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Since the 1980s, a growing number of musicologists have turned to examine the contributions of women composers to musical life. This ‘singling out’ of women composers has come under fire from some feminists as it is argued that it segregates the woman composer by investigating her music in an isolated context. Charles Rosen, on the other hand, recognises that women have been ‘harshly excluded from history and attempting to bring them uncritically and naively back into it neither does them posthumous justice nor acknowledge the difficult reality of their lives.’ Rosen is not suggesting that investigation of women’s musical activities is futile, but rather he points to the need for a unique approach to these activities in order to reveal their unique achievements despite the struggles they faced. This paper aims to probe some of the implications of the category ‘woman composer’ and interrogate some of the enduring ideologies that have surrounded women and musical composition. Nancy B. Reich states that women musicians are becoming more ‘visible’, but the virtual absence of women in the stock anthologies and histories – despite a growing body of primary and secondary literature – is something that should concern us. In this paper, I argue that the relative absence of women from music history has been brought about partly by the lack of a serious approach to their music and an overemphasis on biographical detail. Critical engagement with the actual music of women composers is vital if we are to deepen our knowledge of musical life in the nineteenth century.

Scholars are faced with many difficult questions in the realms of gender studies and music with regard to female composers. Does the examination of women’s music isolate their music from the mainstream musical tradition for example? Since undertaking a doctoral dissertation on the Lieder-composer Josephine Lang, I have deliberated over methodological approaches to her music and career. Lang composed numerous engaging settings of poetry by major German poets, yet one feels that a typical appraisal of her songs is not adequate to retell the whole story of her musical achievement. A great deal has been written on the subject of women’s music and yet, it is a difficult task to settle on a methodological approach to her music and career. This paper therefore seeks a viable methodology for appraising women composers of the nineteenth century. By sifting through the growing amount of literature surrounding women composers, I wish to probe some of the implications and contradictions of the category ‘woman composer’ and explore the consequences of discussing women composers independently. After contemplating attitudes and recent approaches to scholarship on women composers of the nineteenth century, it is my aim to suggest possible solutions to the problems that confront scholars in the field, the most pertinent of these being the adoption of critical methodologies in looking at women’s music.
Implications of the category ‘woman composer’

Many modern female composers prefer not to be grouped under the umbrella term ‘women composers’. Why – in the twenty-first century – should women be separated from the mainstream musical tradition? Yet in exploring the achievements of a nineteenth-century woman composer such as Josephine Lang, one cannot claim that she was on an equal footing with her male contemporaries because of the virtual absence of a proper musical education in her formative years. In the nineteenth century, women composers were forced to cope with limitations placed upon them by society. Professional activities were seen as improper to their sex. Alongside this, there existed the widespread belief that women were not capable or worthy of creating art. Indeed, the term ‘composer’ in the nineteenth century, at least, seems to imply inherently ‘male’. Lucy Green asserts that ‘music delineates not only a masculine mind but also the notion of a male composer.’ Although gender is not an issue for composers today, Green’s contention remains true for music of the past.

When we refer specifically then to the sex of the composer we choose to study, do we set their music apart from ‘men’s music’? What other meanings might be construed by the designation, ‘woman composer’? Sally Macarthur identifies an inherent implication of women’s music as ‘other’ in the designation ‘woman composer’: she considers the label ‘women’s music’ as a problematic one, for it immediately conjures up the idea that it exists in a domain separate from men’s music. In fact, it could be argued that the category ‘women’s music’ has been brought about by the fact that men’s music is simply music; women’s music, to follow this line of thinking, is understood as something else.

Susan McClary issues a word of caution in relation to the prejudicial implications of perceived difference, warning that ‘different from’ can indeed imply ‘inferior to’. Here McClary suggests that by identifying the sex of a composer as female, we potentially separate her from mainstream musical experience and this difference will imply that the quality of her work will not equal that of men. It must be remembered, however, that the inherent implications within the term ‘woman composer’ grew out of the persistent ideology of the designation ‘composer’ as male. Problems arise when we try to eliminate all sense of difference between the music of women and men, that is, when we think of women’s music as ‘men’s music’ since in reality it may not cope with such contextualisation. This is not to say that comparison with men’s music is futile; on the contrary, it is an intrinsic element of the study of women’s music. However, when embarking on such comparative studies, an awareness of the restrictions on women’s compositional activities in the nineteenth century must be at the forefront of our considerations.

Women and Canonicity

The blind inclusion of female composers in a male-dominated canon brings with it the possibility of subjecting women’s music to criteria that is not
compatible with women’s singular experiences. Citron describes a possible consequence of such subjection by stating that ‘the new work becomes integrated into the canonic pantheon and as such is discussed in the same terms, according to the same paradigms and categories.’ For this reason, it would not be appropriate merely to try to slot women into the existing canon; instead we must try to adjust our own understanding and perception of how that canon is formed. Citron advocates a pluralistic approach to the canon where new members will ‘enrich and not replace’ while at the same time testifying that ‘pedagogical canonicity can be elastic.’ In challenging the method by which a canon is set up, Citron effectively highlights the need for a ‘reconceptualisation’ of history in order to challenge the ‘dominion of men’ which has endured within music history with unremitting tenacity.

Within existing scholarship on women composers, it could, however, be claimed that a canon of its own is evolving. Alison Booth suggests the futility of such action by stating, ‘if constructing supplementary canons of histories were an effective way to infiltrate dominant canons or histories, we would have long ceased to need such supplements.’ Booth’s comments reinforce the reality that there is still a dearth in representation of women in history. Consequently, there remains a deep need to argue for women’s inclusion in history, not merely by adding women to the existing canon but by continuing to re-evaluate ‘the canon’ as we know it today. Although the concept of the canon has been questioned since the early 1970s, the issue of women’s visibility in music history has not yet become a moot point: there is, still, the need to draw attention to the scarcity of women in music history.

**Attitudes to the ‘Woman Composer’**

The investigation of gender studies in music possesses the ability to attract criticism, especially among women composers. Jill Halstead states that ‘many of them feel that any special examination of their position – that is, any study which highlights problems affecting women as a group – in some way ‘excuses’ those who lack sufficient talent and training.’ One can understand contemporary women composers’ position on the matter but indeed for the nineteenth-century composer, an absence or at least deficiency in her musical training was a concrete problem for many women composers. Another possible reason for resistance to the label ‘woman composer’ is offered by Halstead, who supposes:

Many people still question the need to single out women composers and musicians for special attention. It is often felt that women have more than sufficient encouragement and opportunity to become professional musicians and that therefore any ‘artificial’ segregation serves only to reinforce their position outside the mainstream. The belief that any music of quality will sooner or later be recognised as such, no matter who composed it, is widespread.

There is a problem, however, with this belief to which Halstead refers. Due to social, pedagogical and ideological limitations on women in the nineteenth century, their music has not made its way through to the public consciousness in the same way that men’s music has. It is plausible that paying special
attention to women’s music might cause such ‘segregation’ of their music, and yet paradoxically such ‘separate’ consideration is essential to combat the enduring obstacles that prevent women’s music from being heard today. Any possible effect of ‘segregation’ is therefore valid and worthwhile although, in my opinion, the risk of actually bringing about isolation of women’s music from the mainstream is small if scholars resolve to present a true account of women’s experiences in music. The initial step of examining women composers separately is necessary not only because little tends to be known about these women but it is also constructive in discerning the historical, social and cultural contexts of their music. Serious critical appraisal of women’s music could make it more incorporeal to mainstream musical scholarship and pedagogy rather consistently occupying a position outside of its considerations, thus painting a truer and fuller picture of musical life in the nineteenth century. Citron states that some female composers refuse to accept the term, ‘woman composer’, since ‘any qualifier can imply specialness and therefore lesser competence but many consider it necessary for strategic and psychological reasons at least until ‘composer’ is gender-blind and works by women receive the same attention as men.’

In the past, such composers as Rebecca Clarke published their music under pseudonyms for this very reason. In Clarke’s case, the music she published under the pseudonym ‘Anthony Trench’ received more critical attention even though she had established a solid reputation for herself as a serious musician. Women have had, it seems, to battle with society’s traditional perception of the designation ‘composer’ as male and divergence from this norm has fostered subconscious negative attitudes towards women’s music. One of the reasons that women’s music tends to be viewed differently, as McClary and Macarthur have suggested, is because of the different relationship that women have had to art. If we could start thinking about art as gender neutral and the different ways that our activities intersect with that gender-neutral art, i.e., women’s unique relationship to art, perhaps we could begin to increase our understanding of music in the early nineteenth century.

Why gender?

According to Bonnie Anderson and Judith Zinsser, ‘gender has been the most important factor in shaping the lives of European women.’ This proves the poignant need for a methodology or set of methodologies or at least a broadening in our way of thinking about women composers’ music. Susanne G. Cusick refers to power that men’s practice of musicology of the past attained by separating itself from the feminine. Perhaps, by temporarily disentangling women’s music from the wider musical tradition, we can, in fact, empower women’s music.

The results of exploring the music of women composers not only augments our knowledge of unknown talent but can have consequences for musicology on the wider stage. The need for a fuller expression of humanity, i.e. one which includes both sexes, has been noted by many critics. Liane Curtis considers that ‘as the veil is lifted on women’s musical activities, we are gaining a fuller and more accurate picture of the history of music.’ In a similar way Citron
considers that ‘works by women can indeed play an important role. Not only do they introduce new questions for themselves, but they have the very real power of modifying the discourse for the entire canon so that a fuller range of human expression is being represented.’ Margaret Mead states that ‘when an activity to which each could have contributed is limited to one sex, a rich differentiated quality is lost from the activity itself.’ This phrase can indeed be applied to both the art of music and the practice of musicology. In looking at Josephine Lang’s Lieder, we learn more about the nineteenth-century German Lied tradition and its position within society.

A Perilous Road Ahead

While taking the contextual background of women’s music into account, however, there are several potential pitfalls in appraising the work of women composers. In the process of examining women’s music, there is a danger of recreating the dichotomy of the past between the music composed by men and women Macarthur in fact tries ‘to resist the temptation to create a dichotomy.’ Indeed, dichotomies by nature possess the tendency to become a ‘hierarchy’. I find the term dichotomy inadequate to describe a relationship between the music of men and women, because firstly, it suggests mutual exclusivity and secondly, an absence of interchange between the two sides, which was not the case. Rather than dwell on a split between the music of women and men, or consider women’s music as the subordinate element of a hierarchical structure it is more fruitful to consider women’s and men’s music as constantly intersecting with a dominating structure that we could call ‘music’. In the case of Josephine Lang, I can examine how she relates to the Lied tradition which incorporates comparison of her Lieder with both her female and male contemporaries. Hence, I can discuss her music both in the context of gender studies but also as part of a wider tradition of German song to which I believe her contribution to be unique. Indeed, a study of Lang’s songs teaches us about the Lied as a genre. That Lang’s Lieder lay naturally at the divide between ‘high’ and ‘low’ art – between ‘serious’ and ‘popular’ music – tells us that her music was in an unstable position and perhaps gives us part of the reason as to why her music is not known today.

Wilson Kimber argues that there is a great hazard in creating a discourse based on what women might have achieved. This is a valid point which, I believe, poses a very significant question, namely: how one handles the issue of unrealised potential. This is indeed a grey area but, nevertheless pertinent to scholarship concerned with female musicians of the nineteenth century, since more often than not, these women were denied educational and performance opportunities that were available to men. In the case of Josephine Lang, she showed prodigious talent from an early age – some of her best Lieder originate from her teenage years – but was denied the opportunity to study with Zelter in Berlin, a figure who was central to music in nineteenth-century Germany. Who is to say what Lang might have achieved if she had been given this opportunity? When faced with such creative tragedies, however, scholars must also be particularly careful not to distort the truth and create the story which they want to tell. Wilson Kimber addresses many of these crucial issues arguing that in order for ‘feminist biography and women’s history to have any validity, they must not abandon a historical
method that believes in evidence and replace it with fiction.'31 Firstly, Wilson Kimber points out that traditional positivist methodologies are very useful in unearthing the music of women composers but at the same time they are insufficient to tell the whole story of their achievement. This brings me to one of my central arguments: namely, that the attempt to remain true to women’s work must pay serious attention to their musical works and avoid becoming engrossed in retelling a version of their lives that ignores the musical material and resorts to the kind of ‘hero-worship’ that was widespread in musicology of the early twentieth century.

In 1986, Bowers and Tick argued in Women Making Music that it is not just women who have been neglected in music history but the entire sociology of music.32 Such neglect was significant because it not only has consequences for the music of both sexes but it reveals a critical deficiency, namely a failure to appreciate women’s role in history. Such deficits point to the foremost argument that has evolved out of the discourse on women and music: namely that a critical approach to contemporary social and cultural ideologies of the period is essential to deepen our understanding of the role of women and their music in the nineteenth century. Of course, the different social positions of women and men in the nineteenth century and the adjacent impact this had on their art must relate to the way we treat them in musicology today. However, I ask tentatively, have we now arrived at the other extreme where our immersion in theory has led us to forget about the music?

**Women’s music – towards a methodology**

In returning to Rosen’s remark that uncritical examination of women composers’ works does not do justice to the real tragedy of their lives, we are alerted to one of the dangers involved in study of women composers, namely that their music should not be mindlessly uncovered without acknowledging the pedagogical limits on women of the nineteenth century. Whitney Chadwick points to the tendency of historians to avoid serious criticism of women’s works because of an idealist desire to see the work materialise in the public domain.33 In the same vein, McClary observes that the problem with much scholarship on women’s music is its failure to engage seriously with actual music.34 Similarly, in a review of New Grove Dictionary of Women Composers, Judy Tsou criticises the volume for a dearth of technical description of these composers’ music.35 All of these opinions endorse one of my central conclusions: if we are to be serious about women composers, we must indeed be serious about their music.36 However admirable the desire to revive women’s music and see it revitalised in the current musical climate, the foundation on which this kind of research is built is simply not strong enough to lend permanence to a tradition. Such methodology fails in its efforts to achieve awareness of women’s musical works by treating these works as ‘special’37 and beyond the possibility of serious criticism. In pursuing this path, a certain weakness in women’s music is, albeit unintentionally, implied. In Green’s opinion, we must judge the music, for if we do not, how are we to learn anything of the musical substance of the work?38 However, this said, in any critical appraisal of women’s musical works, the scholar must be acutely sensitive to the composer’s circumstances. Through a heightening of the
understanding of these circumstances, we can appreciate women’s music of the nineteenth century for no less and no more than what it is.

There are, of course, important social and cultural factors (among others) that one must take into account when exploring women’s music. Citron, for example, points out that ‘women composers might also resist the temptation to be innovative and stand out; patterns of socialisation predicted on community and conformity might guide such a response.’ In the light of such social pressures – not to mention the educational context – it would be duly unfair to criticise women’s work for a lack of ingenuity, for example. Josephine Lang’s compositions ranged from more sophisticated Lieder to stylistically simple songs. Where male composers tended to experiment in many genres (and larger genres at that) women composers tended to compose in smaller genres. Lang composed predominantly within the genre of the Lied, for example.

There is an unvoiced fear among some scholars, I suspect, that the music we are exploring may not be of good quality. This has resulted in a fear of discussing women’s music critically. However if such discrepancies do occur in the music of nineteenth-century women composers, it only strengthens existing findings in nineteenth-century music pedagogy, namely that having been denied the same opportunities as their male contemporaries, women’s music was severely affected. In musicological discourse on women’s music, it is absolutely essential to stay faithful to the music and not distort the reality in an attempt to disguise women’s music in order to prove its scholarly worth. It is also important that women’s music is heard in performance. Since much of women’s music was composed for the salon, an awareness of the performance context is required so as not to distort the music or create unrealistic expectations for the audience. In many cases, we must learn to appreciate it for what it is.

In the light of this historical context, how do we examine the music itself? While it is not my main venture to search for a feminine aesthetic in Josephine Lang’s Lieder, I can look at deviations from the given aesthetic as an expression of her femininity. Green points to the need for ‘comparative analytical work’ on both the music of women and men which can provide further insights into the musical landscape of men’s and women’s music. Bearing in mind nineteenth century pedagogical limitations, comparison with men’s music plays a crucial role in erudition of women’s music. It acts as a useful yardstick to evaluate a composer’s musical style, formal and harmonic progressiveness, and use of the piano in the Lied, for example. At the same time, it is crucial to employ advanced and rigorous analytical methods in looking at women’s music. My own study of Lang’s Lieder incorporates analytical methods by such scholars as Jonathan Dunsby, Steven Paul Scher, Edward T. Cone, Lorraine Byrne Bodley and Susan Youens (the two latter scholars’ work is especially relevant in analysing Lang’s innate gift for interpreting the meaning of poetry in her Lieder) among others. In the past, there has been over emphasis on biography in this study of women composers and not enough discussion of the music. A balance is needed if women’s music of the past is to gain permanence in music history but also a rightful place in the public perception.
Citron stresses the importance of trying to understand women composers ‘in their own terms.’ If we do not attempt to attain this understanding we will, as Rosen argued, ignore the real ‘tragedy’ of many of their situations. Consequently, I wish to move away from the antiquated practice that Green describes as talented women becoming acknowledged as ‘honorary men’ and instead recognise women’s achievements as important in their own right. That tradition of designating exceptional women as ‘honorary men’ does nothing to encourage the investigation of women’s music. Instead, it pushes the investigation of women’s music into a deeper position of isolation.

Conclusion

Women composers were not permitted to enjoy fully the status of ‘professional’ composers in the nineteenth century. In a letter to Mendelssohn, Josephine Lang finds it ‘amusing’ that she has now become a housewife, for example, when she obviously felt that her true calling was to be a composer. The reality is that she was indeed a professional composer, who, despite a limited musical education, succeeded in becoming one of the most widely published Lieder composers of the nineteenth century and yet largely eludes music history today, although this is beginning to change. Consequently, an understanding of the gendered ideologies and the pedagogical limitations placed on women of the nineteenth century is crucial if we are to expand our knowledge of women’s musical activities. In striving to combine a serious critical engagement with women’s music with an acute appreciation of the social context, our knowledge of musical life in the nineteenth century can be deepened considerably.
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