composers and to their many works of varying historical significance; in the large view that can only be taken by such an experienced and versatile scholar; in the constant effort to give organ music at least its full share (if not more) of attention along with music for stringed keyboard instruments, when the distinction can be made; and in the flexibility of approach in dealing with music of different periods.

William S. Newman
The University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill


In reading this book, one must, I believe, take the author on his own terms, for he is particularly explicit in his description of what they are. As Mr. Kerman notes early in the book, one goes to work in the study of music with two general methods: the acquisition of facts, and the exercise of intuition. Now this is an essay on the music of Beethoven. Therefore, anyone’s intuition must be stretched to the limit. Many, though by no means all, of the facts, both historical and analytical, have been repeatedly combed through and discussed—at times with a degree of acrimony not pleasant to behold—but no one may expect to touch bottom with all of them, nor can anyone come to feel that his musical intuition has fully encompassed what we are forced, for want of some better term, to call the significance, the meaning, what you will, of this music. I repeat that this book is about the music of Beethoven. Writing a book on this subject is comparable to writing on the visual works of Michelangelo or on the epics of Homer. When one embarks upon such great seas, islands of fact nudge one in the right direction, and a sense of the right direction helps one to find other such islands or to feel wrong when nothing appears on the horizon.

Mr. Kerman is particularly clear about the relationship between facts and intuition, especially when they are in conflict. He says (p. 27) that “three obvious moves are possible in dealing with the problem. The first follows the instinctive tendency of the analyst, which is to instruct himself (and others) to experience as aesthetic fact what begins merely as observed fact. This tries to bring intuition around. The opposite move is to call the observed data into question on grounds of error, irrelevance, taking out of context, and so on. This tries to bring observation around. Only if these do not meet the situation should an aesthetic breach be conceded between ends and means within the work of art itself. This can feel like a failure of sensitivity on the listener’s part; but the failure might be on the composer’s part too. He could have tried for something and not succeeded.”

To illustrate:

1. In the Quartet in C sharp minor, op. 131, the well-known thematic cross-references between the opening fugue and the finale are facts so strong that even Tovey had no trouble bringing his intuition around. Nor does Mr. Kerman have trouble.

2. But the fact that in the second movement of the Quartet in A minor, op. 132, there is a passage part of which resembles the fugue subject in op. 131—this is a different matter. Here, many a scholar would have one believe that this fact is part of a set of facts demonstrating that the three quartets op. 132, op. 130, and op. 131 are, in effect, a single work. This famous critical apple-cart is beautifully upset by Mr. Kerman—and the apples below the top layer are seen to be not of the best quality—when he carefully shows a stunning set of stylistic parallels between op. 132 and op. 127 in Chapter 8. Many a reader may well be ready to crawl up the wall when he comes upon this chapter, but it is a superb example of Mr. Kerman’s air of always obviously asking himself what in fact one should do as one studies music.

3. The notion that a great composer
may have failed in one of his most famous and well-loved works may not be welcome, but I think it is sound. The crux of Mr. Kerman’s discussion of the Quartet in B flat, op. 130, with its shocking problem of the substitute finale, is as follows (p. 322): “... Beethoven was working toward some new idea of order or coherence in the cyclic composition, an order markedly different from the traditional psychological sequence that he had developed in the earlier music. This new order is not easy to comprehend, because... the idea was not entirely realized. In the few works that were now left for him to compose, he did not pursue the new conception but reverted to more traditional ideas of order.”

Near the beginning of the book (p. 28) we read: “To deal with art is to deal with fact and feeling, and to deal closely is to discover more and more that each is problematic—fact as well as feeling.” Equally difficult is a fitting balance between the claim of a work as an individual thing and the position of that same work in the evolution of style. This book is a critical essay, but there is no criticism without history. There are, in the author’s terms, exterior as well as interior contexts in each work. History is handled here mainly in two interdependent ways:

First, three general problems of the composer are identified:

1. What is an appropriate ending to my work?—the “problem of the finale.” This amounts to asking what is meant by the whole sequence of movements.

2. What is the relationship between the subjective and the objective aspects of my music?—the “developing subtlety of voice and insight.”

3. I have inherited “contrast” as a main principle of composition. What does it mean?

Interdependent with the discussion of these questions is the identification of three evolving categories of works, all distinctly present among the last quartets:

1. The “integrated” work, such as the Quartet in C sharp minor, op. 131.

2. The “dissociated” work, such as the Quartet in B flat major, op. 130.

3. The “nostalgic” work—stylistically nostalgic, that is—such as the Quartet in F major, op. 135.

So much for the point of view from which Mr. Kerman has set to work. His actual procedure in organizing the book is one calculated to do justice to his point of view. The quartets are discussed in chronological order and according to the “trois styles” (one “Book” for each of the three), but the special topics which the author wishes to emphasize are introduced at appropriate points, often with a comparative consideration of several works or movements.

The most important of these special topics, I believe, is the one called “Voice.” The chapter on “Voice” stands at the beginning of the last half of the book, the part devoted to the late works. So far as I am aware, no one has heretofore placed such strong emphasis on this topic, and it should be clear that no successful critical enterprise can deal with Beethoven’s music without careful consideration of the facts brought out here.

By “Voice” the author means Beethoven’s whole dependence in his later works upon two general kinds of thematic invention: that which is based upon vocal models, and that which is related to folksy tunes, two-phrase tunes of the kind which the author calls “doublets.”

Perhaps because this is to my mind the most original part of the book, I found it the most disappointing. For it is on this very topic that one needs to go outside the realm of the quartets alone and examine Beethoven’s whole oeuvre to a far greater extent than was possible in a book which, even so, is quite long and pleasantly discursive.

Vocal music and doublets were from the beginning important in Beethoven’s imagination. Why did instrumental music in various vocal styles and naive tunes become so much more important in the later “serious” works than they had been before? I am confident that a careful study of the whole corpus of Beethoven’s music, carried out on chronolog-

Ten years ago Gunther Schuller published an excellent original study of Duke Ellington's earliest recorded works, 1926 to 1931. This 40-page essay, with nineteen brief musical examples, appeared first in Nat Hentoff's anthology, *Jazz*, and then in the *Jazz Review*, Vols. II and III. It reappears now, very slightly changed, as the seventh and final chapter of the present volume, which is dedicated to Ellington. Schuller's history of jazz has been eagerly anticipated, especially by readers of the Ellington essay.

Two of the six new chapters, like the old one, deal with single figures in special stages of their careers: Chapter 3 on Louis Armstrong's records, 1923-31, and Chapter 4 on Ferdinand "Jelly Roll" Morton's, 1923-30. "The first great soloist" and "the first great composer," Schuller calls these two heroes. He presents each of them as a unique genius, worthy of careful discriminating study. He praises what is best and pardons what is faulty or just mediocre. He recognizes that each man worked differently in a context of many collaborators and rivals (black and white), many strands of unwritten musical tradition ("black, brown, and beige," in the words of Ellington), and many barriers, pressures, and enticements to corruption (whitish "gray," as LeRoi Jones has it). This social context often makes Schuller impatient. He scorns its "legendry" and its cultish controversies. He wants to concentrate on the music itself. Above all he wants to win respect for the best of the music, a place of honor in "the entire world of music." So it is appropriate to consider here first what he has done with Armstrong and Morton, before we criticize his whole projected history. The new studies of individual men are as sensitive and thorough as the old one on Ellington, but each one necessarily differs from the model.

Schuller knows his subject as probably no one else does. His experience as horn player, as improviser, and as composer enables him to hear clearly both fine details and fairly large structures that are hazy for most listeners. His residence in New York, where he was born in 1925 and where he worked from 1944 to 1966, gave him opportunity to share some considerable part of the life of jazz. His now secure reputation as composer for symphony orchestra and "classical" chamber ensembles as well as champion of a "third stream" between the jazz and classical streams authorizes him to judge impartially what he listens to. His friend-