumer society and the society of exploitation. It may be argued that today it is possible and acceptable for every musicologist (an ordinary listener or a musical score reader) to respond, in accordance with their knowledge, the type and quality of education they have, the social class or a social group they belong to, the style of life they lead, the political and ethical values they advocate, etc., to the ideology that corresponds to the corpus of their intellectual and sensual ranges, to the ideology that interpellates them, stirs their mind, as claimed by Althusser, or their body, as argued by Foucault.<sup>34</sup>

In that case, some musicologists will be challenged by the ideologies of art autonomy and 'art for the sake of art' and will have the need, as well as the right to define in their works the mentioned HM exclamation as well as the sounds of the gusle, tapans, church bells, the voice of the muezzin, stomping the feet on the floor and similar, as enriching the sound colors of the traditional, artistic string ensemble. In such a speech, they would be obliged to find novelties in the treatment of the traditional form of String Quartet, which would normally be attributed to the creativity of artists and changes in musical forms during its history which are immanent to music art. The title of the composition could be interpreted in a universal context, as a typically artistic, humane call to join *We* and the *Other* and the musical diversities that are the symbols of *We* and *Other* – the sounds of archaic and modern instruments, as well as the sounds-symbols of different religions, into one utopian whole, typically artistic, transcendental.

Being interpellated by the ideology of feminism, after applying the same traditional formal analysis or some other kind of analysis, other musicologists would, for example, notice that the archaic instruments have been added to the String Quartet, which was originally a male ensemble, because even in the 19th century, it was still inappropriate for women to play string instruments thus impairing their posture, getting bruises on the body from the attachment of the

---

<sup>34</sup> Louis Althusser, «Ideologie et appareils idéologiques d'État (notes pour une recherche)», *La Pensée* no 151, 1970. (Luj Altiser, *Ideologija i državni ideološki aparati /beleške za istraživanje/*, prev. Andrija Filipović, Loznica, Karpos, 2009, 64);

violin to the neck and the like. They would notice that those selected archaic instruments were also traditionally performed by men, the least for the sake of playing, but more to sing along about the wars they or their ancestors waged, or to produce, by the power and the sound of these instruments, noise, signals, mostly warlike. Feminist musicologists would notice the patriarchal sound of the composition *...hold me, neighbor, in this storm...* and consider the question of whether this patriarchal sound is being interestingly destabilized, compromised when the composition is performed by women or, on the contrary, thus even more easily perceived. In the latter case, they would ask the question why the woman composer insists on the sound that is the symbol of the patriarchy.

Led by the research of postcolonial scientists and the terminology they use, the third group of musicologists could, for example, see in the string quartet *...hold me, neighbor, in this storm...* the insisting on 'exotic,' 'uncivilized,' 'primitive' sound of archaic, warlike instruments of a particular area (recognizable or not), by confronting with the sound of instruments on which art music is performed and putting that archaic instrument's sound, as well as the sound of HM and A exclamation, and stomping the feet on the floor, with assigned performance signifiers: *groan, like barking, very dramatic, fierce*, into the institutions of the original bourgeois concert halls. The 'exotics', after the same formal analysis that would be carried out by the musicologists, would be challenged by other ideologies, interpreted as an artistic subversion of the world of art or as the exploitation of the so-called exotics in the global market that sells it as the most easily sold product.

It seems that the constitution of the world in which we live today enables musicologists to be more aware of the diversity of ideological positions they can take in interpreting music. However, this possibility is not used by all musicologists. Some musicologists consciously pretend not to understand the opportunity that has been available to them for decades. In this regard it is interesting that Charles Rosen, a prominent musicologist and pianist, once "closed his eyes". In 1994 when Rosen and Lawrence Kramer had a brief, but sharp, correspondence about the critique that Rosen addressed to Kramer and other representatives of the New Musicology, Rosen primarily pointed out the alleged mistakes in the formal analysis he found in the works of the representatives of the New Musicology, as if such mistakes did not exist in the works of the authors who advocated the same ideology of autonomy of music as Charles Rosen. For the sake of intellectual kindness Rosen praised the search for new, contextual interpretations of music to which the representatives of 'New Musicology' were devoted, but claimed that, in his opinion, one of the most important representatives among them, composer Lawrence Kramer, did not have the piano playing experience and, therefore, was not sufficiently 'aurally sensitive' to certain,

particularly important, details in Beethoven's music he wrote about. Kramer drew Rosen's attention to the fact that Rose's "Piano experience" was his last refuge from which he could defend the ideology that had been denied by the development of society and time. He criticized his claims that the experience of listening is fixed, unchanging, that is based on a binary opposition: Right as True vs. Wrong, instead of accepting the fact that music actually requires a lot of 'discontinuous, fragmentary experience' that includes thinking, memory, desire of variable intensities. And all of this equally applies to listening, performing or thinking about music. On the one hand, in the correspondence between Rosen and Kramer there was a controversy regarding which ideology (in the modern complex meaning of this concept) a contemporary musicologist can talk from and for whom. Rosen began his text with an unusual claim: "Almost everyone agrees that performing and listening to music are primary activities; writing about music is secondary, parasitical. Ideally, musicologists ought to write for listeners and performers. In real life, they write for other musicologists. Because they have to." As an excellent musicologist and not so much appreciated pianist, Rosen showed in his own case how one "shoots himself in the foot" when advocating a certain ideology without knowing its complexity. In addition, he titled the text *Music à la Mode*. Today, almost twenty-five years later, it has turned out that the world has remained basically the same since the symbolic 1989, or the year of the short musical debate, 1994, with many living conditions that have drastically worsened, while only in some details improved. In that respect, it has turned out that Rosen was wrong when he estimated, because of his nostalgia for the world that had long since disappeared, that the changes that touched musicology at the end of the 20th century would not last longer than a passing fashion. Kramer may have erred as much as all those who hoped that the discovery of the opposites of various 'knowledge' imposed by the ideology of the autonomy of art would help raise the awareness that art is not always magic and contribute, as much as possible, to a change in the world we live in for the better. Regardless of the extent to which these hopes have been betrayed or fulfilled now, everybody should know the opposite of art today: art financiers (patrons or taxpayers) and composers who can no longer afford to hide behind the intuition and abstraction, especially not when they cooperate, for example, with oligarchy that uses the arts to conceal their nefarious action,<sup>35</sup> and performers who choose

---

<sup>35</sup> Only one example of the oligarchical instrumentalization of ideology of art "imagination" and concealment, through art, of oligarchical activities harmful to many social groups will be shown here. It is the example from the UK, Andy Hewitt talks about and Boris Čučković reviews (Boris Čučković, "Autonomy of Today", *TkH, Journal for Performing Arts Theory*, 2012, No. 20, 16–21). The selected example from Great Britain is almost the rule in

which pieces to play, and musicologists and all listeners. Those who want to escape from the 'everyday terrestrial life' through the magic of musical can do it, at the expense of those who will think about different facets of art, with the help of all possible concepts that are available today to art theory. Sometimes the ones fleeing and those thinking, will gladly change places. But this will not change the fact that today, contrary to what Rosen claimed, the primary activities are: performing and listening to music and thinking about music itself and thinking about musical context. And the fact that it is therefore desirable that financiers and composers and performers and listeners, all being members of different ideological, classes, social groups, read good musicological works. A rather cynical response to Rosen's statement that "ideally, musicologists ought to write for listeners and performers. In real life, they write for other musicologists. Because they have to," now would read that today musicologists have to write the least for other musicologists. Being careful not to turn into "Meaning-of-the-Universe merchants" as Terry Eagleton said in another context,<sup>36</sup> and because of

---

many countries today. The part of the text in the footnote is taken from the book: Valentina Radoman, *Muzika, Politika, Užitak: Funkcije politike i ideologije u muzičkom modernizmu*, Beograd, Orion Art, 2018, 19–20:

So, for example, Andy Hewitt identifies three ways in which (autonomous) art has been instrumentalized in the United Kingdom today, or was during the reign of the Labor Party from 1997 to 2010. The same kind of art instrumentalization can be noticed in other countries as well. The first method of instrumentalization implies introducing art into the public space so as to encourage artistic problematization of all issues that would contribute to supporting the development of civil society as a democratic society of public debate and negotiations between social groups. Another use of art for state purposes refers to the treatment of art as an auxiliary tool in "urban regeneration" and "re-branding" of post-industrial cities, while the third form of instrumentalization of so-called autonomous arts implies the participation of "economically marginalized" citizens in the world of art, in order to boost their rise on the social ladder. However, Hewitt notes, while autonomous art in the United Kingdom of the mentioned period served to produce *the impression* of positive social change, state policy actually implemented the privatization of the public sector, reduced the transparency of the rule and deepened social divisions (Andy Hewitt, 2012. *Art and counter-publics in Third Way Cultural Policy*, PhD dissertation, University of the Arts London, <http://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/5679/>).

Thus, art had, in fact, the opposite role in society than the one which appeared on the surface, so that with its allegedly autonomous status and the newly acquired role of mediators in society—which abolished autonomous status in a complicated way—contributed to the real destruction of the public sphere as a place of communication between citizens and the state.

<sup>36</sup> Terry Eagleton, *After Theory*, London, Penguin Books, 2003. (Terry Eagleton, *Što nakon teorije?*, prev. Darko Polsek, Zagreb, Algoritam, 2005, 75.)



the development of their musicological competences, now musicologists have to read books on philosophy, political philosophy, political geography, sociology, anthropology, literary theory, art theory, psychoanalytic theory, and they will certainly devote the time left to reading musicological books. But only the best ones, the authors of which can equally well describe a way of creating a musical work superbly using formal or some better musical analysis, as well as to interpret the meaning and the purpose of these musical works from the ideologies from which they are called out, in the context of the world they live in.

It seems that the time has come in which clever, contextually thinking and interdisciplinary prone musicologists want / do more good to the world than many artists, the alleged creators of magic, but in fact, very often the victims of consumer society and the society of exploitation.

Table No. 1: A selection of concepts in musicology which can be redefined, and concepts of the various scientific disciplines or fields which can be used in musicology.

<b>Musicology</b>	<b>Literary Theory</b>	<b>History of Art and Art Theory</b>	<b>Post-colonial studies</b>	<b>Critical Social Theory</b>
A castrato	Author	Acritical critique	Ambivalence	Anti-globalization
Absolute music	Authorial intent	Agony of modernism	Affect	Bourgeoisie
Authentic performance of musical works	Canon	Appropriation	Balkan as a metaphor	Capital
Autonomy of music	Enemy Other	Art as a Commodity	Canon	Class
Commissioning a music work	Heteroglossia	Art as a Truth Procedure	Center / margin	Collective memory
Composer's theory	Horizons of Expectation	Artworld	Civilized	Diaspora
Death of art music	Idiom/Institution	Cynicism tactics	Colonial desire	Elite
Emotions (in music)	Intertextuality	Context	Comprador	Exploitation in Society
Festival	Code	Criticism of humanism	Counter-Discourse	Globalization
History (of music)	Context	Discourse	Decolonization	Hegemony
Histories of music	Metalanguage	Discourse of the Master	Eurocentricity	Ideology

Interpretation (of formal analysis)	Sign	Discourse analysis	Exotic	Ideological State Apparatuses
Music as a culture	Self-reference in language	Ecological art	Hegemonic histo- riography	Institution
Music Work	The Limits of Interpretation	Gaze	Imagining as knowledge	Interpellation
Opera	The Pleasure of the Text	Hybrid arts	Imagining the Bal- kans	Modernization
Originality	Thick Description	Iconology	Imperialism	Multiculturalism
Performativity of music works	Narrative	Kitsch	Liminality	Nationalism
Perception of music	Reception	Manifest	Modernization	Oligarchy
Popular music	Referentiality	Memory	Orientalism	Post-industrial society
(Public) concert	Signified	Performance Art	Post-colonial body	Repressive State Apparatus
Semiotics of voice	Signified	Polygenre	Primitive	Self-stereotyping
Weak concept of modern	Signifier	Post-history	Racial Other	Social groups
The Beautiful in Music	Style	Political Art	Stigma	Social mobility
The ideology of voice (typology of opera voices)	Text (From Work to Text)	Radical Modernism	Subaltern	Space
Total work of art /Gesamtkunstwerk	The Anxiety of Influence	Representation (arts)	The idea of Europe	Stereotype
Virtuosity	The Open Work	The End of Art	Trauma	Utopia

Table No. 2: A selection of concepts from different scientific disciplines or fields that can be used in musicology.

<b>Philosophy</b>	<b>Gender Studies – Feminism</b>	<b>Cultural Studies</b>	<b>Body Studies</b>	<b>Psychoanalytic theory</b>
Artworld	Ahetestic Formalism is Political	Active consumer	Artist's body	Acoustic mirror
Aura	Construction of female hysteria	Alternative cultures	Body	Anti-Oedipus
Authenticity	Desubjectification	Anti-elitism	Body and privacy	Big Other
Body without Organs	"Domestic" Art	Commercialized culture	Body disabilities	Desire
Capitalism and Schizophrenia	Dominant fiction	Consumer culture	Body in culture	Discourse of the Analyst
Deconstruction	Exclusion policy	Contingency of meaning	Body of art performer	Discourse of the Hysteric
Deterritorialization	Femininity	Cultural policy	Childhood	Discourse of the Master
Dissemination	Feminist strategy of inclusion	Cultural populism	Cyborg	Discourse of the University
Discourse	(Female) Other	Culture as a political ideology	Death	<i>Ego</i>
Empire	Fundamental unrecognition	Culture as commodity	Docile bodies	Fetish
Event	Identity	Culture of a period (or structure of feeling of a period)	Emotion	Gaze
Ecstasy of communications	Inner Patriarchate	Decoding	Gaze / Sighting	Hysteria
Meta-politics	Masculinity	Dominant values	Generation	<i>Id</i>
Mimesis	Men as Culture	Domination	Gesture	Identity
Multitude	Patriarchate	Generation	Hearing	Imaginary order
Order of discourse	Perfect visibility of women	Gothic fantasy	Mental illness	<i>Jouissance</i>
Policy	Posthuman	Hegemon code	Old age	Mirror stage
Political	Private sphere	Inequality	Pain	<i>Objet petit a</i>
Politics	Public sphere	Intellectual field	Power	Phantasm
Power	Sacrifice	Minority discourses	Remembering	Real

Simulacra	Subject	Popular culture	Sense	Social production of Oedipus
Soul	The Death of a “Woman”	Postculture	Sexuality	Symbolic order
Space	The private (personal) is political	Procedures of everyday creativity	Sounds of the body	Scopophilia
Subject	Transnational femininity	Social practice as a culture	Speech	Subject
Text	Women as Nature	Society of the spectacle	Stigma	Sublimation
Trace	Women’s Right to Education	Tastes of different social classes	Voice	Symptom/Sinthome

## Works cited

- Eagleton, Terry: *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983. (Terry Eagleton: *Književna teorija*. Prev. Mia Pervan-Plavec. Zagreb: Liber, 1987)
- Eagleton, Terry: *After Theory*. London: Penguin Books, 2003. (Terry Eagleton: *Što nakon teorije?*, prev. Darko Polšek, Zagreb: Algoritam, 2005)
- Илић, Ивана: *Епистемологија савремене музичке анализе*, докторска дисертација (рукопис), Катедра за музикологију, Београд: Факултет музичке уметности, 2016.
- Jankélévitch, Vladimir: *La Musique et l’Ineffable*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1961. (Vladimir Jankelevič: *Muzika i neizrecivo*. Prev. Jelena Jelić. Novi Sad: Književna zajednica Novog Sada, 1987.
- Keucheyan, Razmig: *Hémisphère gauche: Cartographie des nouvelles pensées critiques*. Paris: La Découverte, 2013. (Razmig Kešejan: *Leva hemisfera; Kartografija novih kritičkih mišljenja*. Prev. Olja Petronić. Beograd: Fakultet za medije i komunikacije, Univerzitet Singidunum, 2016)
- Kramer, Lawrence: In response to “Music à la Mode”. *The New York Review of Books*, June 23, 1994.
- Mastnak, Tomaž: *Evropa: med evolucijo in evtanazijo*. Ljubljana: Studia humanitatis, Apes 8, 1998. (Tomaž Mastnak: *Evropa; Istorija političkog pojma*. Prev. Milan Đorđević i Dušan Đorđević Mileusnić. Beograd: Beogradski krug, 2007)
- McClary, Susan: “The blasphemy of talking politics during Bach Year”, in: Richard Leppert and Susan McClary (Eds.) *Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception*. Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Said, Edward W.: *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993. (Edvard Said: *Kultura i imperijalizam*. Prev. Vesna Bogojević. Beograd: Čigoja štampa/Beogradski krug, 2002)

- Rancière, Jacques: *Le Partage du sensible: Esthétique et politique*. Paris: La fabrique, 2000. (Žak Ransijer: *Sudbina slika; Podela čulnog: estetika i politika*. Prev. Olja Petronić. Beograd: Centar za medije i komunikacije, Fakultet za medije i komunikacije, Univerzitet Singidunum, 2013; Jacques Rancière: „Raspodjela osjetilnog – estetika i politika”. Prev. Leonardo Kovačević. *Up&Underground*, 2006, 09/10)
- Radoman, Valentina: *Muzika, Politika, Užitek: Funkcije politike i ideologije u muzičkom modernizmu*. Beograd: Orion Art, 2018.
- Rosen, Charles: “Music à la Mode”. *The New York Review of Books*, june 23, 1994.
- Шуваковић, Мишко: „Изузетност и сапостојање: *Gesamtkunstwerk*, интертекстуално и појам разлике“. *Изузетност и сапостојање*, V Међународни симпозијум *Фолклор, Музика, Дело*. Београд: Факултет музичке уметности, 1997, 30–39.
- Šuvaković, Miško: *Epistemologija umetnosti ili O tome kako učiti učenje o umetnosti*. Beograd: Orion Art, 2008.
- Šuvaković, Miško: *Pojmovnik teorije umetnosti*. Beograd: Orion Art, 2011.
- Веселиновић-Хофман, Мирјана: „Контекстуалност музикологије“. *Нови Звук*, специјално издање *Постструктуралистичка наука о музици*. Београд, 1998, 13–20.
- Веселиновић-Хофман, Мирјана: „Позиција уметничког објекта у интердисциплинарном научном окружењу: питања интерпретације“. *Зборник Матице српске за сценску уметност и музику*, 2009, 41, 67–77.

## Summary

In 1994 there was a brief discussion between Charles Rosen and Lawrence Kramer on the perspectives of musicology in *The New York Review of Books* magazine. Charles Rosen advocated the idea of music autonomy and claimed that a pianist could better hear music than those musicologists who were not active players of an instrument and then a pianist-musicologist could offer his analysis of a musical piece to performers and listeners. He expressed doubts about the ‘hearing sensitivity’ and musicological analyses of Lawrence Kramer, the composer, who was also one of the most important representatives of the so-called New musicology. By this discredit Rosen actually criticized all those musicologists who, in those years, reached out for new interpretations of music or attempts to exceed the frameworks of formal analysis and formalistic aesthetics. In response to this kind of criticism, Kramer noted that the ideology of music autonomy from which music was heard and interpreted by Charles Rossen, was the ideology of the past, applicable to the music of the 18th and 19th centuries, but that musical experience is much more complex than the moralizing binary division to the right (true) listening and wrong listening.

This paper sets the thesis that today it is possible to use different ideologies of interpretation of musical works in accordance with intellectual, educational, sensuous, class, ethical and all other potentials of the musicologist. It points out the importance of the critical ability of musicology to highlight its own means and methods of music research, but the focus is placed on exploring the critical potential of musicology which is not related to musicology itself, but surpasses its traditional limits. The application of critical

terms from various critical theories and scientific disciplines in contemporary musicology allows musicologists to do much more subtle analyses and interpretations of musical works than ever before. When such types of analyses and interpretations of a piece of music are successful they can be useful to a much greater number of readers than ever before. Unlike traditional musicology which, according to Charles Rosen, mostly addressed musicologists themselves, and only in ideal cases to performers and listeners, today's interdisciplinary critical musicology, in its good examples, is indispensable to all: the financiers of art (patrons or taxpayers), composers who are often victims of the market today, or are masks used by the oligarchs to hide behind, performers who choose what musical works to play and affirm and how to do it, and all listeners who are not professional musicians, but they need to be informed about different aspects of music art.