

H-France Review Vol. 14 (November 2014), No. 182

Edward Campbell, *Music after Deleuze*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013. viii + 194 pp. Notes, bibliography, and index. £55.00 (hb). ISBN 9781441101815; £17.99 Sterling (pb). ISBN 9781441157027.

Review by Helen C. Thomas, Lancaster University.

The interface between music and philosophy has been a dynamic area of interdisciplinary exchange in recent years. The success of the Royal Musical Association's Music and Philosophy Study Group and the publication of significant texts by Andrew Bowie, Peter Kivy, and Roger Scruton attest to the continued fascination with the ontology and aesthetics of music.[1] But this is a field of study that is still dominated by Germanic philosophical traditions and the influence of French phenomenology on music reception studies provides an important alternative to well-known Germanic paradigms. Henri Bergson's (1859-1941) philosophy of temporal simultaneities in relation to the experience of music was notably developed by Suzanne Langer, Thomas Clifton, and Jonathan Kramer.[2] More recently the importance of the reciprocal relationship between some of Deleuze and Guattari's key concepts—namely stratification, assemblages, rhizome, plane of consistency, deterritorialization, and abstract machines—and music has motivated new social and analytical research approaches to the study of music and musicking.

Although Deleuze did not dedicate a text specifically to music he frequently employs the temporal and ambiguous nature of music as an inspiration and support for his philosophical theories. In *What is Philosophy?*, Deleuze posits music as being the most significant of all the arts in revealing the creative processes of the natural world.[3] Like Merleau-Ponty, it is music as a *symphonic* art (its “sounding togetherness”) that becomes a metaphor for naturally occurring, temporal patterns such as animal behaviour and evolutionary processes.[4] Additionally Deleuze adopts musical terminology such as “refrain” and “voices” as adjuncts to support his six key philosophical concepts although he frequently adjusts definitions of these terms to suit his own multi-sensory perception of the world.

Music after Deleuze complements other volumes in Bloomsbury's series “Deleuze Encounters” that deal with concepts of cinema, philosophy, political theory, theology, and space *after* Deleuze. The choice of conjunction is significant. In an article on musical ontology after Deleuze and Guattari, Michael Szekeley notes the double sense of “after” as meaning the inheritance of ideas but also, more creatively, how a composer might compose “after” another composer.[5] Similarly, Campbell offers a post-Deleuze view of musicology but he also introduces the reader to examples of compositional thinking that employ Deleuzian concepts and therefore exhibit Szekeley's second sense of “after.” This reflexive relationship between the philosophy of music and composition is not unique to Deleuzian concepts, of course. Campbell has published a study of philosophical “encounters” between the composer-cum-musical polemicist Pierre Boulez (b.1925), also discussed in depth here, and the philosophers Adorno, Lévi-Strauss, and Eco as well as Deleuze.[6] In *Music after Deleuze*, however, the repertoire referenced ranges from Bach to the post-Boulezian generation of experimental composers and includes thoughts on Gaelic psalm singing, jazz improvisation, Javanese/Balinese gamelan, and Japanese gagaku.

Campbell's stated purpose is “to offer alternative ways of viewing repertoire which is more often discussed in terms of more traditional epistemological paradigms” (p. 23). Thus he opens up an a-chronological, non-hierarchical space in which to explore the peculiarly human phenomenon

whereby, according to Langer, “music makes time audible and its form and continuity sensible.”[7] The book is organized into five chapters which, like Deleuze and Guattari’s *Mille Plateaux*, may be read in any order as they deal with concepts and sub-concepts that are “interconnected and mutually explanatory” (p. 163).[8] Unlike *Mille Plateaux* however, where the reader is instructed to read the conclusion last, readers might usefully begin *Music after Deleuze* with Campbell’s conclusion in the spirit of a Deleuzian “refrain” as it is framed less as a summary discussion than a catalyst for re-thinking music.

Deleuze rejects an established view of music as a canon of reified works (Beethoven’s Symphony no. 5, Stravinsky’s *The Rite of Spring*) in favour of music as a precept of dynamic assemblages. These assemblages are made up of transient sonic behaviours including composition, performance, listening and other “diverse milieus” such as literature, visual arts and philosophy (p. 164). Assemblages have an infinite potential to fragment or reassemble (processes that Deleuze and Guattari call deterritorialization and reterritorialization) and the musicologist, analyst or composer constructs “lines of flight” that create new patterns of organization or new planes of consistency. In chapter two, Campbell explains and illustrates this radically different idea of music with examples of “circumstantial” or “open” works that are realized in new ways at each performance either as a consequence of notational innovations such as graphic and/or verbal scores or in response to a specific event environment. He provides two case studies. Pascal Dusapin’s opera *Faustus, The Last Night* (2003-2004) employs a “cut-up” libretto and a variety of forms of motivic “deviation” as the principle composition process. The genesis of Georges Aperghis’s *Avis de tempête* or “Storm Warning” (2004) relies on the improvisation of elements from previous work and its performance realization is a consequence of live mixing and interaction between aspects as diverse as dance gestures, video images, acoustic and electronic sonic materials.

Repetition and variation of sonic elements are fundamental to our experience of musical forms and it is these concepts that form the basis of Campbell’s enquiry in chapter one. For Deleuze, musical repetition is based not on identity and thus similarity but the productive difference inherent to multiple sonic occurrences in time. Thus a musical theme is but one determination from any number of permutations emanating from a virtual plane. A particular determination of a musical element such as a motive, theme, line, form, work, or repertoire cannot be thought of as being privileged over any other similar determination. Campbell applies this notion of difference to musical themes. He teases out the non-similarity of inverted or retrograde twelve-note rows of the Second Viennese School, the developing variations of Brahms, the diversification of an “underlying idea” in middle- and late- period Beethoven and improvisation techniques of Bebop, Gaelic psalm singing, Javanese gamelan and North Indian music. What emerges is a liberating view of musical difference where musical themes are constantly subject to perceptual revision due to their changing inter-, intra-, and extra- musical relationships.

Deleuze theorized spatial and temporal fields in terms of seemingly oppositional conditions of continuity and discontinuity. He appropriated the terms “smooth” and “striated” to describe these conditions “after” Boulez who used them in an article on “Form.”[9] In chapter three, Campbell addresses the dialectics of these conditions as they apply to the musical parameter of pitch organization. It provides a particularly clear overview from a Deleuzian perspective of the development of the tonal system (an encultured adjustment of the Pythagorean discovery of harmonic sequences above a fundamental pitch that produces a hierarchical arrangement of twelve equal divisions of the octave). The Western Tonal Tradition is described as “the state-sponsored paradigm” but one that is subject to a process of deterritorialization (p. 80). Campbell traces some of the alternatives to this dominant tradition of twelve equal striations: the organization of pitches into more (the forty-three-note scale devised by Harry Partch) or less (Indonesian five-note *sléndro* and seven-note *pélog* scales), fixed equal or unequal, or flexible divisions of the octave. He points out a flaw in Deleuze’s assertion that the process of deterritorialization of pitch space historically leads to the emancipation of dissonance (p. 79). This narrative thrust is antithetical to Deleuze’s habitual non-historical aesthetic. Chapter four continues with a discussion of the “striated” (pulsed) and “smooth” (unpulsed) organization of musical time but with the rather odd *zeitgeist* caveat that “Deleuze’, in this context, is a name for a collective assemblage of enunciation, not to be confused

with this historical Gilles Deleuze" (p. 131). Whilst this chapter provides a summary of philosophical and musical developments in relation to the experience of time, Deleuze's achievement is shown to be the dissolution of the "striated"—"smooth" polarity in favour of a multiplicitous simultaneity. Campbell's selection of pitch and time parameters may have been made on the basis of pragmatism as these are the parameters within which Western musicologists primarily think about music but the concept is equally applicable to other parameters such as timbre and dynamic intensity.

The start of the final chapter titled "A Deleuzian Semiotics of Music" is challenging. It summarizes Pierceian semiotics although Campbell encourages the reader not to be perturbed by the density of Pierce's prose, adds in some musical semiotic highlights (a frequently contested area), combines these with Deleuze's interest in Hjelmslev's theory of expression and content and then relates all this to avant-garde compositional developments in the 1960s. These areas combine to show a form of semiotics that is peculiarly suited to the specificity of Modernist experimentation in the arts. The molecularizing of sound through technology reveals musical "part-signs" or "sign-particles" that can be reassembled in new ways providing new semiotic potential. In Helmut Lachenmann, Georges Aperghis, and Michaël Levinas, Campbell provides three compelling examples of composers working in this electro-acoustic area.

Music after Deleuze provides the reader with concepts with which to formulate radically alternative listening strategies to the centre-periphery schema that supports the edifice of tonality and goal-directedness. New concepts require new language terms and the clarity with which Campbell articulates and applies Deleuze's concepts provides a strong basis from which analysts, historical musicologists, composers and performers might integrate new ways of thinking into the flux of musical assemblages. The book's emphasis is on compositional strategies and it would be good to see these ideas more comprehensively applied to aspects of performance and listening. However, Campbell's enthusiastic advocacy of European experimental repertoire explicitly or implicitly composed with Deleuzian ideas is infectious. The inclusion of Javanese, Indian, Japanese, jazz and some popular repertoires is welcome although Buchanan and Swiboda's volume of collected essays also concentrates on traditions other than the European Classical tradition.[10] Most provocative is the inclusion of canonical Classical works written before Deleuze which provides grounds for overcoming the privilege given to identity in so much thinking about this music.

This book guides the reader across the extraordinarily rich interface between Deleuze's philosophy and music. The level of erudition that Campbell brings to the reflexive relationship between these two modes of thinking means that complex ideas and repertoire are made accessible and relevant to everyday experiences of music. Campbell has produced a genuinely inter-disciplinary book which deserves to find a place in academic libraries on both the philosophy and music shelves.

NOTES

[1] See for example Andrew Bowie, *Music, Philosophy, and Modernity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Peter Kivy, *Introduction to a Philosophy of Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Roger Scruton, *The Aesthetics of Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

[2] See Susanne Langer, *Feeling and Form* (London: MacMillan, 1953); Thomas Clifton, *Music as Heard* (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1983), Jonathan Kramer, *The Time of Music* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1988).

[3] Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).

[4] Ronald Bogue, *Deleuze on Music, Painting, and the Arts* (New York & London: Routledge, 2003), p. 2.

-
- [5] Michael Szekely, "Becoming-Still: Perspectives on Musical Ontology after Deleuze and Guattari," *Social Semiotics* 13/2(2003):113-128, p. 113.
- [6] Edward Campbell, *Boulez, Music and Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [7] Langer, 1953, p.110.
- [8] Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. B. Massumi. (London: Athlone, 1988).
- [9] Pierre Boulez, "Form," in Jean-Jacques Nattiez ed., trans. M. Cooper. *Orientations: Collected Writings* (London: Faber & Faber, 1986), pp.90- 96.
- [10] Ian Buchanan & Marcel Swiboda eds, *Deleuze and Music* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004).

Helen C. Thomas
Lancaster University
h.thomas2@lancaster.ac.uk

Copyright © 2014 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for edistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/ republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of H-France Review nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on H-France Review are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172