REVIEWS AND INFORMATION ON PUBLICATIONS — RECENZIJE I OBAVIJESTI O IZDANJIMA

Theophil ANTONICEK — Gernot GRUBER (Hrsg.), ***Musikwissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft damals und heute. Internationales Symposion (1998) zum Jubiläum des Institutsgründung an der Universität Wien vor 100 Jahren,*** **Tutzing: Schneider, 2005.**

Es ist kein Wunder, dass die Problematik, die in diesem Sammelband behandelt wird, meistens um den Institutsgründer Guido Adler kreist. Die Herausgeber wählten deshalb die Teilnehmer aus verschiedenen Universitäten[1], »die von ähnlichen [gemeint sind selbstverständlich Adlers Erfahrungen in Wien — Anm. N. G.] oder anders gelagerten Erfahrungen der Disziplinwerdung der Musikwissenschaft berichten konnten« (8). Trotz der Unterschiede, sogar im Inhalt des Faches, zeigte sich doch »einiges an Ähnlichem oder jedenfalls Vergleichbarem: Ohne charismatische Persönlichkeiten ging nichts — das Interesse für die europäische Musikhistorie dominierte, wurde aber durch Grundfragen nach dem Ursprung von Wesen der Musik vertieft — das Bemühen um die Positionierung der Musikwissenschaft im allgemeinen Musikleben und im Fächerkanon der Universität war viel allgemeiner ausgeprägt als dies heute der Fall ist.« (8)

* * *

Im einleitenden Beitrag versucht **Gunter Scholtz** (»Die moderne Zivilisation und die Wissenschaften von der Kunst«; 11ff) zu zeigen, »was die heutige Aufgabe [der] Wissenschaften [von Kunst] ist und warum sie nicht folgenlos verschwinden werden« (11). Er analysiert die moderne Zivilisation durch fünf Thesen und versucht »jeweils die Konsequenzen für die Wissenschaften von der Kunst zu zeigen« (11):

[1] Aus Bochum, Düsseldorf, Innsbruck, Wien, Graz, Prag, Brno, Berlin, Leipzig, Tübingen, Paris und Salzburg.

Die erste These bezieht sich auf die von Max Weber postulierte »Rationalisierung«, der aber auch ein moderner »Irrationalismus«, die Nicht-Rationalität oder Antirationalität gegenüber steht. Daraus ergibt sich die fragwürdige Wissenschaftlichkeit der »Philosophie, Geschichtsschreibung, Dichtung und Interpretation«, weil sie alle einfach Literatur seien. Es geht also um einen »Dualismus zwischen den rationalen Wissenschaften, welche sich nicht als Literatur verstehen können und wollen, und dem nicht- oder antirationalen Rest, der Literatur« (12-13). Scholtz ist der Meinung, dass »[d]as methodisch gesicherte Wissen […] das einzige [ist], das den subjektiven Beliebigkeiten und dem Kampf der Weltanschauungen, die gerade in die Kulturwissenschaft eingreifen, entzogen werden kann« (13). Max Weber erwähnt auch eine »Uniformierung des Lebensstils« als Folge der Rationalisierung. Scholtz sieht in der Musikwissenschaft ein (m. E. utopisches) Mittel, »um der Uniformierung des modernen Lebens entgegenzuwirken. Das gilt analog […] auch für die anderen Disziplinen, die sich mit Literatur, Malerei, Skulptur usw. befassen.« (15)

Die zweite These definiert die Moderne als »Zeitalter der Differenzierung« (15). Die Folge davon ist z. B. die Interdisziplinarität in den Wissenschaften und die Folge für die Musikwissenschaft ist, »dass andere Wissenschaften ihr einerseits neue Erkenntnisse vermitteln können, ihr andererseits aber auch den Gegenstand wegzunehmen drohen« (18).

Die dritte These behandelt die Trennung von Kunst und Wissenschaft als Folge der Ausdifferenzierung: »die Wissenschaft [wird] zum Ort der Wahrheit, die Kunst aber das Feld der Schönheit« (19). Da die Kunst aber auch mit der Wahrheit zu tun hat, »haben die Wissenschaften von der Kunst die Aufgabe, auf solche Wahrheit aufmerksam zu machen und sie zu explizieren, die spezifische ästhetische Wahrheit vom blossen Schein, von der Illusion und der Lüge abzugrenzen« (20).

Die vierte These befasst sich mit dem »Prozess beschleunigter Veränderung« in dem aber »immer mehr Veraltetes, Vergangenes, auch ausdrücklich bewahrt [wird]« (20). Die Kulturwissenschaften müssen sich so ständig mit der Bewältigung von Neuheit, Fremdheit und mit Umbrüchen der Kultur befassen (23).

In der fünten — und letzten — These geht es um den Multikulturalismus, den Scholtz interessanterweise mit dem Unterschied zwischen »subjektiver« und »objektiver Kultur« von Georg Simmel erörtert. Am Ende setzt er sich für die Wiederbelebung der »artes« ein, wodurch die subjektive Kultur bewusst gefördert wird. »Dies aber kann nur Sache der Geisteswissenschaften, nicht die der Natur- oder Sozialwissenschaften sein.« (26) Utopisch vielleicht, aber doch überzeugend!

In seinem Beitrag (»Musikwissenschaft zwischen Szylla und Charybdis oder Dasselbe ist nicht Dasselbe«; 27ff) analysiert **Volker Kalisch** den Unterschied in der Auffassung der Musikwissenschaft bei Adler und bei Kretzschmar: »Adler […] hat bei allen Ausflügen und Brückenschlägen in den Bereich der musikalischen Praxis 'Musikwissenschaft' primär immer in des Wissenschaftsbegriffs reinem Sinne verstanden — Kretzschmar jedoch nie. Die Verbindung von Musikwissenschaft und Musikleben ist bei Kretzschmar keinesfalls ein willkommener Nebenaspekt,

ein Eindruck, der sich zwangsläufig einstellt, wenn man sich mit Adlers Musikwissenschaftsverständnis auseinandersetzt, sondern sie ist ihm logisch und zwingend […] Adlers Vorstellung einer Musikwissenschaft als primär selbstbezweckter 'Musikhistorie' stellt Kretzschmar sein Konzept einer 'Musikgeschichte' als eine Art 'musikalisch angewandter Ästhetik' entgegen.« (41, 42) Zum Schluss (44-45) hebt Kalisch den Nutzen aus diesem Unterschied für die heutige Musikwissenschaft hervor!

Tilman Seebass elaboriert in seinem Beitrag (»Musikwissenschaft: von wem und für wen. Unser Auftrag im neuen Jahrhundert«; 47ff) die künftigen Aufgaben der Musikwissenschaft (besser: Musikwissenschaften, weil bei ihm auch die Musikethnologie eine sehr wichtige Rolle spielt!). Wir könnten ihm völlig zustimmen als er Folgendes schreibt: »Von wo aus immer wir das Problem des Anderen angehen, es bleibt allemal bei der einfachen Botschaft, dass, je besser wir Pluralität [und notwendigerweise auch 'Methodenpluralismus' — Anm. N. G.] verstehen, desto größer unsere Chance ist, auch im 21. Jahrhundert unser Fach in eine gedeihliche Richtung lenken zu können und uns im Wettbewerb zu bewähren.« (58) Es bleiben aber einige Ansätze, die problematisch erscheinen, z. B.: »In Wirklichkeit ist selbstverständlich jede Kultur unseres Globus geschichtlich und muss mit Methoden untersucht werden, die die historische einschließen — ungeachtet der Tatsache, dass viele Musikethnologen sich mit der Gegenwart als Positivum begnügen.« (47 — Anm. 2) Einige weitere Ausführungen wiederlegen diese mutige Hoffnung im Hinblick auf die Geschichtlichkeit aller Weltkulturen, z. B. als Seebass (übrigens mit Recht!) verlangt, dass man »Wissenschaftsverständnis in nichtwestlichen Schriftkulturen« untersucht (51). Dann sollte man auch die Auffassung der eventuellen »Geschichten« im Rahmen des Wissenschaftsverständnisses untersuchen! Oder als Seebass hofft, dass für die Japaner in Zukunft »westliche Forschungsmethoden tragfähig genug« sein werden (54), obwohl sich dieselben Japaner »bei der Erforschung ihrer eigenen Musik zögernd vom Adlerschen Modell [lösen]«, und zwar trotz der Tatsache, dass »es sich nicht auf die historische Erforschung der eigenen Musik anwenden lässt« (53). Dasselbe gilt für das Verhältnis zwischen Musiktheorie, die es in außereuropäischen Kulturen praktisch nicht gibt, und Musikpraxis, die wesensbestimmend für jede Geschichtlichkeit wäre. »Eine vergleichende Geschichte der Musiktheorie und Musikforschung außerhalb Europas« (54) wäre ja vielleicht wünschenswert. Wie sollte sie aber aussehen, wenn es keine Theorie in außereuropäischen Kulturen im herkömmlichen Sinne gibt? Und was für eine Geschichte hätten schließlich diejenigen Kulturen, »die anders [als unsere — Anm. N. G.] analysieren und anders tradieren« (55). Diese Fragen muss man offensichtlich negativ beantworten. Damit wird die Idee einer Geschichtlichkeit aller Weltkulturen reine Utopie, um die man sich m. E. endlich nicht weiter kümmern sollte!

Der Beitrag von **Theophil Antonicek** (»Hanslick und Adler — ein problematisches Verhältnis«; 61ff) sollte als Beweis dafür dienen, dass »Hanslick als akademischer Lehrer versagt [hat], sein Nachfolger [bzw. Adler — Anm. N. G.]

ganz von vorne beginnen [musste]« (68). Die Gegenüberstellung von Hanslick und Adler beruht auf der Tatsache, »dass Adler sich […] deutlich von Hanslicks Verhältnis zu seinem akademischen Fach absetzt. Hanslick hingegen scheint den Bestrebungen und Aktivitäten Adlers vielleicht wenig Verständnis, aber sehr wohl Achtung entgegengebracht zu haben, wobei nicht auszuschließen ist, dass ihm bewusst war, dass Adlers Weg jenem der damaligen Universität und ihrer teilweise glänzenden Vertreter in Wien mehr entspräche als seine eigene Einstellung und Praxis.« (63) Zwar stand im Zentrum von Hanslicks Berufsleben »seine Tätigkeit als Kritiker« an erster Stelle, was für Adler »sicherlich Verrat an der Sache war« (64). Man fragt sich selbstverständlich, was dies alles mit Kulturwissenschaft zu tun hat! Vielleicht nur der Vermerk Adlers, dass die Musikästhetik, die »noch nicht auf vollstaendig objectiv wissenschaftlichem Boden steht« (62), im Lehrplan tiefer vertreten sein sollte.

Dagegen befasst sich der Beitrag von **Barbara Boisits** (»Kulturwissenschaftliche Ansätze in Adlers Begriff von Musikwissenschaft«; 125ff) gerade mit dem, was im Beitrag von Antonicek offen geblieben ist:[2] Einige Schriften Adlers[3] sind, nach Meinung der Autorin, ein Beweis dafür, dass er die Diskussionen um die historischen Kulturwissenschaften (initiiert von Ernst Troeltsch, Gustav Schmoller, Werner Sombart, Wilhelm Windelband…) kannte und die Ergebnisse in seine Konzeption der Musikwissenschaft als Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaft einführen wollte. Die Debatte kreist zuerst um den Historismus »als Positivismus der Geisteswissenschaften« (127f), als »Relativismus« (128) und als »Prinzip« (128) und schon in der Hermeneutik Diltheys wurde die Hauptfrage »nach der Möglichkeit objektiver Erkenntnis von Geschichte, wenn das erkennende Subjekt selbst einer Historisierung unterliegt« gestellt (128). Und gerade »[d]ie Einschätzung der Genese von Musik als bestimmendem Gegenstand von Musikwissenschaft leitet in Adlers Konzept in eine kulturwissenschaftliche Betrachtungsweise über, da alles, was in einen möglichen Zusammenhang mit Musik gebracht werden kann, zur Erhellung musikalischer Kunstwerke beiträgt« (129). Selbstverständlich ist, dass deswegen die Musikwissenschaft interdisziplinär vorgehen muss (130), wobei sich auch die Frage »nach der Dominanz einer Disziplin über eine andere bzw. nach der Begründbarkeit einer Disziplin durch eine andere« stellt (131). Weiterhin wird die Wert- (131ff) und Objektivitätproblematik (137f) diskutiert und somit wird man auf den »Unendlichkeitscharakter der Kulturwissenschaften« aufmerksam gemacht (134f). Der Schluss präzisiert den Charakter von Musikwissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft in der Konzeption Adlers: »Adlers Auffassung von Wissen-

[2] Im Unterschied zum zweitem Beitrag von **Barbara Boisits** in dieser Sammlung (»Guido Adler und die Gründung der Bibliothek am musikwissenschaftlichen Institut in Wien«; 69ff), wo es praktisch keinen Nachweis über die Bestände der Bibliothek gibt. Es geht nur um die administrativ-finanzielle Schwierigkeiten, die Adler lösen sollte, um die Bibliothek zu ihrer Funktion zu bringen.

[3] »Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft« (1885), »Musik und Musikwissenschaft« (1898), *Der Stil in der Musik* (1911) und *Methode der Musikgeschichte* (1919).

schaft als Forschung, der kulturwissenschaftliche Ausgang seiner Problemstellung, die Historisierung des Gegenstandes von Musikwissenschaft und des sie untersuchenden Wissenschaftlers, das Bewusstsein, dass die Gegenstände von Forschung in einer Wertbeziehung zum Forschenden stehen und stehen müssen, um überhaupt erkannt zu werden, zeigen, dass Adler viele Probleme aufgriff, die die geistes- bzw. kulturwissenschaftlichen Debatten um 1900 bestimmten.« (139)

In ihrem Beitrag (»Die jeweils Ersten und '... Lektorat nur auf Kriegsdauer'«; 89ff) untersucht **Gerlinde Haas** »[die] Positionierung der Frau in der Musikwissenschaft« (89) anhand von zwei Frauen, die im Institut tätig waren: Elsa Bienenfeld (1877-1942; abtransportiert nach Minsk — S. 94) und Frida Kern (1891-1988), die 1943 »das Lektorat nur auf Kriegsdauer« bekam, und kommt zum folgenden Schluss: »Der Zugang der Frau zum Studium an der philosophischen Fakultät war in Österreich seit 1897 möglich. Obwohl nachweislich bereits ein Jahr später Studentinnen in der Musikwissenschaft inskribierten und 1903 die erste Absolventin promovierte, bedurfte es nach derzeitiger Kenntnis weiterer 40 Jahre, bis Frauen im 'Mittelbau' Beschäftigung fanden (während des Krieges üblicherweise nur auf 'Kriegsdauer'!). Weshalb Habilitation und Berufung zur Ordinaria so lange auf sich warten ließen, wäre einer Analyse wert, wo doch die Habilitationsordnung die Erteilung der 'venia docendi' an Frauen bereits 1919 thematisierte, die tatsächliche Habilitation wie die Vergabe eines Lehrstuhls an der Musikwissenschaft in Wien hingegen erst nach 85 bzw. 104 Jahren ihres Bestehens zustande kamen.« (98-99)

Gabriele Johanna Eder (»Guido Adler. Grenzgänger zwischen Musikwissenschaft und Kulturleben«; 101ff) befasst sich mit den weniger bekannten Aktivitäten Guido Adlers, die nicht mit seinen musikwissenschaftlichen und akademischen Verpflichtungen verbunden waren. Schon in seinem berühmten Aufsatz »Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft« (1885) bemühte sich Adler um einen lebendigen Kontakt zwischen der Musikwissenschaft und der zeitgenössischen Musik (102f), pflegte eine kreative Freundschaft mit Gustav Mahler (104f, *passim*), unterstützte besonders Arnold Schönberg und diejenigen Komponisten, die sich zur *Vereinigung schaffender Tonkünstler* in Wien zusammenschlossen (105ff), empfiehl seinen Studenten den Kompositionsunterricht bei Schönberg zu nehmen (109ff). Es ist wohl bekannt, dass einige Schönberg-Schüler bei Adler Musikwissenschaft studierten (z. B. Webern, Wellesz, Kurt Roger, Paul A. Pisk). Der Weg, meint Eder, führte »eher von Adler zu Schönberg als von Schönberg zu Adler«, so dass Adler »aufgrund seiner spezifisch handwerksbetonten Musikwissenschaftsauffassung letzlich […] ein Drahtzieher für die Entstehung des Schönberg-Kreises gewesen sein [dürfte]« (109). Zwar hatte Adler später Schwierigkeiten »mit Schönbergs rasanter Entwicklung« (111), jedoch hat er sich »redlich darum [bemüht], zumindest intellektuell Schönbergs Entwicklung im Auge zu behalten« (113). Des weiteren beschreibt Eder Adlers (gescheiterte) Initiative um die Reform des Konservatoriums der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde (114ff) und stellt ihn als Festorganisator dar (117ff): erwähnenswert sind z. B. Haydn-

und Beethoven-Zentenatfeier (1909, bzw. 1927) und seinen (wieder gescheiterten) »Traum von den regelmässigen Veranstaltungen von Musikfesten in Wien«, wo auch die ausländische zeitgenössische Musik ausgeführt werden sollte (119ff). Eder zum Schluss: »Adler war jener in der österreichischen Wissenschaftsgeschichte nicht so häufigen Universitätsprofessoren, die weit über die Grenzen des akademischen Diskurses hinaus wirkten. Er nützte seine anerkannte fachliche Autorität, um sich ins Kulturleben massiv einzumischen und dieses durch seine Initiativen entscheidend zu prägen.« (123)

Rudolf Flotzinger (»Hausegger zwischen Hanslick und Adler«; 141ff) hat erfolgreich die Auffassungen von Friedrich von Hausegger (1837-1899) untersucht und sie mit denjenigen von Hanslick und Adler zu vergleichen versucht, sich dabei fragend, ob »Hausegger eher zwischen oder neben Hanslick und Adler einzuordnen wäre« (141, 151). Die Anwort ist ein interessantes Beispiel von Wirkung und Rezeption von Hanslicksen und Adlerschen Theorien im 19. Jahrhundert: »[Die eingangs gestellte Frage] ließe sich vielleicht am ehesten durch ein triadisches Bezugssystem beantworten […]: dabei scheint der Pfeil (Strahl) von Hanslick zu Adler noch am relativ deutlichsten ausgeprägt, der von Hanslick zu Hausegger bereits deutlich lockerer zu sein und die zwischen Hausegger und Adler überhaupt kaum mehr (wenn nicht, wie angedeutet, gar unter negativen Vorzeichen) zu bestehen. Und keineswegs nur mein persönliches (pessimistisches) Resümee ist, dass viele Kritikpunkte an der Musikwissenschaft und Forderungen Hauseggers an sie noch heute weitgehend aufrecht sind, **es vielleicht aber nicht wären, wäre Hausegger erfolgreicher gewesen.**« (151-152; Hervorhebung N. G.)

* * *

Der III. Teil des Buches ist verschiedenen regionalen und/oder nationalen Traditionen der Musikforschung gewidmet: **Tomislav Volek** aus Prag schreibt über Musikwissenschaft an den Prager Universitäten (155ff), **Mikuláš Bek** aus Brno (Brünn) über Musikwissenschaft in Mähren — zwischen Prag und Wien (169ff), **Christian Kaden** aus Berlin über die Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft in Berlin (175ff), **Wilhelm Seidel** aus Leipzig über die Rolle Hugo Riemanns bei der Institutionalisierung der Musikwissenschaft in Leipzig (187ff), **Manfred Hermann Schmidt** aus Tübingen über 100 Jahre Musikwissenschaft an den Universitäten in Baden-Baden als mögliche Alternative zum Wiener Konzept (197ff), **Serge Gut** aus Paris über Anfang und Entwicklung der Musikwissenschaft in Frankreich (205ff) und **Jürg Stenzl** aus Salzburg über die Anfänge der musikwissenschaftlichen Mittelalterforschung an den Universitäten (215ff).

* * *

In der Anmerkung zu ihrem oben schon erwähnten Beitrag hat **Gerlinde Haas** mit Recht betont, dass »[d]ie Debatte um die Kulturgeschichte und -wissenschaft«

auf diesem Symposion »aufgrund der Komplexität anfallender Fragestellungen« ausgeschlossen wurde (89 — Anm. 1). Schade! Vielleicht gerade deswegen hat die Mehrheit von den Beiträge mit der Kulturwissenschaft nichts zu tun (eingeschlossen übrigens auch den Beitrag von Gerline Haas). Sogar in der Schlussdiskussion (223ff) ist die Kulturwissenschaft oberflächlich und nur am Rande erwähnt worden (vgl. z. B. S. 227 im Statement von Diskussionsleiter Karl Acham und S. 240 in der Diskussion von Tilman Seebass).

Das Buch hat leider keine Sach- und Namenregister, die in dieser Fülle von verschiedensten Daten wirklich nützlich wären.

Nikša GLIGO
Zagreb
ngligo@yahoo.com

Nikša Gligo is a professor of musicology at the Department of Musicology, Academy of Music, University of Zagreb.

Cliff EISEN — Simon P. KEEFE (eds.), ***The Cambridge Mozart Encyclopedia.*** **Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.**

This long-awaited volume is a splendid thing, having struck—in its 662 pages—a fine balance between the most essential of encyclopedic requirements: concision and comprehensiveness. The entries are uniformly »to the point;« at the same time, they never feel »sketchy,« and there is hardly any person, idea, or thing of significance in the »Mozartian Universe« which does not receive an entry. Moreover, the suggestions for further reading that follow most entries (and every entry of any length) are well-chosen. The lists are compact (seldom more than two or three), and lead the reader to the finest instances of contemporary scholarship.

I will say more about the matter of concision and comprehensiveness later in this review; let me address, however, another aspect of the »dialectics« that go into the making of a fine encyclopedia. As if well-known, many encyclopedias seem to proceed on the (one hopes »unconscious«) supposition that precision of scholarship must be at the expense of grace of verbal expression. It is a joy to report that this volume does not evidence that dreary principle of »inverse proportion.« The praise, clearly, is for the editors. Whether it is due to their initial wisdom in selecting contributors of the first-water, or whether we should credit their skill in yielding the »red pencil« with unusual deftness and insight—however it came to be, Eisen and Keefe have succeeded in giving the musical world an encyclopedia that is, at once, meaty in content and a joy to read.

How to demonstrate this? The best way, perhaps, is through »random sample.« So here follows the third sentence of the second paragraph of the second entry on every hundredth page. (If there is no »second entry« on that page, I go to the first page following it that meets the requirement—and if *its* second paragraph has only two sentences, I take that sentence as illustration. If it is a single paragraph entry, then the third sentence, as such.)

- Page 100: Ulrich Konrad on **compositional method:**

»The portrayal of composers as creators or musical artists in a categorical sense is really a feature of the modern era, to be seen in close conjunction with the new definition of genius in the course of the eighteenth century.«

- Page 201: Bruce Alan Brown on **Gluck, Christoph Willibald:**

»Though initially supportive of Leopold's idea to have Wolfgang compose an opera buffa (*LA FINTA SEMPLICE*) for the court theatre, Gluck later opposed the project.«

- Page 301: Ruth Halliwell on **Mozart, Maria Anna:**

»Her writing style and orthography show that she was not as well educated as her daughter NANNERL MOZART, but she was a capable housekeeper, a role then encompassing highly developed skills like needlecraft, food preservation and the preparation of medicaments.«

- Page 402: Simon P. Keefe on **Prato, Vincenzo dal:**

»On 20 November Mozart heard him sing 'most disgracefully', predicting that he would 'never get through the rehearsals [for *Idomeneo*], still less the opera'.«

- Page 501-502: Simon P. Keefe on **symphonies: 2. The Vienna years, 1782-1788:**

»The critical tendency to marginalize the pre-1781 repertory, evident as early as the 1799 issue of the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*, which dismissed four of the 1773-4 works as 'entirely ordinary symphonies …without conspicuous characteristics of originality and novelty', is unjust on account of the high quality of Mozart's works in the 1760s and 1770s.«

I do not include page 600, for it brings us to the midst of the first of the five appendices to this encyclopedia: a fifty-two page »Worklist.« Incidentally, that worklist is easier on the eye than its parallel in New Grove while containing pretty largely the same amount of information.

Having reached, almost by accident, the subject of the appendices let me describe the other four—for they are a bit surprising, and reflect the wide meaning Mozart has come to have for our modern world. Appendix 2 (the »Worklist« was number 1) is titled »Mozart movie (theatrical releases).« Am I the only scholar surprised (and delighted) to learn that the number is currently twenty-two? I doubt it! The earliest, incidentally, was 1909: *La Mort de Mozart*, directed by Louis Feuillade. Not surprisingly, Austria tops the list with six films—the earliest *Mozarts Leben, Lieben und Leiden* (1921), the most recent a contribution by director Juraj Herz from 1991, entitled simply *Wolfgang A. Mozart* but also released with the far more interesting title *Wolfgang—Mehr als ein Prinz*. In keeping with the high scholarly standards of this encyclopedia, there are three suggestions for further reading which follow this appendix.

Appendix 3 is, of necessity, selective; nevertheless, very valuable. It lists »Mozart operas on DVD and video.« For less frequently performed works, the number is understandable limited; *Apollo et Hyacinthus* receives two listings. *Le nozze di Figaro*, on the other hand, receives twenty-eight. For each, the conductor, the director, and the principle singers are listed—and if the recording was made at a particular theatre, that, too is indicated. In this appendix, too, there are notable surprises. I would venture to say that very few people are aware that a 1916 silent film on *Don Giovanni* was created, let alone that it is currently available for viewing.

Appendix 4 is also something one doesn't encounter so very often in scholarly encyclopedias—but hopefully the trend will change, for it is exceedingly valuable. It is a list, complete with full mailing address, telephone and fax numbers, to thirty important »Mozart organizations« world-wide. Many of these entries also include brief descriptions of their work. More expected, but highly valuable.

Of our time is Appendix 5, a list of »Mozart websites.« And let us thank the good sense of the editors in limiting this to a mere seven—for there are dozens of sites out there which, to put it mildly, lack scholarly rigor! For these seven, the editors also provide thumbnail sketches of the character of each site, and what material one can find posted there.

Following these appendices are three very useful indices enabling one swiftly to travel to those entries one needs. The first, an »Index of Mozart's works by Köchel number,« the second, an »Index of Mozart's works by genre.« These two indices include only works which are mentioned in the main body of the encyclopedia's text, and readers are directed to Appendix 1 for »further details on all of Mozart's works.« The final index, of course, is a general one and steers, once again, a wise course »down the middle« between concision and comprehensiveness. It is thirteen pages of smaller, yet still easily legible, type.

One always has the melancholy responsibility, when reviewing long works, of mentioning the fact that minor details have gone astray. Fortunately, as far as this reviewer can tell (and I admit to not having read all six-hundred plus pages), the errors are exceedingly few. I'll mention just one: in the entry on Mannheim it

is said that Mozart and his mother arrived on 30 October 1778. That should be 1777.

The longest entry, naturally, is about Mozart himself. It is forty-two pages long, and is divided into nine sub-sections: Biography, Personality, Education, Religious Beliefs, Medical History and Death, Mozart as Author, Mozart as Letter Writer, Biographies, and finally: Mozart: Literature and the Theater. Cliff Eisen, Ruth Halliwell and Peter Branscombe are the authors. Other lengthy entries concern the principle genres (and forms) in which he worked, the major operas he composed, his most important contemporaries, and the most significant aesthetic or cultural concepts we need to bring to bear in our attempts to understand and appreciate this man and his music. David Schroeder, for example, contributes a wonderful, compact survey of the philosophical aesthetics of the time as well as an extended entry on the term »Enlightenment.« William Stafford provides a valuable short essay on the concept of »Genius«—which has been applied as liberally to Mozart as to any musician in history. John Irving tells us, in remarkably clear fashion about »Rhetoric«—(a topic that easily becomes too congested in many hands)—and, to choose just one more instance, Bruce MacIntyre provides a detailed and lengthy entry on the critical topic of »Religion and Liturgy.«

There are also many entries that give one historical perspective. Derek Beales writes on »Austria, Austrian, Austrian Monarchy.« David Schroeder appears again to inform us about the »French Revolution,« and Peter Branscombe takes on the topic of »German Language and Literature.« Mary Sue Morrow has a long entry on »Vienna,« and Simon McVeigh on »London«—not quite as long, of course! And there are unexpected entries. Friedl Jary was charged with the responsibility to do justice by »Kitsch«—and succeeds, including through a swift (and chilling) paragraph near the end on the way the Nazis appropriated Mozart for their own purposes.

I trust that something approximating a true picture of the contents of this volume is emerging. Obviously, a reviewer (bound by a 1,700 word limit) can only hint of the actual riches. Before concluding, however, I shall play a game with my readers, which I hope you will enjoy—by listing five entries which were entirely news to me! Likely many of you out there will do better than I. Then again, had you compiled your list of five, I may have known one or two! So here are my five points of admitted prior ignorance; or, put otherwise, five points (among many, many more) of gratitude to Eisen and Keefe for enriching my knowledge of Mozart and his world:

Calvesi, Teresa
Consoli, Tommaso
Dalberg, Wolfgang Heribert;
Gamerra, Giovanni de
Went (Vent), Johann (Nepomuk).

I conclude by listing the names of all the contributors to this volume whom I have not yet mentioned: Sarah Adams, Rudolph Angermüller, Rachel Beckles Willson, A. Peter Brown, Tim Carter, Sharon Choa, Paul Corneilson, Tia DeNora, Sergio Durante, Faye Ferguson, Genevieve Geffray, Roger Hellyer, Mary Hunter, Thomas Irvine, David Wyn Jones, Andrea Lindmayr-Brandl, Dorothea Link, Nicolas Mathew, Robert Münster, Don Neville, Michel Noiray, Pamela L. Poulin, Michael Quinn, Wolfgang Rehm, John A. Rice, Julian Rushton, Stanley Sadie, Áine Sheil, Jan Smaczny, John Spitzer, Yo Tomita, Linda L. Tyler, Jessica Waldoff, Harry White, and Neil Zaslaw.

Edward GREEN
New York
egmusic@rcn.com

Edward Green is a professor at Manhattan School of Music since 1984, where he has taught courses in the humanities, musical composition, and music history.

Miguel MERA — David BURNARD (eds.), *European Film Music*, Hampshire and Burlington: Ashgate, 2006, ISBN 0-7546-3658-5.

People know and like American film music, because they are surrounded by it. It is well-known through films and CDs, and through many articles and books that have been written by film music lovers, musicians, technicians and scholars. European film music differs from American film music: it is less haunting, less easy-going and more »serious«. Even if it employs »beautiful melodies«, it needs more thinking to be understood. It seems that Americans have mastered the craft of composing, but also the craft of analyzing music for the movies. They have covered the field in every aspect. Europeans, on the other hand, have not. The book *European Film Music* published by Ashgate and edited by Miguel Mera and David Burnard, is trying to »catch up«. It is the first book on European film music that does not concentrate on one particular film or author — it is a collection of scientific papers by various authors, who come from different parts of the Europe and try to present the film music of their countries.

It is fascinating how different the papers are! In the »Introduction«, Miguel Mera and David Burnard write about the European differences. Unlike America, Europe is divided into many small countries and has many nationalities and many views on films and music. However, we can notice some similarities when reading the papers: many composers and directors like to use »modern classical« music (Louis de Pablo and Carlos Saura, for example, often relying on *musique concrète*),

while some use drones (Eleni Karaindrou and Theo Angelopoulos; Andrew Kötting and David Burnard). The music sometimes acts passively, but more often than not has hidden meanings in relation to the motion picture (music by the Spanish composer Alberto Iglesias in films directed by Pedro Almodóvar; music by the Polish composer Zbignew Preisner in films directed by Krzysztof Kieślowski; music by the British group »Popol Vuh« in films directed by Werner Herzog). There are also special relationships between diegetic and nondiegetic music, which often uses national folk songs (Irish films, British films), or some other national element (operetta, for example, in German films during the Second World War).

The essays reveal many specific approaches that American composers would never use. For example, the narrative is not always important and music does not need to follow the story, or »stick« to the motion picture. It can lead its own life, it can even distance itself and be »unempathic« (the notion by Michel Chion was used in the essay by Kathleen M. Vernon and Cliff Eisen, »Contemporary Spanish film music: Carlos Saura and Pedro Almodóvar«). Some Europeans, unlike some others, do not think that films need historically »correct« music. In the essay »Outing the synch: music and space in the French heritage film«, Phil Powrie explains the word »deterritorialization«. »Deterritorialization« expands the time and the space from the »real« to the much broader sense of the notion. Using that notion, he almost persuaded me that the music for the film *La Reine Margot* by Goran Bregovich is not »out of all the narrative, temporal and spatial elements of the film«, as I thought (but, who can, from my »Balkan« perspective, connect well-known popular songs by the group »Bijelo dugme« to the environment of the Parisian court in the 16th century?).

In some essays authors make the mistake of assuming that everyone and everybody has seen (and heard) the film(s) they are analyzing (this is a mistake that would never be made by an American writer). In the context of the colorful European differences, which this book supports by every means, it should be kept in mind that the readers may not be familiar with all the national films. Without enough general information, it was hard to read »Music as a satirical device in the Ealing Comedies« by Kate Daubney and »'The Rhythm of the Night': reframing silence, music and masculinity in *Beau Travail*« by Heather Laing, although the authors put forward some very interesting theories.

On the other hand, »Screen playing: cinematic representations of classical music performance and European identity« by Janet K. Halfyard shows a very interesting approach by comparing American and European ways of classical music performance on the screen (performances of classical music in American films are connected to something »bad« and »evil«, whereas in European films they are always positive, although sometimes mystical). This essay was founded on comparison of different films, using the supposedly better-known American film mu-

sic culture as its basis. Interestingly, although all the articles try to show differences (which are, in many cases, considerable) from American film music, and they often cite or rely on the most important American book on film music, *Unheard Melodies* by Claudia Gorbman.

My interest was especially drawn to the essays concentrated on one author or on one film or on one problem in the craft of the European film music. Essays such as »Seán Ó Riada and Irish post-colonial film music: George Morrison's *Mise Éire*« by David Cooper, »Angel of the air: Popol Vuh's music and Werner Herzog's films« by K. J. Donnelly, »Modernity and a day: the functions of music in the films of Theo Angelopoulos« by Miguel Mera, and »Preisner-Kieślowski: the art of synergetic understatement in *Three Colours: Red*« by Jon Paxman were so inspirational that I immediately wanted to see (and hear) the movies I have not seen, or to see (and hear) once more movies such as *Three Colours: Red*, which had already been at the center of my analytical attention (a long time ago, though).

Following the path from the general (problems) to the particular (films and film music), and trying to form a structure of chronological and spatial order, Miguel Mera and David Burnard begin *European Film Music* with two historically oriented articles: »*Per aspera ad astra* and back again: film music in Germany from 1927 to 1945« by Reimar Volker, and »Music, people and reality: the case of Italian neorealism« by Richard Dyer. The first article opens the book with the »provocative« taboo-theme of German film music during the Second World War. It shows that there is no reason for avoiding the subject: composers who lived in those times were doing their best to stay alive and to write music — some making compromises, some leaving the country via Hollywood. The book closes in the most logical manner: it gives a practical overview of the work of the composers. The article »Scoring *This Filthy Earth*« follows the path from the first ideas to the finished score of the film *This Filthy Earth* directed by Andrew Kötting and composed by one of the book's editors, David Burnard. It is also a great way to finish the book, which was written by scholars and theorists but not by practical musicians.

The editors are well aware that *European Film Music* is just the beginning of the research, that its context gives only a glimpse of the »different« ways of European film music. »We hope that *European Film Music* provides a starting point from which such research may grow in the future…«. I hope so, too.

Irena PAULUS
Zagreb
irena.paulus@gmail.com

Irena Paulus is a lecturer at the Zagreb Academy of Dramatic Arts, where she teaches courses on film music.

Anthony GRITTEN — Elaine KING (eds.), *Music and Gesture*, Aldershot — Burlington, Vt: Ashgate Publishing Company , 2006, ISBN 0-7546-5298-X.

This book has its roots in The First International Conference on Music and Gesture, which took place in August 2003 at the University of East Anglia (Norwich, United Kingdom). Some contributions from this conference and some new ones are collected in this publication. Twelve authors contributed to this book: Arnie Cox, Jane W. Davidson, William Echard, Peter Elsdon, Anthony Gritten, Robert S. Hatten, Elaine King, Steve Larson, David Lidov, Justin London, Raymond Monelle, Bradley W. Vines and Marcelo M. Wanderley.

We have to know, as the editors of this book pointed out, that the study of musical gesture, music as gesture and music and gesture is a really large and complex research area. Concepts, interpretations, contexts, methodological approaches etc. to this subject are different within each scientific community, but Anthony Gritten and Elaine King make the point that the main position of most investigations is, in fact, the understanding of musical gesture as »movement or change in state that becomes marked as significant by an agent«. A certain movement or sound becomes gesture only if it is »taken intentionally by an interpreter, who may or may not be involved in the actual sound production of a performance, in such a manner as to donate it with the trappings of human significance« (XX).

The aim of this collection is not to give an explanation of musical gesture or to define a concept of musical gesture, but, first of all, to indicate and identify plurality of theoretical approaches (phenomenological, psychological, cognitive, historic etc.) to this subject.

At first sight, the titles of the essays imply a certain bipolarity. They give a clue, and later readings prove, that the first half of the book is more orientated toward the theoretical consideration and explication of certain issues. The second half directs to concrete problems, including certain case studies and the issues of performance.

In his contribution, *A Theory of Musical Gesture and its Application to Beethoven and Schubert,* Robert Hatten founds his deliberation on the assumption of the biological roots of musical gestures. A precondition for certain theoretical considerations of musical gesture, Hatten argues, is first of all the understanding of human gesture. In this matter, he defines a human gesture as »any energetic shaping through time that may be interpreted as significant« (1). To some extent, the meaning of musical gesture emerges from the biological and the cultural. As he says: »[…] it is the immediacy of biologically typed gestural meanings — anger, grief, joy, disgust, surprise — that allows us to connect viscerally at a basic level with music that may be culturally or historically quite distant from our own time, even as we struggle to decode symbolic levels of gesture or ritualized movement that may have meanings far different from our own cultural expectations.« (10) The author questions the meanings of musical gestures and the possibilities of inter-

pretation. Using different examples from music literature (Schubert, Beethoven, Haydn), he makes efforts to suggest, identify and interpret stylistic types of gestures, that is, gestures that he defines as thematic and rhetoric, or as topics and tropes. Hatten claims that »the immediacy of musical gesture provides direct biological as well as cultural access from the outset; and the practiced mediacy of stylistic conventions such as gestural types, topics and expressive genres reinforce the modalities of gesture with oppositionally secured realms of expressive meaning.« (18)

David Lidov's text *Emotive gesture in music and its contraries,* similar to Hatten's, addresses issues semiotically. He makes a distinction »between the musical representation of gesture and the bodily gestures that are represented« and demands distinguishing of bodily gestures from other bodily actions, arguing that all these distinction are represented in music (24). The contraries of gesture, as for example breathing, vocalizing, gesticulating, utilitarian actions etc. are, for Lidov, no less significant than gesture, because they are all part of »the heterogeneity of the whole somatic field to which it belongs«. (33)

In the essay *Hearing, Feeling, Grasping Gestures,* Arnie Cox claims that the understanding of the physicality of gesture is important for comprehension and perception of musical gesture as a musical act. He considers musical meaning, taking as a starting point that it arises from our »embodied experience« and through our conceptualization of meaning. One of Cox's central questions is »what motivates and structures conceptualization of music in terms of 'gestures', and what sense there might be in using 'gestures' in addition to, or instead of, the often coextensive 'motive' and/or 'figure'«. He bases his deliberation on the so-called mimetic hypothesis, that implies imitation, arguing that our understanding of musical gestures includes »imagining making the heard sound for ourselves, and this imagined participation involves covertly and overtly imitating the sounds heard and imitating the physical actions that produce these sounds«. (46) For Cox, a gesture is a metaphorical concept, which, probably much more than other concepts that imply movement and space, brings the embodiment to the fore.

Steve Larson's text *Musical Gestures and Musical Forces: Evidence from Music-Theoretical Misunderstanding* considers problems of musical gestures through the theory of metaphor and especially through the theory of musical forces. Larson distinguishes three musical forces: musical gravity, musical magnetism and musical inertia that have their equivalents in the physical. It seems that Larson's main thesis is a certain analogy between physical and musical gestures that generate their properties in relation to the force (physical or musical) that moves, initiates etc. He polemizes with the theories of two authors (J. J. Momigny and L. Meyer — related to his book *Emotion and Meaning in Music*), attempting to show that their talking about musical forces is analogous to the human's misunderstanding of physical force. He claims that »[t]hese misunderstandings become a part of the converging evidence in support of the theory that music is shaped by analogues of physical forces«. (63) This thesis is elaborated on musical examples by Bach, Cho-

pin and Haydn, but also on trivial songs, such as *Twinkle, Twinkle Little Star* and *God Save the Queen/King*.

In his contribution *Plays Guitar Without Any Hands: Musical Movement and Problems of Immanence*, William Echard is interested in »the phenomenon of musical movement understood as a perceptual or interpretative event whereby music itself is perceived as something which moves, the fact that motion is a quality often attributed to musical sounds themselves« (75). The central issue of his deliberations is the question of immanence related to musical sound. In this matter, he proceeds from three main points: that »movement is often perceived as a property immanent to musical sound«, that »the musical meaning is often said to be immanent to a realm of musical self-reference«, and that »movement is as much an experiential profile immanent to real events as it is an abstract concept«. (76) Echard also introduces and explicates a theory of supervenience and a theory of emergence as useful ones »to split the difference between traditional views of immanence and transcendence with respect to aesthetic properties such as musical movement«. (83) According to him, the property of certain movement results from the interference of various factors, not only of sound *per se* and audience perception. It also depends on the context and on the historical moment in which certain sound is produced or perceived. However, it has to bear in mind the heterogeneity of signifying systems and semiotic objects that appear in praxis.

Raymond Monelle's case study *Mahler's Military Gesture: Musical Quotation as Proto-Topic* is one of the most interesting to me. Topics and quotations and related musical gestures are in the focus of Monelle's interest. In numerous examples from music literature, especially from Brahms's and Mahler's music, Monelle points out different types of quotations, true quotation or actual and stylistic allusions. He claims that »the signification of musical topics is primarily cultural, not social/contemporary«. In this sense, not real or true quotation but stylistic allusions have the strongest effect. The most effective are those topics »when the reflection of an item of contemporary life is least in evidence, and the musical gesture refers most directly, even unconsciously, to the mythic world of cultural signification« (94). Literal quotations are only proto-topics and function as topical reference.

Anthony Gritten's *Drift* is a very complex text. Drift is understood in a very broad and complex sense as a movement, flowing, or streaming, as moving away and drawing close, that implies not only our engagement in music, our reading and interpretation of music and musical gestures but also music's moving away from us. Drift is a movement but not »of music« and not its property, but »movement 'through' and 'across' its gesture that adds another dimension« (115). The author deliberates on music and musical gesture drifting, but also »the drift of words about music«. (114) In fact, Gritten considers music's reaction on scientific engagement with it, that is, a reaction »to the systematic colonization and territorialization, to the careful excavation and interpretation of so much of its hitherto sovereign territory?« (XXIII) There are so many questions left! What does music do? It drifts, says Gritten. Who possesses music? How does music confront us?

(108) »How does music feel when it entwines with a listener like two bodies sliding over and around each other?« »Does music think while it feels?« He suggests that »we are unable to phrase a just answer unless we drift as music does — languid and light« (119).

In *Musical Rhythm: Motion, Pace and Gesture* Justin London argues that all musical gestures are not in fact musical. His study is based on the analyses of analogies between music and certain non-musical behaviours (non-musical gestures) and, in this concrete case, the analogies between walk and run, their mutual transition, and their temporal conditions and determination. London compares the tempo of walking and running with rhythm in music and concludes that both are parallel. Our perception and movement production is based neurobiologically. He also indicates a problem that arises when we try to focus on atonal music. Rhythm is not the essential component of that music, as it was in tonal music. London writes, using Babitt's music as an example: »While we can hear these melodies and passages as comprised of musical sounds, we cannot move with them. If we cannot move with them, they are not rhythmic, and if they are not rhythmic, […] then they are unmusical. Thus, while they may be, by definition, 'musical gestures', they are not, in some very deep sense, 'musical' gestures.« (137)

The remaining essays in this collection are concerned with the questions of musical gesture in regard to live performance. Elaine King's contribution *Supporting Gestures: Breathing in Piano Performance* and the contribution by Marcelo M. Wanderley and Bradley W. Vines *Origins and Functions of Clarinettists' Ancillary Gestures* focus their attention primarily on the conscious and unconscious bodily movements of a certain performer. Both studies are empirical. King examines the process of breathing, trying to find out how and in which way this process helps pianists in performance, particularly in regard to tempo, musical-structural gestures, and physical or bodily movements. Analyzing performances of three pianists who play the same musical pieces (by Beethoven, Bach, Poulenc), she concludes that all these elements are connected, but unconsciously. And further: »[…] pianists' breathing patterns are 'patterns' — rather than ad hoc actions — and […] they are integral to the delivery of musical and physical features in a performance.« (160)

Marcelo and Vines deliberate on ancillary gestures or accompanist gestures, that is, those that are not learned or directly connected to sound production. But it should be mentioned that their research avoids works where the visual component of the sound production is an integral part of the composer's intention, as was the case, for example, in many of the 20th century music pieces. Ancillary gestures could be interpreted as expressive movements. The authors wonder what role these gestures have in the performance process and what kind of effect they have on audience perception. This study focuses on three elements: the production of ancillary gestures, their repeatability and the comparison of similar movements among different performers (168-169). It also establishes possi-

ble typology of ancillary gestures according to three levels that influence the performer's expressive movements (material/physiological, rhythmic/structural and interpretative) (177-178). The authors claim that the ancillary gestures are not necessary in certain performance, that is, they are not essential but only »play an integral role in the performance process and mental representation of the music« (185).

In his contribution *Listening in the Gaze: The Body in Keith Jarrett's Solo Piano Improvisations,* Peter Elsdon explores Keith Jarett's physical gestures and their expressive importance. The performing body, he claims, is a very important part of discursive context. He asks »what does body signify other than itself?« (193) It could signify »imagining« of music but also the interpreter's responses to the music. The author draws on L. Kramer's term »listening gaze« and claims: «In the listening gaze we as viewers continually strive to make sense of what we see and hear together.« Therefore, Jarett »appears to be played 'by' the music rather than playing the music« (204). His body is »a signifier of the acts of improvisation itself« (200).

The last essay in this collection *'She's the One': Multiple Functions of Body Movement in a Stage Performance by Robbie Williams* draws on singer Robbie Williams. Jane W. Davidson argues that Williams' bodily gestures are very significant. We can read from his gestures not only his ideas about music but even the ways of performance constructing and expressive elements (210). Williams' gestures are a medium of communication with the rest of the performers on the stage and with the audience that »respond to, often in similar or additional physical expressions« (210). Analysing the song *'She's the One'*, Davidson concludes that »the body plays an integral role in musical performance«, especially in the context of the live performance. She also argues that a body is a »critical element in understanding and producing a musical performance: it is part of the generation and perception of the performance.« (222)

The problem area that is presented in this collection is very complex. Musical gestures, music as gesture or music and gesture can be investigated and deliberated on in many ways and from very different perspectives. These essays are very inspiring reading. Most of them dialogise mutually and are interferential. They open up a possibility of consideration and comparison of similar or different theoretical perspectives. Certainly, this could be a good stimulus for further problematization of gesture issues.

Vesna ROŽIĆ
Zagreb
vrozic@muza.hr

Vesna Rožić is a postgraduate student in musicology at the Department of Musicology, Zagreb Academy of Music.

Björn HEILE, *The Music of Mauricio Kagel,* Hampshire and Burlington: Ashgate, 2006 (ISBN-10: 0-7546-3523-6; ISBN-13: 978-07546-3523-9).

Björn Heile focuses in this book (which is the first one on Kagel's music written in English) on the use of music »as a means of intellectual inquiry« (3) and already in the introductory chapter, Heile tries to determine Kagel's multifaceted creative personality, proposing six main aspects of his profile: »[…] which Kagel are we referring to? Kagel, the aspiring multi-artist, steeped in the Bauhaus-influenced compositional avant-garde of 1950s Buenos Aires? Kagel, the member of the European post-war avant-garde, who endeavoured to fuse integral serialism with aleatory technique and live-electronics? Kagel, the experimentalist, whose Fluxus-inspired creations questioned the limits not only of music and composition but of what can be considered art? Kagel, the maker of experimental theatre, film and multimedia works, for whom the term 'composition' is not necessarily connected to the acoustic domain? Kagel, the postmodernist, who recombines the discarded fragments of earlier music, be it 'classical', 'popular' or 'folkloristic', into new, multi-layered artworks? Or Kagel, the composer of deceptively simple pieces of concert music that seem to make a mockery of the conceptual complications and perspectival refractions so often associated with his work?« (1) These questions are provocative! They stimulate our curiosity through the order in which they are posed, avoiding the logic of chronological flow, which should normally present »Kagel's development« — but this development is not straightforward at all, although some »elements of continuity must not be overlooked« and these are just »the use of music as a means of intellectual inquiry, diversity of styles and media, and aesthetic distance« (4).

Heile describes the structure of his book as »synthesis of, or compromise between, a traditional monograph with entries on compositions in chronological order and a series of critical essays on different aspects of Kagel's work« and it is »more an exercise in hermeneutic criticism than in formal analysis« (5).

The 1st chapter (»Buenos Aires«, 7ff) confirms »the importance of Kagel's formative years in Argentina [which] provided him with the backbone of his aesthetic beliefs and the hallmarks of his later style […] [T]he roots of his diverse activities — as composer, performer, critic, anthropologist, cinematographer — can all be traced to Buenos Aires and its unique cultural environment during the 1940s and '50s. To regard him as a typical exponent of the European and the North-American post-war avant-garde, and to place him in the context of Webern, Stockhausen and Cage, as is often implied, therefore represents a rather partial view. This is not to deny, however, that Kagel's maturity as a composer is connected to his encounter with the post-war avant-garde in Cologne.« (15)

The 2nd chapter (»Beginnings in Cologne: Serialism, Aleatory Technique and Electronics«, 16ff) is dedicated to Kagel's encounter with »the intellectual and aesthetics climate of this hotbed of musical avant-gardism« (16) in which Kagel allied himself primarily with Ligeti and »embraced the challenges posed by Cage« (17).

Heile first concentrates on the revised version of the *String Sextet* (1957), Kagel's first European composition (its original version was composed in Buenos Aires in 1953), trying to draw our attention to the revisions that prove Kagel's attempts to accept the Cologne avant-garde, although the *Sextet* »with its expressive gestures and clear textural contrasts […] betrays the influence of […] Schoenberg, more than that of Webern« and was »a million miles away from the profusion of isolated notes of early, 'pointillist', integral serialism as well as dense, complex and often amorphous textures of the late '50s« (18). In addition, Heile comes here to an important conclusion concerning Kagel's attitude toward the (serial) compositional technique: »[…] in contrast to many other composers of the serial avant-garde, compositional technique is [for Kagel] a means to an end, not the contents and objective of music itself.« (20) A much more critical touch with integral serialism can be found in *Anagrama* (1958), an attempt at »the musicalization of language« (22) in which text itself is treated as musical material through the serial procedures. But »instead of using serial technique in order to create coherence and self-similarity […], Kagel's techniques and procedures seem designed to produce multiplicity, heterogeneity and chaos«, which Heile smartly relates to Borges' gobbledegook in all known languages (24). Considerable attention (with more critical flavour) is given to *Transición II* (1959), »the first of Kagel's pieces that are clearly influenced by American experimentalism, attempting something of a fusion between the two«, the piece »with […] bold and idiosyncratic combination of serialism, graphic notation, aleatory technique, open form, live electronics, Cagean piano preparation, cluster composition à la Cowell and theatrical action« (25). Although the »latent theatricality« (25) of the piece and its relationship to Borges (30) might be exaggerated, Heile does not omit the reflections on its contradictions (29, *passim*), also including some of Kagel's theoretical writings of the late '50s (29ff).

The next chapter (»The Instrumental Theatre«; 33ff) is obviously the central one in the book because it is dedicated to the most specific aspect of Kagel's work. In the introduction to this chapter, Heile gives very comprehensive determination of instrumental theatre as of a special kind of musical theatre, defined through the »theatricality of musical performance« (34). Heile locates instrumental theatre along the efforts in the 20th century to »overcome the logocentricity of traditional drama, emphasizing both visual and (non-linguistic) elements« (»Dada, Italian Futurism, Russian Suprematism, the theatre practitioners of the Weimar Republic, Artaud's *Théâtre de la cruauté,* the Theatre of the Absurd and the Living Theatre«; 34) and comes to the influence of Fluxus and John Cage on Kagel (34) and explicates Kagel's critical attitude toward happening and Fluxus (34-35).

The 4th chapter (»Experimentalism and Multimedia«; 69ff) deals with Kagel's works that do not clearly belong to the instrumental theatre, although »the instrumental theatre can likewise be described as experimental« (71). However, the division between experimentalism and multimedia is clumsy: Heile firstly tries to define the difference between »American experimentalism and the European avant-garde«. Both of them »coincide in undermining the primacy of the work of art

understood as a self-contained aesthetic object« and this common denominator proves that Kagel was »profoundly influenced by the *aesthetics* and *practices* of 'experimentalism'« (69). Of course, it can never be clear by which experimentalism if we insist on the above-mentioned division and if we insist on the usage of the term »experimentalism« which has — as we know — very unclear meaning. But just this lack of clarity provides the opportunity to include the multimedia in the discourse, because of Kagel's »interest in breaching the divide between music and the visual arts […] [This] connection between experimentalism and multimedia […] mostly concerns the European avant-gardist sense of experiment, namely the overcoming of boundaries by 'experimenting' with new techniques and artistic means in a quite literal sense.« (70)

We have almost the same constructed relationship in the 5th chapter (»Referentiality and Postmodernism«; 105ff), but with more controversial consequences: Heile follows here the concept of postmodernism that »is neither the negation of modernism, nor its successor, but its extension or complement« (106) — in other words: nothing! What has this modernism to do with referentiality? »In a society which is more and more characterized by the availability of artefacts from all manner of cultures, past and present, near and far, 'high' and 'low', the exclusion of contextual referentiality amounts to a near-pathological denial.« (106) But the inevitable »contextual referentiality« must also be related to the »questions of identity«, inevitable as well: »All identities are constructed, and in contemporary, multiethnic society, there is a confusing diversity of building materials for this construction.« (107) Heile even sees Kagel's »manifold identities, whether inherited or adopted — Argentine, Jewish, German and so forth — [as] part of the reason why the purism of the post-war avant-garde appeared so narrow-minded to him and a pluralistic understanding of musical traditions quite natural« (108). The problem here is again with postmodernism: Are pluralism and referentiality convincing determinants of postmodernism? If it is problematic indeed »to proclaim Kagel a postmodernist *tout court*« (108), it is even more risky to consider him a postmodernist because it would be *à la mode*! Trying to close the cycle at the end of this introductory discourse in the 5th chapter, Heile even adheres to the historical continuity, just at the point where the ahistorical character in the usage of historical material should be justified: »[…] the inclusion of material with specific historical associations as one of the compositional building blocks appears as nothing but a consequence of the avant-gardist expansion of material.« (107)

The 6th chapter (»Apocrypha and Simulacra«; 139ff) is the most inspired in the book, maybe just because Heile expresses his very critical attitude towards the terms in its title or, more precisely, towards their application to Kagel's music. The following quotation might serve as efficient illustration of this very inspiring discourse: »Relating Kagel's term of apocryphal to Baudrillard's simulacrum raises the question whether Kagel at least implicitly shares Baudrillard's analysis, and what, more generally, the aesthetic justification for 'composing apocrypha' might be. Baudrillard's vision is deeply pessimistic and defeatist; his often slightly cyni-

cal tone should not detract one from the abhorrence he seems to experience towards the phenomena he describes. There is little in Kagel's music which encourages a similar reading. But, more fundamentally, the binarism of critique vs. affirmation, or resistance vs. celebration […] seems hopelessly inadequate in dealing with Kagel's work. For his music is ambiguous and multivalent in its very nature, not only allowing different, conflicting interpretations […] but positively demanding them. Likewise, his fascination with the apocryphal is certainly a reflection of or reaction to what could be called the 'crisis of authenticity' in globalized consumer society — which prizes the 'authentic', 'pure', 'primal' and 'uncorrupted' while, by according all value as exchange value, paradoxically negating the very possibility of such qualities […] — but whether his music satirizes this state of affairs or simply adopts it is open to debate. Thus it is impossible to say whether Kagel's aesthetics of the apocryphal is based on a critique of the socio-cultural status quo or on a fascination with it […] [I]t is hard to deny that Kagel's most monumental apocrypha — besides the *Third String Quartet*, *Saint Bach's Passion*, […] *Passé composé* or *Orchestral Etudes* — testify to a desire to compose unequivocal masterpieces, thus partaking of the prestige of generic references in the pieces bestow on them. It almost seems as if Kagel was wary of entering the history books as music's great ironist and consequently set about composing music which, in terms of its structural complexity and a certain 'discourse of profundity', lives up to the masterwork tradition it references, while also, to an extent, emulating its sound world and musical language.« (143) Although it seems to refer to Kagel's music only, this passage offers an answer to the series of six questions at the beginning of the book in which Heile tries to determine Kagel's creative profile: as if music itself, in its traditional sense and dignity, was not a satisfactory tool for carrying out Kagel's intellectual inquiries into the world in which we live! *The Music…* in the title of the book comprises, therefore, much more than music in the traditional conventional sense.

The book contains a »Chronological List of Works« (181ff), »Select Bibliography« (190ff;[1]) with three internet links (202), »Index of Works« (203ff) and »Index of Names« (207ff). With the help of both indexes of works the reader can easily find some words about almost all of Kagel's pieces, although I faced some problems with Kagel's works that are part of larger cycles or collections: I looked, for example, for »Kontra → Danse« which is part of *Staatstheater*. It is indeed there in the »Chronological List of Works« (183), but not in the »Index of Works«. Moreover, it is the same case with other parts of *Staatstheater*, which is rather impractical, because the parts are more often performed independently than as *Staatstheater* as a whole. Another case is *Programm* with 11 sections (p. 184 in the »Chronological List… «). Two of these sections (»Gegenstimmen« and »Die Mutation«) are not included in the »Index of Works« (contrary to the rest of the sections). Why?

Heile's »hermeneutic criticism« (5) is sometimes an excessively simple description of the music, very often as the retelling of Kagel's own words or other sources. It largely points out the non-conventional aspects, the »strangeness« of

the music. The value judgment is almost completely excluded from this kind of »criticism«, which easily becomes non-critical glorification: the originality, the »newness« of the piece seems to be its only value. It is indeed difficult to develop an effective analytical method for this kind of music, but if value judgments cannot be based on the analytical insights, it does not mean that they have to be excluded from the considerations.

This book undoubtedly popularizes Kagel's work, it is easy to read but it could have been equipped with more attractive illustrations (also from the technical point of view). But the level of discourse here is nevertheless below the discussion in German literature, although Heile has obviously been well acquainted with it.

Nikša GLIGO
Zagreb
ngligo@yahoo.com

Nikša Gligo is a professor of musicology at the Department of Musicology, Academy of Music, University of Zagreb.

Norton DUDEQUE, *Music Theory and Analysis in the Writings of Arnold Schoenberg (1874 - 1951)*, Aldershot — Burlington (VT): Ashgate Publishing, 2006.

Norton Dudeque's book is a presentation of Schoenberg's theoretical system. It deals with all the theoretical problems that occupied Schoenberg in the course of his career, as well as the interpretation of their relations. It focuses on Schoenberg the theorist, though inevitably united with Schoenberg the composer in all of the issues. The treatise stays within the scope of tonal music, but the system in question cannot be denoted as a tonal one, as this notion implies several assumptions regarding different compositional elements and their relations, all of which Schoenberg brought into question. Dudeque reveals the nature of this system and its relationship to tradition. As much as Schoenberg renounced and discarded it in different aspects of his work, tradition nevertheless provides one with the simplest way of interpreting and understanding his theory and his music. It is precisely this mode of thinking that Dudeque chooses in his work, also showing that Schoenberg himself was aware of this.

Dudeque first determines the starting-points that generated and shaped Schoenberg's ideas in 19th century theory. He relates Schoenberg's work to A.B. Marx's ideas regarding form, S. Sechter's theses about harmonic theory, and H. Bellerman's view of counterpoint. Dudeque pinpoints the exact ideas Schoenberg took over from these theorists and also the ways he moved beyond them, thus

showing the historical grounds of his system. He also reveals relationships with the theoretical findings of his contemporaries, primarily H. Schenker and H. Riemann. Despite the fact that Schoenberg's theory seems entirely contrary to their principles, Dudeque finds they have some things in common. It is in these clashes of opposite camps, often founded in mutual negation, that Dudeque manages to determine the historical position of Schoenberg's theoretical system. The system was also undoubtedly up-to-date, as Schoenberg, according to Dudeque, »often denies any theoretical proposals that do not consider modern music and his own works« (55). These principles show how closely connected Schoenberg the theorist and Schoenberg the composer were. All of his theoretical postulates have their ideological foundation in an attempt to find a more stable foundation for his compositions. Revealing the historical foundations and setting the context, the author confirms the credibility of Schoenberg's theoretical system.

Dudeque presents the system as such a detailed and complex one that it reveals itself as an impressive teaching project, with Schoenberg as the great teacher. The author says: »Schoenberg's career as a music theorist focuses on aspects of objective presentation of musical structure.« (3) According to this, Schoenberg wanted to create an objective system which would enable objective presentation of the musical idea. The idea was considered as the original musical content that could be fully realized only if it adhered to two compositional determinants — coherence and comprehensibility — so important for Schoenberg's theory. Starting from these basic findings, Dudeque analyses all the elements of the musical structure Schoenberg wanted to submit to his system. Since its primary purpose was teaching, one would logically expect it to be prescriptive. But Dudeque is explicit: »Schoenberg's desire to present a clear and systematic music theory is most comprehensively exposed in the *Harmonielehre*. However, despite its claims, his book of 1911 can hardly (sic!) be classified either as pragmatic or as a clear and objective system of presentation.« (70) The author casts more doubt on Schoenberg's pedagogical approach, claiming that it does not attempt to exclude speculative theory: »Schoenberg's book of 1911 regains and reconsiders the speculative and prescriptive trends in music theory.« (36) That means that Schoenberg's music theory »does not have conclusive evidence« and that »it proposes new and often polemical theoretical formulations« (36).

In this context Schoenberg's refusals of aesthetic and stylistic connotations (35) also become questionable. His view on the idea and style was that the former was »the original musical content of a masterpiece«, and the latter »a surface expression of an underlying idea« (35). Evidently, there is a demand for an objective and practical theory that would not depend on science, but Dudeque shows several instances where Schoenberg's theory is unable to deal with some of its crucial notions on its own. The best illustration of this is the ambiguity of *Grundgestalt* — one of the most important terms. Dudeque says that »there is no agreement on what Schoenberg thought of his concept of *Grundgestalt*« (140) and that it is »dependent on interpretation« (141).

Dudeque's book suggests that the capital notions in Schoenberg's objective system of presentation of the musical idea, and his claim for coherence and comprehensibility are: emancipation of the dissonance, horizontal view of tonality, extended tonality, transformed and vagrant chords, (enriched) cadence, region, monotonality, suspended tonality, motive, *Grundgestalt*, developing variation and musical prose. Dudeque also minutely explains many other terms from Schoenberg's theory, all of which were to contribute to the unity of a work of music, to its coherence and comprehensibility.

»For Schoenberg, tonality is artificial and an artistic product«. (37) That is how he justifies the new syntax which will lead to the emancipation of the dissonance and eventually to extended tonality. He believed the tonality was brought about through the diatonic basis (roots) and a chromatic level of melody. »Schoenberg understood that a tonality may include all twelve notes of the chromatic scale«. (101) Such very loosened links resulted in the notion of monotonality. »One of the major ramifications of the principle of the monotonality is the understanding of tonality as an all-inclusive system, an extended tonality. Ultimately, the major consequence of extended tonality was the abandonment of the traditional tonal syntax.« (116) To define monotonality as such, Schoenberg needed a whole system of various terms that would corroborate that theoretical assumption. Dudeque explicates all of them in detail, and shows how the system of monotonality was to ensure unity, logic and coherence for all sorts of different harmonic procedures that could no longer fit into the traditional tonality. The ultimate comprehensiveness of monotonality is seen in whole-tone and fourth chords. »Schoenberg was possibly the first to acknowledge theoretically these new resources from a tonal perspective« (117), although »it seems that he never fully developed a theory of fourth chords in which they would be considered to be legitimate chords« (119). Finally, these two new chord constructions contributed to the »eventual abandonment of the principle of monotonality« (117). This kind of understanding of tonality, though unclear in some aspects, as also noticed by Dudeque, could no longer serve as the basis of a work's formal structure.

Central to Schoenberg's theory is the fact that the new principle that provides logic and coherence for creating musical form is **motivic**, and that it is independent of tonality. The **motive** is thus the generator and the initial impulse of form. This understanding of **motive** has to do with the notion of *Grundgestalt*, one of the most problematic in Schoenberg's theory. Dudeque explains it from several authors' perspectives, and also notes that even the term *motive* escapes precise definition. (*Grundgestalt* defines motivic content, and it is realized through developing variation.) As the generator of form, the motive provides the organic unity of all its parts, and that is achieved through developing variation. It »represents the modern technique for musical expression« (169) and »Schoenberg highly rated it as a method for the presentation of a musical Idea« (134**).**

Schoenberg's final goal was to relate the principle of unity in harmony (ensured by monotonality) with the principle of unity in form (provided by the con-

cept of *Grundgestalt* and developing variation). Discovering causal relationships between extended tonality and developing variation, Schoenberg creates »unity of musical space« (169) and finalizes the system. It is precisely the connection of these elements that Dudeque points out as Schoenberg's real innovation: »Developing variation and extended tonality seem to be the perfect pair of concepts for encouraging a varied expression of the musical structure.« (170) This was the basis for Schoenberg's complex system of various elements, whose different positions within the system are all thoroughly analyzed by Dudeque.

The last chapter deals with Schoenberg's analytical practice and tests the efficacy of his system in three analyses: Mozart's *String quartet K. 465. in C major (Dissonance Quartet)*, 1st movement; Beethoven's *Diabelli Variations*; and Schoenberg's *Serenade Op. 24* (3rd movement). The analyses show that Schoenberg wanted to confirm the value of his theory both on traditional as well as on his own works, and that he »also tried to make relationship between his music and that of the past« (4).

At the end of this book there is a *Glossary of Terms* »which lists some of the most used technical terms« (239) to be found in Schoenberg's theoretical texts. It is a very valuable contribution that defines the terminology of Schoenberg's system, provides the reader with better understanding of his theory, and defines some of the ambiguous terms, the notion of musical idea being especially interesting in this sense.

The book lists numerous sources, divided into Arnold Schoenberg's writings and general bibliography. The works provided the author with a deeper understanding of the problems in question, and the reader is given insight into the literature, especially recent publications.

Skillfully using scientific methods, Dudeque accomplished a comprehensive and systematic approach to Schoenberg's theory, which has not been done before. The book is also well-argumented, critical and polemical, allowing numerous interpretation options.

Marija BENIĆ ZOVKO
Zagreb
marijabenic@email.htnet.hr

Marija Benić Zovko is a postgraduate student in musicology at the Department of Musicology, Zagreb Academy of Music.