

this reviewer, regional differences are most pronounced in the vernacular music that existed in all regions, iceberg-like below the surface. These musics may give clues to attitudes and patterns that help explain larger musical developments. For example, many of Tawa's New England composers had parents who were music teachers or themselves taught music, or who were interested in vernacular and especially religious music. The separation is artificial and there were special factors. In New England, there was a strong inclination to make music in well-organized groups. In other regions, culture and settlement patterns worked against this practice.

Tawa does mention Transcendentalism and the religious roots of New England attitudes. He points out the New England culture of restraint in the music of one composer, but he does not elaborate. Proximity, polity, the New England communal sense, and the idea of special calling are mentioned, but these concepts are not contrasted with those of other regions, and are not treated convincingly or sufficiently in depth as part of the larger narrative. They come to the reader in bits and pieces. The field of regional New England studies is a vast one, with much recent literature that could have helped present a stronger and more insightful argument. Unfortunately, Tawa seems to have confined himself primarily to the classic works of Perry Miller and overlooked a large amount of more recent work on New England history and culture.

Early New England viewed the education of children as a God-mandated duty, and it saw music as an alternative to godless theater and other entertainment that was more directly corrupting. Such attitudes and folkways persist, some researchers have argued, and have affected New England behavior at all levels.¹ It is a credit to Tawa, however, that he saw the implications of this for music, and recognized the persistence of special New England ways.

Tawa's account of New England institutions that educate artists is not extensive, although they are included and discussed, and he sees music education as a part of the cultural machinery in the region. Tawa leaves many questions unexamined; yet, the book is thought provoking and suggests several avenues of research to the historian of music education history and of American music.

¹David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), *passim* but especially pages 13-206.

The last two chapters are especially important, as they represent a view of the current state of high art music in New England by a major scholar. They have an appealing, uncompromising, sometimes opinionated edge. Patrons, supporters, the politics of university music departments, composers, and conductors come under Tawa's scrutiny. As he presents it, the music establishment is its own worst enemy.

Nicholas E. Tawa is professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts, a major scholar in the field of American music and a leading musicologist who is helping bring a more inclusive, evenhanded, open look at American music. This book is arguably the best regional history ever written on high art music. It recognizes the many facets of high art music, sees its importance to the health of American society, and acknowledges the role institutions of higher education can play on its continued viability. It should be read by serious researchers in musicology and in the history of music education; it is an understandable book accessible also to non-specialists. It is a cautionary tale, a contribution to understanding New England influence on high art music, and a commendable effort in defining regional music.

William R. Lee

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Ankersmit, Frank, and Hans Kellner, eds. *A New Philosophy of History*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press and Reaktion Books LTD, 1995. Ix + 289 pp. Indexed, with a bibliographic essay. Hardcover (ISBN 0-226-02099-1), softcover, (ISBN 0-226-02100-9), \$58.00 hardcover, \$22.00 softcover

This book consists of a twenty-page introduction by co-editor Hans Kellner of the University of Texas at Arlington, nine chapters by nine different authors, and a final chapter and bibliographic essay by the other co-editor, Franker Ankersmit of the University of Groningen. Altogether, the eleven authors hail from institutions in Canada, The Netherlands (2), the United Kingdom, and the United States (7). The first nine chapters are organized in three sections of three chapters each entitled "Rubrics of Style," "Voices," and "Arguments."

Kellner sets forth in the introduction this book's main argument, as he sees it: "It is that history can be redescribed as a discourse that is fundamentally rhetorical, and that representing the past takes place through the creation of powerful, persuasive images which can be best understood as created objects, models, metaphors or proposals about reality" (p. 2). Kellner believes that the authors herein have "a shared vision," but he acknowledges that "[t]his volume of essays on current historical reflection is full of the tensions and contradictions in our capacities to represent and find meaning in the past. . ." (p. 2).

Tensions and contradictions indeed. Several of the authors provide some excellent insights about the nature of history and historiography, but they seem to hold little in common with each other, and in fact collectively they discredit the notion of historical narrative at least as much as they support it, or so it seems to this reviewer. Kellner voiced his awareness of the possibility of negative reactions to the book: "Multiple voices, ironic juxtapositions, strangely unbalanced magnitudes of cause and effect, redescrptions—the topics of discussion in this volume cannot fail to strike some readers as excessive or irrelevant" (p. 9). I do not find the discussions irrelevant, but collectively they do strike me as excessive, primarily because most of the practices touted have characterized historiography for millennia.

In Chapter 1, Nancy F. Partner discusses the popular media's recent tendency to blend fact and fiction in historical accounts such as written documents, films, television news, museum exhibits, and recordings—a tendency she believes came to the fore when academic historians returned from their deconstructionist practices to more or less "normal" rules of evidence. On the other hand, she correctly notes that the use of fiction and literary qualities in history writing is not new, having been employed by Herodotus and Thucydides, who "raised history from a mere descriptive record of events in sequence to a level nearer philosophy" (p. 27). Curiously, the author of the second chapter, Richard T. Vann, argues that by the mid-twentieth century "there was just as long a tradition of calling attention to, and in fact glorifying, the literary qualities of historiography as there was of claiming that history was a science" (pp. 41-42). The fact is that narrative history existed from the beginning of historiography, whereas "scientific" history was and is a product of Renaissance Europe and North America.

The third chapter, a well-written one by Arthur C. Danto, concerns the analytical philosophy of history, an approach that essentially posits

general laws of history and therefore relies on something akin to scientific models. The author dates the beginning of analytical philosophy "very largely" to work by C.G. Hempel in the early 1940s. Hempel later modified his views somewhat, and by the early 1960s the history-as-applied-science-model "hardly had enough life left in it to want to die" (p. 72). Danto asks the following astute question in relation to the existence of general laws of history: "Is there a woman's point of view which has defined the perspective of women invariantly through, say, the past 100,000 years?" Similarly, he notes that "Marxism insisted upon the point of view of the proletariat. . ." (p. 80). Then, in 1962, came Thomas Kuhn's paradigmatic model of scientific changes, in which "history came to be the matrix for viewing all the sciences" (p. 72, emphasis in original).

In another clearly written chapter, Linda Orr discusses three nineteenth-century (or "Romantic") historians who used in their narratives "a subject position and appear to assume that this presence of the subject advances, rather than detracts from the historical argument" (p. 91). In Chapter 5, Philippe Carrard notes in his discussion of the French *Annales* school of historiography that "[e]ven hard-core positivist historiography shifts frequently from 'story' to 'discourse', as data do not speak for themselves. . ." (p. 112). Furthermore, he notes that the *Annales*, together with other schools of historiography, apparently believe that "inquiries are always situated" (p. 123). He reminds readers that "there is no such thing as a narrative told 'in the third person';" that "[e]very narrative has a narrator, the variable being the narrator's [visible] level of involvement" in the text. As for the extreme end of the positivist-subjectivist continuum, Carrard hints at the implausibility of "what anthropologists have tried on occasion: to conduct in the first person a study that combines a story of the research with the presentation of the findings. . ." (p. 124). On a related issue, Ann Rigney in Chapter 6 comes down on the side of interpretative history: "[w]hile the reality of certain phenomena can be established once and for all with the help of sources, their significance or importance cannot. . ." (p. 129). Unfortunately, this author then drones on *ad infinitum* about "relevance" and "coherence" in historical research.

In an excellent Chapter 7, Allan Megill wrestles with the idea of universal history. He discusses why various historians and philosophers

believed in the possibility and desirability of universal history, including individuals driven by religious (e.g., Ranke), nationalistic (e.g., nineteenth-century Germans who lacked a unified national history), humanistic (e.g., Kant and Hegel), and scientific (many) values and motives. He also contributes an interesting perspective on postmodernism: "It is not that the social cultural situation is any more 'diverse' [today] than it was before; rather, via contemporary modes of communication, the diversities are brought into closer proximity than before . . ." He goes on to say that "[i]t seems impossible and in any case undesirable to attempt to homogenize or synthesize the diversity" (p. 167).

Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., in Chapter 8, argues that:

An ideal multicultural history should integrate multiple viewpoints as well as different voices from at least three sources: from within the represented world of the past; from without the represented world of the past in light of subsequent events; and from the conflicting or at least diverse viewpoints existing in the present. (pp. 189-90)

However, he comes down on the side of the desirability of the historian telling the main story, while "representing [some] viewpoints in addition to that of the historian" (p. 189) because of the difficulty of "assimilating multiple voices in a single text" (p. 183). Chapter 9, by Stephen Bann, ties in with the book's final chapter about visual (as opposed to written, literary) history, but the chapter seems vague in and of itself.

Most of the authors represented in this book make interesting points in the introduction and first nine chapters, but the book's premise that rhetorical practice should constitute "a new philosophy of history" fails to convince due to the weak and contradictory arguments presented. On the other hand, Frank Ankersmit sets forth what could be considered a new philosophy of history in his excellent final chapter of the book. He explains why a pictorial model should prevail over a literary model in representations of the past. He argues convincingly that visual art models would be a superior analogy for historical writing because "[t]he study of history is more a 'depiction' than a 'verbalization' of the past" (p. 239).

This book presents three rather striking ironies. First, the editors purport to advocate a more complete return to the use of narrative

history, narratives based on "powerful, persuasive images" (p. 2). The irony here is that the book is difficult to read due to the writing style(s) employed. The need to read the syntax-tortured, overly qualified, hyper-complex sentences and paragraphs more than once for comprehension appears to have resulted from at least two causes: the esoteric language and gargantuan sentences, and the publisher's practice of omitting the comma before the final "and" in series, which can result in confusion even in moderately (and appropriately) complex writing (the book was originally published in London). I quote one example, the first non-quoted sentence from the first chapter, which unfortunately is not atypical of the writing in this book:

For the past twenty-five years, more or less, a multi-faceted, philosophically serious and analytically acute movement throughout the *sciences humaines*, synoptically referred to as the "linguistic turn", has relentlessly revolved about the forms of discourse which create and mediate our evolving knowledge of ourselves, our institutions and our histories. (p. 21)

Second, this reviewer suspects that the real cause of the (mostly) unclear writing is the editors' and authors' lack of clarity about "a new philosophy of history" in their own thinking. Thus, perhaps it is not ironic that a book purporting to be about philosophy lacks cohesiveness, that instead it leaves an impression of an attempt at interdisciplinary cooperation, an attempt that results in an uneasy alliance between the fields of history and rhetoric (or literature or literary theory), the respective specialty fields of the co-editors Ankersmit and Kellner and of the other authors. After all, it would seem exceedingly difficult for eleven different individuals to write a coherent philosophy.

The third irony is that neither the practice nor the recognition of narrative history as a subjective phenomenon is at all new, a point made by several of the authors. The admonition to see words in historical narratives as artifacts in and of themselves, and to recognize their subjective nature, is certainly not new either. As author Nancy Partner points out, history in the past incorporated fiction, although "history was not allowed to be fiction" (p. 33, emphasis in original). The same author opines that "[m]aintaining traditions, glorifying the past and socializing the young into widely shared values have usually taken precedence over the reality-commitment of history" (p. 35). She even

goes so far as to say that in historical writing “fact-based natural standards for truth are the exception, not the rule” (p. 38). Kellner states that “[i]t is difficult today to find any proponents of naïve realism in historical practice, if that term is taken to mean that the past can be recaptured, explained, represented in historical discourse. [In fact, Leopold von] Ranke’s undeniable greatness and originality has been compromised by his stated aspiration to present the past as it actually was” (p. 10). Furthermore, Ankersmit mentioned in the book’s bibliographic essay that as far back as the nineteenth century both Johann Gustav Droysen and Friedrich Nietzsche wrote about the impossibility of historical texts reflecting the past exactly. Actually, some of the most notable historians of the ancient worlds, Eastern and Western, made few if any claims to objectivity.

Finally, author Richard Vann states that “. . . philosophy of history after World War II did not entirely ignore the fact that historical texts are verbal artefacts, constructed almost entirely on the basis of other verbal artefacts” (pp. 42-43). Ankersmit points out that if the notion of historical text as a “verbal artefact” can be attributed to any one individual it would be Hayden White, who published his highly influential book entitled *Metahistory* in 1973. Interestingly, Ankersmit asserts that although White appealed to literary theory as a basis for historical writing, he was not, as most people think, a postmodernist.

Music education historians interested in philosophical and methodological issues would probably find this book worth reading, its dense style and turns and twists notwithstanding. It lacks cohesion, but it does raise important issues about historical research. For example, Partner’s characterization of most historians’ interest in “[m]aintaining traditions, glorifying the past and socializing the young into widely shared values . . .” (p. 35) unfortunately characterizes much traditional musicological writing, if not music education history. The book also presents concepts that might prove useful to music education philosophy as well. For example, Danto wrote that “Hempel’s theory [analytical philosophy of history] in fact strikes me still as true. It just stopped being relevant . . . It was replaced with a different set of questions, a world in effect, into which it no longer fit” (p. 84).

Given the lack of attention given to philosophy of any kind in the music education historical literature to date, this book could be of some use at least in whetting the interest of readers in philosophy of history. Music education history resembles Kellner’s characterization of

historiography in general, as “the most commonsensical of the human sciences . . .” However, the similarities between general historiography and music education history do not extend beyond the superficial, because, according to Kellner, in the former “[e]ach new wave of historical innovation unleashes a new group or technique or jargon which redefines the field of data, or invents new fields of data.” Arguably, significant innovations have not yet occurred in music education historiography. In general historiography, the “new historical practices and discourses make no sustainable claim to be integrated with other versions of the past, nor even to deny them.” Instead, they “jostle to displace one another in a sort of struggle of wills” (p. 10).

The field of music education history could broaden and deepen its work through discussions about philosophy of history and about some applications of the principles and methodologies implied. Meanwhile, traditional historiography of the sort practiced by most music education historians to date remains alive and well and valuable to the field of music teaching and learning, and any predictions of its demise would be premature. I close with a quotation from Nancy Partner, who opposes “. . . alarmist postmodern prophesies of the decline and death of fact, truth, external reality, objectivity and other candidates for postmodern extinction.” On the contrary, she proclaims that:

The intellectual life of Western societies, with its deeply ingrained bias for realism, mimesis, factuality and verification, has done very well without attainable absolutes; the failed candidates are transparent language, irreducible concepts, demonstrable facts . . . [and] a single satisfactory mode of comprehending reality.” (p. 32)

Jere T. Humphreys
Arizona State University