

which is the only surviving source, as the book itself seems to have disappeared. No comments are necessary, they speak for themselves of the ideals of their author:

“... The day will come when socialism has rooted so strongly in the whole world that the horrors of war will die out by themselves. . .

The massacre of the human race will cease and transform itself into ever-higher forms of spiritual contest, into a life-confirming and life-enriching instead of destructive contest in all fields. . .

It is part of God's plan of the world that the war in spite of everything, as long as it has its horrible grip on the world, brings about improvements ('als Teufel schaffen muss'). Thus. . . the question of women's rights must be coming nearer to their fulfilment with a gigantic stride. Alone. . . through the brutal fact of the immense loss of the lives of men in this most deadly war. One will be glad to fill with women the huge gaps, that have opened in all fields of men's work and occupation. And thus the right to vote for women, indispensable for themselves and for society as a whole, cannot fail to be instigated. . .” (p.12).

For the publication of this book Natalie Bauer-Lechner was arrested, accused of treason and imprisoned for a longer period of time.

Her friendship with Gustav Mahler lasted from 1890 until his engagement with Alma Schindler ended it in 1902. As to the nature of this friendship one can only guess. It is more than likely that she herself saw the attachment in a different light than Mahler, who in his self-centred manner seems to have treated her affectionately, but essentially as someone whom it was handy to have around. The devastating effect that Mahler's engagement with Alma Schindler had on her is felt acutely in the last entry with which the memoirs are abruptly cut off: “Six weeks ago Mahler engaged himself to Alma Schindler. If I were to speak about it, I would find myself in the role of the doctor, who had to treat his nearest and dearest on life and death. To finish this therefore shall be laid in the hands of the highest eternal Master!” This experience undoubtedly later led her to write that in their lives with great men women could give men humanity (Fragmente p.109). We can only be thankful to her that she had the insight to record her relationship with Gustav Mahler and leave us one of the most important documents on his life and thinking.

*Susan Haase Derrett*

*Joseph Kerman: Contemplating Music. Challenges to Musicology, Harvard University Press 1985, 255pp. (hardback). British edition: Musicology, Collins 1985 (hardback), Fontana 1985 (paperback)*

This newly-published book by Joseph Kerman, professor of Music at the University of California, Berkeley, comes right in the middle of an ongo-

ing evaluation of musicology in the USA. Kerman's book is not a systematic survey of musicology as a scholarly field of research in the style of Ingmar Bengtsson's *Musikvetenskap* from 1977. Rather it is a work of debate, in its very personal, at times almost autobiographical, approach to the subject matter, with a conspicuous underlying tone of impatience with the author's compatriots for not having got further in the general discussion. This accounts for the polemical tone that is present throughout the book. The subject matter is the uprising of American musicologists, or at any rate some musicologists, Kerman among them, against the neopositivism that they still see as the prevailing approach in American musicological research in spite of various scattered voices against this approach since the days of Charles Seeger. Kerman sees the reason for his country's adoption of and strong roots in, neopositivism in American musicology's indebtedness to the European (that is Continental European) musicological tradition brought to the United States by immigrants such as Apel, Bukofzer, Sachs, Schrade, and others in the nineteen-thirties and forties. These immigrants institutionalized American musicology which had hardly existed as a systematical, scholarly discipline before the war — American musicologists had to be trained in Europe — and at the same time, or so it seems to the outside observer, they institutionalized the positivistic tradition they brought with them. As Kerman himself points out, they did not take into account that European positivism was not easily transferred to a country that had a totally different educational system, its students thus lacking the European educational background of the *Gymnasium*. When the immigrant-scholars realised this discrepancy they turned to academic rigour to make up for it. (This is undoubtedly right, but positivism also had its limitations in the countries *with* the *Gymnasium* background, as was to be seen later.)

In recent years it seems that American musicologists' discontent with the positivistic stand has grown steadily and that the field is in a period of re-definition. As Kerman himself formulated the situation in a talk given at a meeting of the American Musicological Society in May 1984, American musicologists must now make the long overdue move from the first step of positivism: the collecting of data, to the second step: the interpretation of these data, here paraphrasing a quotation by the historian R.G. Collingwood which he has included in his book (p.43f; page numbers here refer to the American edition).

The central theme throughout Kerman's treatment of the various traditional subdisciplines of musicology (analysis, theory, music history, ethnomusicology and performance practice) is *criticism*. This term should not be regarded as a new branch of musicology, but as a different approach to musicology as a scholarly field, an approach that is to bring musicology precisely that step forward from the first to the second level of positivism mentioned above. (It should perhaps be mentioned here that Kerman, as well as using the term musicology in its general meaning of "musikforskning", "musik-

videnskab", frequently uses it also to cover music history; I use it in the meaning of "musikforskning".)

To get hold of the concept of *criticism* is not easy and Kerman does not make it easier; it is a somewhat amorphous concept. There is no equivalent term in German or Danish for it, and it should not be associated with journalistic writing about music, although criticism may be a part of this. Kerman himself calls it "academic" or "serious" music criticism to differentiate it from the more journalistic version (p.17).

As we have noted, Kerman's preoccupation with criticism has emerged out of his understandable discontentedness with the neopositivism of the post-war years, whose prime interest lies in the objective, seemingly value-free presentation of verifiable data, and which has resulted in a quantity of editorial works. Here lies the key to Kerman's concept of criticism. The 'value-free' presentation is worthless to Kerman. Instead, Kerman advocates taking a subjective position to a subject matter and its data by evaluating and in that process, interpreting it. Kerman would like to see this critical approach infiltrating into all branches of musicology. He also emphasises the necessity for more contextuality in studies of both a historical and an analytical nature, if they are to be called critical. However, these studies in the various branches of musicology (also in ethnomusicology) should not be an end in themselves but a means towards the ultimate goal of criticism: the deeper understanding of the individual piece of music as an art work. This should include music, indeed all musics, from the earliest times to the present day, and not predominantly Early Music, which has been the tendency in Anglo-American musicology. (Kerman is, in principal, in favour of the study of all musics, but openly admits that he himself is only interested in other musics in so far as they give him insight into Western art music, p.19.) The illumination of the aesthetical quality of music is the very core of Kerman's conception of criticism; he defines criticism as "the study of the meaning and value of art works", here music (p.16), the "model for musicology" being "the movement...from the various branches and methodologies of music history towards the actual music" (p.126). Indeed, it is the musicologist's personal aesthetical experience that should guide her research. This makes itself felt in the language that is used in conveying her critical opinion, Kerman's own book, with its highly subjective tone, is a striking example of it.

Apart from stating that literary criticism is his inspiration (but without discussing how literary criticism is to be transferred to criticism in musicology), Kerman does not feel himself to be in a situation to describe the theoretical foundations of his concept of criticism, instead he refers to his own Byrd-studies *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1981), in which he uses a variety of methods to illuminate his opinion of the music's aesthetical value. Among other examples, he also refers to Anthony Newcomb's studies in 19th-century music and his book

*The Madrigal at Ferrara 1579–1597* (Princeton 1980). Charles Rosen's work *The Classical Style* (New York 1971) emerges from Kerman's book as the absolute proto-example of criticism.

What makes me somewhat uneasy in Kerman's insistence on the aesthetical goal of his concept and his emphasis on the musicologist's own aesthetical experience as the guiding force in her critical approach to research in music, is his understanding of the aesthetical value of music itself. If the establishment of the aesthetical value of music is to be the goal of one's concept, one should at least make an investigation into how the aesthetical value of music is determined and how it is defined. Value is only possible in relation to a system. This system — whatever it is and however it is to be defined — is never discussed or even recognized as having a central position in making an aesthetical decision. It is assumed to be understood. In his unwillingness to theorize on what he himself calls an "abstract level" (p.124), Kerman's concept of criticism is in danger of tacitly or unconsciously establishing a new (although considerably enlarged) canon of 'classical music' — to replace the old canon, a result of Schenker's analytical theory, that Kerman criticises heavily (as he does Schenker's theory in general, p.69ff). Moreover, as a consequence of not having a formulated basic theory Kerman is on his way to create the same kind of "patchwork-quilt" (though now consciously subjective), he accuses the post-war positivists of working on (p.44).

Kerman presents his concept of criticism upon the background of Anglo-American musicology, which gives us an interesting insight into musicology as it has been practised in these two countries since the first world war. We follow British musicology in its quite recent transition from a discipline largely dominated by the dilettante (in the best meaning of the term) into established, professional musicology. In Kerman's opinion, and to his regret, this move has consolidated neopositivism in British musicology, his main target here is Iain Fenlon's work. We are also introduced to the American Charles Seeger, among others, whose writings seem worth another look at. And we are given an impression of how important an influence the work on the *New Grove's Dictionary* has had on Anglo-American musicology. Surprising for the Danish reader is the fact that Kerman seems to take so little account of what has happened in current musicological research in Continental Europe in *its* uprising against positivism at the end of the nineteen-sixties and during the seventies (and the eighties for that matter). Kerman only deals with the more traditional branches of musicology. New fields like psychology, semiotics, sociology, the reassumed hermeneutics, and communication-theory in general, which have had a strong influence in the continental countries, are scarcely mentioned, if at all.

Furthermore, apart from the obligatory reference to Adorno, the only German scholar Kerman mentions is Dahlhaus. This is understandable, as his own ideas seem to coincide somewhat with those of Dahlhaus, especially Dahlhaus' advocacy of methodological pluralism on the basis of a

structural approach, or on the ground of a "Prinzip der Prinziplosigkeit" as Dahlhaus himself puts it in *Grundlagen der Musikgeschichte*. But there are many others whose work lean toward criticism: Bernd Sponheuer, Tibor Kneif, H.-H. Eggebrecht et al. (As a footnote let me mention that only in recent years has a start been made in translating Dahlhaus' books into English, in some cases many years after they were first published in German (e.g. *Musikästetik* from 1967, translated in 1982; *Grundlagen der Musikgeschichte* from 1977, translated in 1983) and they are thus first now starting to make an impact on Anglo-American musicology. Adorno, whose work has had a major influence on Continental European research (and not only on left-wingers, see for example Eggebrecht's *Die Musik Gustav Mahlers*) has hardly had any impact in the USA — the exception being Rose Rosengard Subotnik. It seems that American musicology has had a hard time getting out of its insularity, a characteristic, that according to Kerman applies to Britain, too.) As Kerman is interested in dealing with music, a look at Georg Knepler and Harry Goldschmidt also seems appropriate, as they, too, work from the ground of methodological pluralism, though admittedly they have a different basic approach. None of these researchers' works are discussed, nor are Dahlhaus' ideas, in spite of Kerman's mentioning him. Although Kerman's main concern is Anglo-American research, a serious discussion of current Continental European ideas which stem from the same situation his own country's musicology finds itself in, would nevertheless seem fruitful to me.

But in spite of these shortcomings Kerman's *Contemplating Music* is a most interesting book, which is sure to spark off many discussions, especially in the USA and Britain, for whose musicological world it is written. (A broader view on current Anglo-American musicology is given in D. Kern Holoman and Claude V. Palisca (ed.): *Musicology in the 1980s*, New York 1982, to which Kerman is also a contributor.)

Susan Haase Derrett

*Erik Kjellberg: Svensk jazzhistoria. En översikt. 295 s., Norstedts förlag, Stockholm 1985.*

Tiden er inde til udarbejdelse af nationale jazzhistorier, kunne det se ud til. Det er allerede mange år siden der både i Danmark og Sverige blev udgivet antologier med ældre jazzindspilninger, men efter en række eksempler på bøger, hvor den nationale jazz har fået mindre afsnit, ser vi nu eksempler på, at den bliver gjort til selve sagen, også i bogform.

Erik Wiedemanns doktorafhandling fra 1982, *Jazz i Danmark*, et værk i to bind og med tre kassettebånd, har for vor egen del ført tingene grundigt til protokols frem til 1950, og det er umuligt ikke at trække Wiedemanns arbejde frem, når man skal vurdere den første svenske jazzhistorie, som