Introduction

According to Reinhard Strohm, 'today, the question of a conceptual framework for a history of music that pays due attention to global relationships in music is often raised'. As he continues, such work should 'aim to promote post-European historical thinking [. . . and be] based on the idea that a global history of music cannot be one single, hegemonic history'.[1] Nowhere is this demand more evident than in modernist studies. There are two reasons for this. First, musical modernism – dated here to the period from around 1910 to the present day[2] – has been contemporaneous with a period of intensified global encounter, covering the heyday of empire, decolonisation and accelerated globalisation. Far from being accidental, this historical parallel has profoundly affected the nature and meaning of musical modernism. Specifically, I argue that the global diffusion of musical modernism and the ensuing encounters between modernist music and its various counterparts across the world transformed both. Second, despite or because of this explosive cultural and geographic expansion, many modernist composers, musicians and critics have embraced universalism. As a result, more even than earlier periods of the Western classical tradition, musical modernism appears placeless. Indeed, it was often defined as an 'international' or 'cosmopolitan' movement in opposition to supposedly rooted national or vernacular traditions.

This, at least, is the impression given by textbooks on modernist music, which overwhelmingly focus on 'genius' (and, more often than not, white male) composers and their masterworks, buttressed by notions of influence and technical innovation.[3] The cultural-geographic origin of the music is, if

[1] Reinhard Strohm, ed., *Studies on a Global History of Music: A Balzan Musicology Project*, SOAS Musicology (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2018), blurb.

[2] Björn Heile and Charles Wilson, 'Introduction', in *The Routledge Research Companion to Modernism in Music*, ed. Björn Heile and Charles Wilson (London: Routledge, 2019), 1–30.

[3] The examples, in ascending chronological order, are Robert P. Morgan, *Twentieth-Century Music: A History of Musical Style in Modern Europe and America* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991); Glenn Watkins, *Soundings: Music in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Schirmer, 1995); Arnold Whittall, *Musical Composition in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Arnold Whittall, *Exploring Twentieth-Century Music: Tradition and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Richard Taruskin, *The Oxford History of*

at all, reflected only in the earlier chapters, whereas, after the World War II watershed, music appears to become untethered from any specific places. Although centres, such as Darmstadt, Paris and New York, continue to loom large, the innovations associated with them are depicted as being of universal significance. Moreover, there is at best fleeting recognition of the world beyond Europe and North America, as if the remarkable flowering of modernist composition and performance in Latin America, East Asia, Australasia and parts of Africa and the Near and Middle East never happened or is of no particular significance.[4] While a topic such as 'globalisation' has had a profound impact on popular music studies, until recently, no comparable effect has been registered in modernist music studies.

In this book, I propose an alternative model according to which musical modernism *is constituted by* a global diasporic network of composers, musicians and institutions. While modernist music is embedded in specific places, the nodal points of the network, it is the manifold entanglements between those points that make it what it is. This network has similarities with the Deleuzian rhizome: there is no absolute centre, and the relations between points are dynamic and subject to constant change.[5] At the same time, not all points are necessarily equal: the network is the result of unequal power relations, many of which persist to this day. To sketch this network, I will be exploring some of the transnational connections and contact zones through which modernist music has been transmitted and where ideas about musical modernism have been negotiated.

It follows that 'musical modernism' as used here is a discursively constructed concept that is contingent on specific contexts. I will therefore not be providing a formal definition with a list of features, because the question is not how *I* define the term but how it has been understood in different places and at different times. This raises the question to what extent we can speak of 'this concept', given that the term itself is a recent coinage specific

Western Music (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), www.oxfordwesternmusic.com; Paul Griffiths, *Modern Music and After*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Joseph Auner, *Music in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2013). Cf. Björn Heile, 'Mapping Musical Modernism', in *Music History and Cosmopolitanism*, ed. Anastasia Belina, Kaarina Kilpiö, and Derek B. Scott (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 90–105.

[4] An exception to this is Martin Scherzinger's chapter on African composition in the *Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music*: Martin Scherzinger, '"Art" Music in a Cross-Cultural Context: The Case of Africa', in *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music*, ed. Nicholas Cook and Anthony Pople (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 584–613.

[5] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 3–25; cf. also, among others, Edward Campbell, *Music after Deleuze* (London: A&C Black, 2013), 35–66.

to Anglophone musicology.[6] It is therefore employed here as an umbrella for broadly equivalent terms in different languages. On one level, there is nothing new in this: we have long spoken of Béla Bartók, Heitor Villa-Lobos or Toshiro Mayuzumi, in addition to, say, Arnold Schönberg and Igor Stravinsky, as 'modernist' composers, and it is generally understood what is meant by that. More specifically, I am following the Global Musical Modernisms Forum that likewise employs the term for a wide range of composers across the world who were active at different times and who share certain qualities (although note the plural 'modernisms', which I am not adopting).[7]

Charles Wilson and I have previously described musical modernism as 'an artistic response to the social changes wrought by modernity', arguing further that, for modernists, 'the means of expression have to be adequate to the spirit of the age and to what is being expressed', which implies a 'highly self-reflective and critical approach towards style and technique', including viewing 'inherited tradition with suspicion' (which does not, however, necessarily mean discarding it).[8] While this characterisation was admittedly primarily informed by Western modernist music and Western theorists, it may serve a more global perspective too, once we accept that 'modernity' and 'tradition' can take different forms. We further advocated conceiving of 'musical modernism as a series of family resemblances, whereby different members of the family may share certain features but none is common to all of them, and where distant members may be connected by a chain of resemblances without sharing a single feature in common'.[9] This allows for a considerable diversity of expressions and styles across the network, while ensuring an underlying kinship and recognisability. Furthermore, what makes musical modernism *global* are transnational links. This is the key difference between a diasporic network as I have described it here and parallel national and regional histories. As will be outlined in more detail, globality, then, is not a question of comprehensiveness of coverage but attention to relationality and transnational entanglements.

Chapter 3, on the International Society of Contemporary Music (ISCM), will highlight some of these issues, since the ISCM was faced with precisely the problem of negotiating between different musical cultures and coming

[6] Arnold Whittall, 'Foundations and Fixations: Continuities in British Musical Modernism', in *The Routledge Research Companion to Modernism in Music*, ed. Charles Wilson and Björn Heile (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 354–57.
[7] https://globalmusicalmodernisms.hcommons.org/about/ (accessed 28 July 2022).
[8] Heile and Wilson, 'Introduction', 5–6. [9] Heile and Wilson, 'Introduction', 12.

to an agreement about what 'contemporary music', the operative term, might mean in different contexts. As a result, what we have come to know as musical modernism has been shaped by the ISCM and similar institutions like it. In this sense, musical modernism is defined by a transnational and transhistorical dialogue.

My approach builds on the 'spatial turn' that musicology has recently undergone and that has acted as a corrective to the blind spots in scholarship on musical modernism identified here. Among a diverse list of examples, important work by Brigid Cohen, Dana Gooley, Tamara Levitz, Sarah Collins and Amy Bauer as well as an edited collection on music and cosmopolitanism can be singled out.[10] In addition, there has been a novel focus on modernism in national and regional music history that often complements and occasionally challenges universalist accounts.[11]

[10] Brigid Cohen, *Stefan Wolpe and the Avant-Garde Diaspora*, New Perspectives in Music History and Criticism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Brigid Cohen, 'Limits of National History: Yoko Ono, Stefan Wolpe, and Dilemmas of Cosmopolitanism', *The Musical Quarterly* 97, no. 2 (17 October 2014): 181–237, https://doi.org/10.1093/musqtl/gdu008; Dana Gooley (convenor), 'Cosmopolitanism in the Age of Nationalism, 1848–1914', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 66, no. 2 (1 August 2013): 523–49, https://doi.org/10.1525/jams.2013.66.2.523; Tamara Levitz (convenor), 'Musicology Beyond Borders?', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 65, no. 3 (1 December 2012): 821–61, https://doi.org/10.1525/jams.2012.65.3.821; Sarah Collins and Dana Gooley, eds., 'Music and the New Cosmopolitanism: Problems and Possibilities', *The Musical Quarterly* 99, no. 2 (1 June 2017): 139–65, https://doi.org/10.1093/musqtl/gdx006; Sarah Collins, 'The Composer as "Good European": Musical Modernism, Amor Fati and the Cosmopolitanism of Frederick Delius', *Twentieth-Century Music* 12, no. 01 (March 2015): 97–123, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1478572214000164; Amy Bauer, 'The Cosmopolitan Absurdity of Ligeti's Late Works', *Contemporary Music Review* 31, no. 2–3 (1 April 2012): 163–76, https://doi.org/10.1080/07494467.2012.717358; Anastasia Belina, Kaarina Kilpiö, and Derek B. Scott, eds., *Music History and Cosmopolitanism* (Routledge, 2019).

[11] See, among others, Philip Rupprecht, *British Musical Modernism: The Manchester Group and Their Contemporaries* (Cambridge University Press, 2015); Matthew Riley, ed., *British Music and Modernism, 1895–1960* (Routledge, 2017); Michael Hooper, *Australian Music and Modernism: 1960–1975* (London: Bloomsbury, 2019); Daniel M. Grimley, *Carl Nielsen and the Idea of Modernism* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010); Bonnie C. Wade, *Composing Japanese Musical Modernity* (University of Chicago Press, 2014); Luciana Galliano, *Yogaku: Japanese Music in the 20th Century* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2002); Omar Corrado, *Música y modernidad en Buenos Aires (1920–1940)* (Buenos Aires: Gourmet Musical, 2010); Daniela Fugellie, *'Musiker unserer Zeit': Internationale Avantgarde, Migration und Wiener Schule in Südamerika* (Edition Text + Kritik, 2018); Vera Wolkowicz, *Inca Music Reimagined: Indigenist Discourses in Latin American Art Music, 1910–1930* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2022); Pablo Palomino, *The Invention of Latin American Music: A Transnational History* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2020); Alejandro L. Madrid, *Sounds of the Modern Nation: Music, Culture, and Ideas in Post-Revolutionary Mexico* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008).

The inspiration for this book did not only come from music studies, however, and my approach is also influenced by discourses in neighbouring fields, such as critical cosmopolitanism, postcolonialism and decoloniality. In literary studies, in particular, the notion of 'global modernism(s)' has been common currency for many years.[12] For instance, in an influential article, Susan Stanford Friedman has spoken of 'polycentric modernities and modernisms at different points of time and in different locations', an idea that led to her concept of 'planetary modernisms'.[13] From another perspective, Franco Moretti's novel ways of depicting cultural transfer, such as 'graphs, maps and trees', hold hitherto unrealised promise for a reconceptualisation of the cultural geography of musical modernism.[14]

If it had been my intention to adopt this notion of global modernism for musicology, I was beaten to it, however. Largely while I was writing this book, there has been a spate of publications in global musical modernism, inaugurating it as a recognisable field. In most cases, however, the theoretical framework has been borrowed not from global (literary) modernism but global history, just like many of the contributions seem to be concerned more about music historiography than modernist studies. In any case, what was quite a fragmented area drawing on diverse disciplinary and theoretical traditions has started to coalesce into a couple of interrelated, widely held positions or overarching concepts, without however congealing into orthodoxy. If, in the following, I attempt to sketch a theoretical framework on this basis, it is important to bear in mind that this did not exist at the outset but is to a certain extent a retrospective imposition.

An important role is played by Christian Utz's *Musical Composition in the Context of Globalization* (the German original of which was published in 2014, although the enlarged English translation did not appear before 2021). Although it is situated more in the field of intercultural composition, this is arguably the first systematic and comprehensive attempt to conceptualise modernist composition on a global level (albeit with a strong emphasis on East Asia). The aforementioned Balzan

[12] See, within a vibrant and diverse field, Mark A. Wollaeger and Matt Eatough, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* (New York, NY; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). It is characteristic of the presumptuousness of that field that 'modernism' here (as so often) refers to literature.

[13] Susan Stanford Friedman, 'Periodizing Modernism: Postcolonial Modernities and the Space/Time Borders of Modernist Studies', *Modernism/Modernity* 13, no. 3 (15 November 2006): 426, https://doi.org/10.1353/mod.2006.0059; Susan Stanford Friedman, *Planetary Modernisms: Provocations on Modernity Across Time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015).

[14] Franco Moretti, *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History* (London: Verso, 2007).

Musicology Project on *A Global History of Music*, which has yielded three collected volumes as well as associated activities and publications, has also acted as a catalyst, not least through its challenge to traditional Eurocentric music historiography.[15] Having said that, due to the project's emphasis on 'traditions', very few contributions directly addressed modernism, which, as mentioned, has tended to have a complicated if not necessarily antagonistic relation to tradition.

Last but not least, there have been three collected volumes on aspects of East-Asian music in relation to (countries within) the West, adding to the focus already established by Utz.[16] Beyond the eye-opening nature of their contributions, what is significant about these books is that they bring together researchers from or working in Western and East-Asian countries. Thus, 'the West' has been decentred here also at the practical, disciplinary and institutional level, and it is the 'how' of knowledge production that is as innovative as the 'what' of the knowledge produced. While, by contrast, I have in this book acted as the 'lone wolf' that Daniel Chua has warned about and thus talk about different world regions from the perspective of the Western academy,[17] I will be guided as much as possible by local scholars.

Salutary though this activity in the study of the musical relations between East Asia and the West is, it raises the question of other world regions, such as Latin America or Africa. Although I make no claim to represent the world equally, all are covered in the book, so the theoretical framework should be applicable without the 'epistemic violence' of imposing alien paradigms. To the extent that I am able to judge, the work being

[15] Strohm, *Studies on a Global History of Music;* Reinhard Strohm, ed., *The Music Road: Coherence and Diversity in Music from the Mediterranean to India* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019); Reinhard Strohm, ed., *Transcultural Music History: Global Participation and Regional Diversity in the Modern Age* (Berlin: VWB-Verlag, 2021); Reinhard Strohm, 'The Balzan Musicology Project towards a Global History of Music, the Study of Global Modernisation, and Open Questions for the Future', *Muzikologija*, no. 27 (2019): 15–29, https://doi.org/10.2298/MUZ1927015S.

[16] Hon-Lun Yang and Michael Saffle, eds., *China and the West: Music, Representation, and Reception* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017); Chien-Chang Yang and Tobias Janz, eds., *Decentering Musical Modernity: Perspectives on East Asian and European Music History* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2019); Joanne Miyang Cho, ed., *Musical Entanglements between Germany and East Asia: Transnational Affinity in the 20th and 21st Centuries* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021). Since this book was submitted in August 2022, more recent publications, such as the special issue on 'Global Musical Modernisms', in *Twentieth-century Music* 20/3 (2023), edited by Gavin S. K. Lee and Christopher J. Miller, could not be considered.

[17] Daniel K. L. Chua, 'Global Musicology: A Keynote without a Key', *Acta Musicologica* 94, no. 1 (2022): 122.

carried out in the study of Latin-American and African musical modernism(s) is no less important and innovative as that on East Asia and many contributions will be discussed in the following chapters, but it tends to at least ostensibly follow the tradition of regional or national music history, rather than global musicology. That said, events such as the online conference on 'Global Musicology – Global Music History', co-organised by Amanda Hsieh (Chinese University of Hong Kong) and Vera Wolkowicz (then based at the University of Buenos Aires), indicate a convergence between regional perspectives and traditions that had previously tended to act more in parallel than in dialogue.[18] One of my intentions is to further this process of connecting these disparate perspectives and insights to create a fuller picture of musical modernism(s) around the world. While I realise that this liberty to roam freely across countries and continents is a Western privilege, I can only hope that the results will benefit scholars more widely. Problematic though this position may be, it seems preferable to the alternative of focusing on the Western Self as if the Other and the long and often painful history of interactions between the two did not exist. Likewise, while there is no view from nowhere and I therefore write from the perspective of an academic born and bred in Germany and employed by a Scottish university, I seek to reflect on my own positionality.

Elements of a Theory of Global Musical Modernism

At the risk of generalisation, the contributions named in the previous section and many others like them allow sketching a preliminary theoretical framework. One of the key problems of any such framework is how to conceptualise the relations between musical modernism(s) in different regions to one another and to 'the West'. According to traditional models focused on innovation such as the textbooks discussed at the outset, modernist music is necessarily Western, by implication rendering any instances from outside the West inauthentic imitations. Such historical models prioritise 'centres' (or 'cores'), where most of the innovations have been introduced, over 'peripheries' (or 'margins'), where they have been adopted after a certain time lag. As proponents of postcolonialism and decoloniality have argued, the spatiotemporal logic of this paradigm

[18] https://groups.google.com/g/musicology-announce-2/c/XqDgjvY8k1A (accessed 9 August 2022).

replicates that of colonialism, in which the metropolis is both at the centre and 'more advanced' than the colony.[19] It is therefore not surprising that the centre–periphery model has been widely criticised as inherently Eurocentric.[20] It could be argued that even the apparently indisputable fact that musical modernism originated in the West is ultimately a consequence of the concept's (Western-derived) definition, which prioritises compositional techniques such as harmonic organisation or non-periodic rhythm associated with European and North-American composers such as Stravinsky, Schoenberg, Bartók, Scriabin and Ives, over, say, the expressive modulation of 'a note' (itself a Western concept) in performance or practices involving improvisation and communal music-making. Nevertheless, this argument has been rarely made. Instead, there has been an effort to decouple origin from primacy or essence: just because musical modernism may be of Western origin does not mean that it will necessarily always stay that way or that this is part of its innermost nature. Accordingly, instead of accepting a model of 'dissemination' or 'diffusion' that relies on imitation or passive adoption in 'the periphery', global music scholars have emphasised that 'cultural transfer' is an active process that requires musicians and composers to translate innovations in their specific contexts which involves a complex negotiation between local traditions and imported models. Furthermore, as the postcolonial theorist Homi Bhabha has argued, what he calls 'mimicry' disrupts the authority of the colonial discourse by 'disclosing its ambivalence'.[21] In other words, imitation has the power to exceed and subvert the original. At the same time, Leonhard B. Meyer, for one, has criticised 'innovation history' as long ago as 1983, although this does not mean that it did not remain influential.[22]

The critique of ideas and concepts such as the centre–periphery model or diffusion does not necessarily make them entirely obsolete, however. It is difficult to deny that there have been centres of musical modernism and,

[19] Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, Routledge classics edition (London: Routledge, 2004), 145–74; Linda Martín Alcoff, 'Mignolo's Epistemology of Coloniality', *CR: The New Centennial Review* 7, no. 3 (2007): 79–101.

[20] See, among others, William Fourie, 'Musicology and Decolonial Analysis in the Age of Brexit', *Twentieth-Century Music*, 17/2 (2020), 1–15, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1478572220000031; Yu-jun Choi, 'Modernity as Postcolonial Encounter in Korean Music', in *Decentering Musical Modernity: Perspectives on East Asian and European Musical Modernity*, ed. Tobias Janz and Chien-Chang Yang (Bielefeld: transcript, 2019), 41–62; Fumitaka Yamauchi, 'Contemplating East Asian Music History in Regional and Global Contexts: On Modernity, Nationalism, and Colonialism', in *Decentering Musical Modernity*, 313–36.

[21] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 127.

[22] Leonard B. Meyer, 'Innovation, Choice, and the History of Music', *Critical Inquiry* 9, no. 3 (1983): 517–44.

despite the negative connotations, this implies the existence of peripheries. Likewise, it has been more common for people, styles, techniques and ideas to travel from the centres to the peripheries than vice versa. The point is, though, that these relations are not fixed but dynamic. Alongside long-standing centres, such as Vienna, Paris, New York and Moscow, newer ones, such as Buenos Aires, Tokyo and Shanghai, have emerged, just as the status of these international metropoles is rivalled by provincial towns, such as Darmstadt (home of the International Summer Courses in New Music) or Tongyeong (birthplace of the composer Isang Yun and host of the Tongyeong International Music Festival). Likewise, the 'cultural flows' connecting these centres to peripheries, however defined, are not necessarily unidirectional. This is a complex issue to which I will return, but what defines centres is their ability to *attract* people and ideas, prior to transmitting them.

As has already become apparent, I have not been able to entirely avoid these terms despite their problematic nature, but this should not be equated with acceptance of unequal power relations or the belief that they are immutable. A similar point can be made about 'the West' and the 'non-Western world' (or 'the rest'). These terms imply an extraordinary degree of simplification, reducing what are extremely heterogeneous regions to monolithic entities and erecting an apparently impermeable border between them (which is why I feel compelled to use scare quotes, although they don't solve the problem). This nomenclature largely replaced an earlier and now widely discredited one that distinguished between the 'First' and the 'Third World' (the 'Second World' was represented by the now-defunct Warsaw Pact and allied countries), and it is now in turn often supplanted by the supposedly more value-free distinction between the 'Global North' and the 'Global South'.[23] These concepts are not exactly synonymous, and they all have specific histories and associations. Whatever terms we use, however, the real injustice consists of the division of the world and the power differential between its different parts. These facts must be acknowledged.

One theoretical paradigm that has been adopted by many theorists of global modernism is that of *Multiple* or *Alternative Modernities*, which gained traction in the social sciences around the turn of the millennium. According to the definition by Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, Jens Riedel and

[23] The reason I primarily use 'the West' and the 'non-Western world' here is because that distinction allows for cultural rather than economic criteria. Specifically, East-Asian countries such as Japan and South Korea can be considered 'non-Western' although they are part of the 'Global North'.

Dominic Sachsenmaier, '[t]he core of multiple modernities lies in assuming the existence of culturally specific forms of modernity shaped by distinct cultural heritages and sociopolitical conditions. These forms will continue to differ in their value systems, institutions, and other factors.'[24] Similarly, according to Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, '[t]he idea of "alternative modernities" holds that modernity always unfolds within specific cultures or civilizations and that different starting points of the transition to modernity lead to different outcomes'.[25] The attractiveness of these ideas appears obvious: if there are forms of modernity that differ from the Euro-American model, it follows that musical modernism is not necessarily a Western import and that it can emerge in different places and cultures and can take different forms. It is no surprise, then, that they have been embraced, for example, by Utz, Janz and in my own earlier work.[26] In response, Fumitaka Yamauchi has launched an 'argument for a *singularity* of global colonial modernity – with its different manifestations in divergent contexts fully acknowledged . . .'. As he continues:

> This should not be mistaken . . . as a reaffirmation of the singularity in a Eurocentric fashion; rather, it is a radical remolding of modernity into representation of a profoundly complicated and asymmetrical inter-subjective network that, while being triggered by the West, has involved a countless number of participants, regardless of being Western or non-Western, colonizing or colonized, or categorized otherwise, thereby fostering awareness of one *single* interconnected globe, or rather, our planet.[27]

Yamauchi is influenced by Dirlik, but the multiple modernities paradigm has had many critics, including Fredric Jameson and Walter Mignolo, who, although appearing to come from opposite ends of the spectrum, converge in the view that the notion of multiple or alternative modernities

[24] Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, Jens Riedel, and Dominic Sachsenmaier, 'The Context of the Multiple Modernities Paradigm', in *Reflections on Multiple Modernities: European, Chinese, and Other Interpretations*, ed. Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, Jens Riedel, and Dominic Sachsenmaier (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 1.

[25] Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, *Alternative Modernities* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001), blurb.

[26] Christian Utz, *Musical Composition in the Context of Globalization: New Perspectives on Music History in the 20th and 21st Century* (transcript Verlag, 2021), 57; Tobias Janz, 'Multiple Musical Modernities? Dahlhaus, Eisenstadt, and the Case of Japan', in *Decentering Musical Modernity: Perspectives on East Asian and European Music History*, ed. Tobias Janz and Chien-Chang Yang (Bielefeld: transcript, 2019), 279–312; Björn Heile, 'Musical Modernism, Global: Comparative Observations', in *The Routledge Companion to Modernism in Music*, ed. Björn Heile and Charles Wilson (London: Routledge, 2019), 177.

[27] Yamauchi, 'Contemplating East Asian Music History in Regional and Global Contexts: On Modernity, Nationalism, and Colonialism', 336. Italics in the original.