

Sound in the Papers: Musical Hermeneutics in the Age of the Feuilleton

Hansjakob Ziemer, *Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Germany*

ABSTRACT

This article examines the intersection of feuilleton writing and musicology in early twentieth-century Germany. Starting from the contemporary concern that music lacked the capacity to express its meanings and that listeners in concert halls could not understand music without intermediaries, I trace the historical actors' quest to resolve that problem by establishing "musical hermeneutics," a method that applied older scholarly traditions of understanding texts empathetically to music. Rather than on the historical evolution of hermeneutical ideas, the essay focuses on the publishing contexts in which one of its main protagonists, the music historian, public intellectual, and feuilleton author Hermann Kretzschmar, worked to found what he saw as a new discipline. I argue that the practice of and discourse on journalism at the time importantly shaped the search for words about musical sounds—for a language in which cultural, political, and social assumptions could be used both to explain the listening experience and to educate the listeners. The language of the feuilleton offered tools to convey observations, interpretations, and instructions on understanding music to a wide audience, far beyond the academy. Although Kretzschmar failed to have this approach incorporated into the musicological curriculum, and hermeneutic methods were not accepted until the late twentieth century, the struggles surrounding hermeneutics in the fin-de-siècle German-speaking world illuminate the role of publishing contexts in generating knowledge on sound. They reveal a complex entanglement of journalism and the humanities at a time before the two fields split into demarcated territories of knowledge.

In 1903, the well-known music historian, conductor, and journalist Hermann Kretzschmar attended a subscription concert by the Gewandhaus orchestra in Leipzig and reported on his visit in the feuilleton of the *Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten*, Leipzig's

highest-circulation daily newspaper at the time. To give his readers a full account of his concert hall experience, he detailed the diversity of its elements, sharing some historical background on the music, commenting on the behavior of the audience, explaining his own listening experience in terms of an imagined boat trip, discussing the compositional structure of the pieces, and evaluating the soloists' technical abilities and choice of tempi. The newspaper reader was to receive an all-encompassing picture to which he or she could easily relate. Describing his listening experience of the second symphony by Robert Volkmann, a Romantic composer and a local Leipzig hero, Kretzschmar referred to other, better-known Romantic composers ("Schumann-like tongues") and alluded to national styles in Volkmann's music ("Russian distichs").¹ Kretzschmar's feuilleton piece combined metaphors with technical and historical descriptions in order to make musical sounds accessible to the newspaper's readers. This unification of so many features in a single text was typical of an era when writers sought to capture the experience of sound and music in the language of the feuilleton.

In Kretzschmar's descriptions of his concert hall experiences, the relationship between music and language is complex. First and foremost, he was deeply convinced that music could be perceived as a language, and not just a language of compositional structure. In the case of Volkmann's symphony, for example, he identified the tones of the composer's own voice: "That is the language of the easygoing, philosophical, just slightly roguish Saxon."² Second, Kretzschmar believed that music was in desperate need of translation. Music spoke in a language, yet that language was not easily intelligible, lacking the tools to make itself understood to a wide spectrum of listeners—it could neither "objectify" its own effects by proposing concrete meanings, nor give listeners a particular set of images and terms to guide their listening, nor enable its meaning to be shared by different listeners. Music thus needed, third, written and spoken language in order to be explained. It required nonmusical, external interpretation by experts like himself.

This need for explanation was music's greatest deficit and challenge: "Music's lack of independence is a flaw, a speech impediment," Kretzschmar wrote in 1902.³ As I will show, Kretzschmar and his contemporaries saw this problem as something greater than the immediate issue of understanding musical pieces in the concert hall: it was symptomatic of a larger crisis of German culture. In response, Kretzschmar aimed to establish a "new theoretical discipline," musical hermeneutics, which would be a legitimate

1. Hermann Kretzschmar, "Fünftes Gewandhauskonzert," in *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik und Anderes aus den Grenzboten* (Leipzig: Grunow, 1910), 528.

2. Ibid.

3. Hermann Kretzschmar, "Anregungen zur Förderung musikalischer Hermeneutik," in *Gesammelte Aufsätze aus den Jahrbüchern der Musikbibliothek Peters* (Leipzig: Peters, 1911), 172. Kretzschmar's term *Sprachfehler* (speech defect) could also be read in a literal sense as "defect of language."

and accepted method for understanding and resolving what he called music's *Sprachlosigkeit*, or "speechlessness," an inability to speak for itself.⁴

Kretzschmar did not invent musical hermeneutics. He could draw on much older theological and philosophical traditions in the "discovery of meaning in texts by way of understanding"—by way, that is, of "an approach to a text that is empathetic rather than empirically verifiable"—and on a tendency in musicology since the late eighteenth century to bring works of art into the purview of hermeneutical practices.⁵ By the time Kretzschmar articulated his approach, the significance of hermeneutics in the humanities had expanded, in particular through the seminal work of Wilhelm Dilthey, as a way of reforming scholarly practice and challenging the success of scientific, positivistic, and philological methods in the late nineteenth century.⁶ Kretzschmar diagnosed the danger of positivism in musicological practice as well, and proposed musical hermeneutics as a way "to fathom the meaning and ideational content that is encompassed by the forms, always to seek the soul below the body, [and] to detect in every element of a work of art the pure kernel of thought, the whole out of the clearest cognizance of the smallest detail."⁷ The social, cultural, and scholarly ambitions that Kretzschmar attached to this project went far beyond the narrow study of musicology in the university. But although it initially attracted wide attention and dissemination in the musical world, it fell out of fashion in the 1920s, and was labeled as "corrupted," "pseudoscientific," or "trivializing" in subsequent decades.⁸ Only in the 1970s did hermeneutics begin to regain its profile as a theoretical concept and become recognized as a legitimate methodology in musicology, often in explicit rejection of Kretzschmar's approach.⁹

4. Ibid.

5. Ian D. Bent, "Hermeneutics (Ger. *Hermeneutik*)," in *Grove Music Online* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

6. Both Dilthey and Kretzschmar were professors at Friedrich-Wilhelm-University in Berlin around the same time, but there is no evidence for any direct personal interaction. There are overlaps in their approaches to hermeneutics. See Lee Rothfarb, "Hermeneutics and Energetics: Analytical Alternatives in the Early 1900s," *Journal of Music Theory* 36, no. 1 (1992): 50–56; Adolf Nowak, "Dilthey und die musikalische Hermeneutik," in *Beiträge zur musikalischen Hermeneutik*, ed. by Carl Dahlhaus (Regensburg: Bosse, 1975), 11–27. On Dilthey and his concept of *Geisteswissenschaften*, see the contributions by Karsten Lichau and Viktoria Tkaczyk in this issue.

7. Kretzschmar, "Anregungen," 168.

8. Carl Dahlhaus, "Vorwort," in *Beiträge zur musikalischen Hermeneutik*, ed. Carl Dahlhaus (Regensburg: Bosse, 1975), 7; Siegfried Mauser, "Hermeneutik," in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik begründet von Friedrich Blume*, ed. Ludwig Finscher (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1996), 4:265.

9. Wolfgang Gratzer and Siegfried Mauser, eds., *Hermeneutik im musikwissenschaftlichen Kontext: Internationales Symposium Salzburg 1992* (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 1995). For an overview of the literature, see Bent, "Hermeneutics."

This article will consider Hermann Kretzschmar and his role in the publishing culture around 1900 in order to explain his popular approach to solving the problem of music's speechlessness. Starting from musical hermeneutics as a legitimate intellectual framework in its historical context, I show how Kretzschmar used the language of the *feuilleton* as his main tool to convey observation, interpretation, and instruction on understanding music to a broad audience far beyond the academy. In his *feuilleton* writings, Kretzschmar artfully brought scholarly erudition, journalistic accessibility, and literary expressiveness to bear on the newly emerging opportunities offered by the newspaper and journal market at the end of the nineteenth century.

The language that Kretzschmar used in this endeavor was shaped by its immediate context, the *feuilleton*. A French term that originated in the wake of the French Revolution to mean a single-page insert in a newspaper, *feuilleton* came to refer to a wide range of local journalistic traditions as it spread throughout Europe in the course of the nineteenth century. In nineteenth-century newspapers, the *feuilleton* was the section for all kinds of information aside from politics and economic reporting. This included theater and music criticism, fiction, advertisements, cultural news, entertainment, fashion, philosophy, natural wonders, and much more.¹⁰ Compared with other genres or publication formats in the nineteenth century, such as the novel or the scientific journal, the *feuilleton* lacked clear specifications regarding style, length, or subject matter. Instead, it offered an open space to communicate observations and commentaries about human life, social relationships, and ephemeral objects—such as sound—that could not easily be shared elsewhere. In this article, the *feuilleton* is thus conceived of as a format in two senses: both as a physical section within the newspaper (quite literally “below the line,” with a black line separating it from other articles) and as an intellectual frame to address social issues of interest. In this dual function it served as an intersection of the arts, humanities, and society by synthesizing the details of everyday life with reflections upon them.¹¹ Its language mirrored this function, combining subjective and instructive, reflective and descriptive elements in a literary way. This kind of small-format writing evolved within the “media ecosystem” of the nineteenth century and became hugely popular among authors and readers.¹² The *feuilleton* circulated with

10. Research on the *feuilleton* has recently surged, especially in German-speaking literary scholarship. Most recently, see Hildegard Kernmayer and Simone Jung, eds., *Feuilleton: Schreiben an der Schnittstelle zwischen Journalismus und Literatur* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2017); Ethel Matala de Mazza, *Der populäre Pakt: Verhandlungen der Moderne zwischen Operette und Feuilleton* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2018).

11. See Martina Lauster, *Sketches of the Nineteenth Century: European Journalism and Its Physiologies, 1830–50* (New York: Palgrave, 2007), 1.

12. Patrizia C. McBride, “The Edge of the Page: Alfred Polgar, the *Feuilleton* and the Poetics of the Small Form,” *German Quarterly* 93, no. 1 (2020): 2.

ease from the newspaper to the journal article and to the book and back again, often adapted to new contexts and purposes along the way. During the years when Kretzschmar's musical hermeneutics arose, the omnipresence of this writing was as much critiqued, as the *Feuilletonisierung* (feuilletonization) of the public sphere, as it was celebrated, as the "golden years of the feuilleton"—or, in Hermann Hesse's memorable phrase, the "Age of the Feuilleton," when feuilleton writers reported on "a thousand-and-one items of knowledge."¹³ The language of the feuilleton was, indeed, a "reservoir of knowledge" in as much as it offered the tools to observe, interpret, and instruct.¹⁴ Kretzschmar made use of this language, which was most easily accessible to him and seemed best suited to his social goals, and which also promised wide circulation while still being recognized as legitimate in the humanities, especially in musicology.¹⁵

As Alex Csizar in his study on nineteenth-century scientific journals has shown, "formats and genres have epistemic consequences."¹⁶ In line with this, the present article analyzes the locus of the feuilleton in journalism and the humanities around 1900, tracing how a new journalistic language promised to change the understanding of music and sound. I begin by outlining the changing ways in which the problem of music's "speechlessness" was interpreted in the public sphere during the nineteenth century. I then show how Kretzschmar used the newly industrializing world of publishing to advocate feuilletonistic language as a solution to that problem. Third, I examine the implications of the establishment of a feuilletonistic language for careers and institutions of the time. Finally, I draw some conclusions on the increasing rift between journalism and musicology at the beginning of the twentieth century.

KRETZSCHMAR, MUSIC'S SPEECHLESSNESS, AND THE CRISIS OF LISTENING

As a wanderer between the musical worlds of scholarship, practice, and the public sphere, Hermann Kretzschmar was in a unique position to observe and comment on issues of musical listening. Born in 1848 in the small Saxon village of Olbernhau as the

13. Hermann Hesse, *The Glass Bead Game*, trans. Richard Winston and Clara Winston (1943; New York: Picador, 2002), 18 and 20. On the "golden years," see Peter Fritzsche, *Reading Berlin 1900* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 43. On "Feuilletonisierung," see Ernst Meunier, "'Feuilletonisierung' der modernen Presse," *Der Zeitungs-Verlag*, June 14, 1930.

14. Haun Saussy, "Languages as Knowledge Reservoirs," *KNOW* 1, no. 2 (2017): 261.

15. On the history of music criticism in general, see Sandra McColl, *Music Criticism in Vienna, 1896–1897: Critically Moving Forms* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996); Ulrich Tadday, *Die Anfänge des Musikfeuilletons: Der kommunikative Gebrauchswert musikalischer Bildung* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1993); Benjamin M. Korstvedt, "Reading Music Criticism beyond the Fin-de-Siècle Vienna Paradigm," *Musical Quarterly* 94, nos. 1–2 (2011): 156–210.

16. Alex Csizar, *The Scientific Journal: Authorship and the Politics of Knowledge in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018), 3.

son of a cantor, he grew up in the conservative German Protestant musical tradition. Kretzschmar knew all the aspects and institutions of the musical world from a young age, studying philology and music in Leipzig, working as a conductor, music instructor, and music historian in Metz, Rostock, Leipzig, and Berlin, and obtaining professorships at universities in these cities as well as various positions at academic institutions.¹⁷ When he published his two main theoretical articles on musical hermeneutics in 1902 and 1904, presenting his general approach to musical writing, Kretzschmar had already established himself firmly as a commentator on the “crisis” of the musical world—a notion widespread in the public discourse.¹⁸

Reinhart Koselleck has defined a “crisis” as a situation in which a decision is urgently required but has not yet been reached.¹⁹ Contemporary observers of musical life such as Kretzschmar detected signs of just such a watershed at various levels, whether musical institutions, artistic production, education, or public writing. These factors of the musical world were, Kretzschmar found, proving unable to overcome the main problem of instrumental music, its “speech impediment”: the lack of an appropriate language to talk and write about listening experiences. Faced with the challenges of urbanization and the need to reform cultural institutions, traditional practices of music listening were called radically into question by the change of the audience’s social structure and behavioral norms. One result was the lack of understanding of music among the public, which was “quite simply the fundamental question of music,” as Kretzschmar’s student Hans Mersmann put it.²⁰

The prevalence of “unschooled listening,” a term Kretzschmar ascribed to philosopher and psychologist Carl Stumpf, intensified the perception of crisis.²¹ For Kretzschmar and his peers, however, the lack of an appropriate language was more than a matter of education. It had profound social and cultural implications for Germany—

17. On Kretzschmar’s biography, see Heinz-Dieter Sommer, *Praxisorientierte Musikwissenschaft: Studien zu Leben und Werk Hermann Kretzschmars* (Munich: Emil Katzbichler, 1985), esp. 13–17 on the early period.

18. A collection of his feuilletons and journal essays on that topic was published as Hermann Kretzschmar, *Musikalische Zeitfragen: Zehn Vorträge* (Leipzig: Peters, 1903). His first overview of the German musical world is Hermann Kretzschmar, *Über den Stand der öffentlichen Musikpflege in Deutschland* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1881).

19. Reinhart Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015), 127.

20. Hans Mersmann, “Musikalische Hermeneutik und Musikunterricht (Teil 1),” *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung* 43, no. 38 (1916): 500.

21. Kretzschmar, “Anregungen,” 169. On Carl Stumpf, see the contributions by Julia Kursell and Viktoria Tkaczyk in this issue.

because the public's failure to understand musical sounds was a "threat to the nation."²² Nineteenth-century discourse having elevated music to the status of a pillar of German identity, anything that might hinder its mission was perilous. Music was not a "luxury item," but a basic necessity for society: "If we neglect it, if we hamper its development by incorrect judgments, then we commit a social sin that may have dire consequences in times of grave national misfortune."²³ The nation's fate depended on the cohesion to be achieved by listening to music, but that in turn depended on "receptivity and understanding" among listeners, which was now in crisis.²⁴ Commentators such as Kretzschmar were heavily invested in that narrative. They argued that the risk of social disintegration could be avoided by improving music listening.²⁵ And the precondition for improving music listening and securing its standards, they firmly believed, was the improvement of language to talk about listening.

Although such alarmist tones were new, the trope of music's "language problem" had been well established since the beginnings of the symphony concert in the decades before and after 1800. The search for language to remedy this problem was pursued in the emerging publishing culture through journals and feuilletons.²⁶ The philosophical discourse on listening conducted there by Wackenroder, Goethe, Hegel, Schopenhauer, and others sought new ways to legitimize an associative language that could verbalize listening experiences.²⁷ This language reflected a continuing practice of seeking associations with music—concrete mental images of experiences produced by listeners during performances—as a way of making sense of the symphony concert.

22. Kretzschmar, "Anregungen," 169 and 170.

23. Richard Wallaschek, "Das ästhetische Urteil und die Tageskritik," *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters* 11 (1904): 65.

24. Hermann Kretzschmar, "Falsche und richtige Zeitfragen," in *Musikalische Zeitfragen: Zehn Vorträge* (Leipzig: Peters, 1903), 3. For a summary of music's role in German public culture, see Celia Applegate, *The Necessity of Music: Variations on a German Theme* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017), esp. 3–19.

25. In general on this crisis, see Hansjakob Ziemer, "The Crisis of Listening in Interwar Germany," in *The Oxford Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, ed. Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), 97–121.

26. Leon Botstein, "Listening through Reading: Musical Literacy and the Concert Audience," *19th-Century Music* 16, no. 2 (1992): 132–34.

27. Eric Reimer, "Hermann Kretzschmars musikalische Hermeneutik und die Tradition des assoziativen Hörens," *Die Musikforschung* 43, no. 3 (1990): 211–21, esp. 215. On traditions in the eighteenth century, see Mark Evan Bonds, "Turning *Liebhaber* into *Kenner*: Forkel's Lectures on the Art of Listening, ca. 1780–1785," in *The Oxford Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, ed. Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), 150–54.

Articulations of this associative form of listening were widespread, found in the feuilleton writings of Heinrich Heine in the 1830s and 1840s, for example, but the notion also attracted growing criticism. Eduard Hanslick, who developed new formalist norms on listening in his feuilleton contributions of the 1850s, discredited metaphorical and associative accounts: they were misleading when taken literally. In his view, music did not possess its own emotions; nevertheless, it was “autonomous,” requiring no extra-musical referents in order to be understood.²⁸ Hanslick’s conclusions were unmistakably hierarchical, favoring abstract analysis and rational deduction over associative language as a way to listen. The resulting new normative language about listening claimed legitimacy by applying the rules of rational deduction rather than emotional involvement. One effect was to establish new behavioral norms of listening in silence. Attentive and immersed listening was now required, practices that also informed the physical set-up of concert halls.

Hanslick’s enduring influence on philosophical and aesthetic musical thinking notwithstanding, traditions of associative language persisted in general discourse and practice throughout the nineteenth century. Resistance to formalist approaches was often inspired by the fear of a decline of emotionality with regard to music more generally. In particular, there were concerns that philological and analytical tools, though usefully promising objectivity, would mean the end of associative listening practices in the concert hall and undermine the legitimacy of overwhelming emotional experiences. It is worth noting that the opponents of Hanslick’s language applied imagery from the sciences, philology, and medicine to alert the readers to what was at stake. For example, another music historian and journalist, Walter Niemann, portrayed music analysis as follows in 1905: “The poor work to be explicated is strapped to the dissecting table of music-scientific-philological analysis and then may God have mercy on it!”²⁹ His scientific metaphor is typical of the imagery used by feuilleton writers. Niemann’s description of a musical piece as an “anatomical specimen” articulates the fear of a scientization of listening whose aim would be to detect the “laws of the reputable musical citizen as scientifically acknowledged to be normal.”³⁰ Hanslick’s opponents thus used the feuilleton, a forum for dispute, to signal the dangers of his and others’ application of

28. More detail on Hanslick can be found in Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer, “The Art of Listening and Its Histories: An Introduction,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, ed. Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), 9–10; Dana Gooley, “Hanslick and the Institution of Criticism,” *Journal of Musicology* 28, no. 3 (2011): 290–325.

29. Walter Niemann, “Musikalische Auslegekunst,” *Die Grenzboten* 64 (1905): 255.

30. *Ibid.*

rigorous scholarly methods to music, to subvert the supposedly superior methods of the natural sciences, and to offer an alternative for the generally educated public.³¹

Kretzschmar blamed the lack of an appropriate language for music and sounds on the state of feuilleton writing itself. In theory, newspaper writing about music was thriving around 1900, when every provincial town had one or more local critics at hand.³² In practice, though, Kretzschmar identified a poor level of writing, moral corruption, and a lack of education, intellectual rigor, and professionalism as reasons why the power of the word was failing to reach a wide readership. He accused the newspapers of randomly hiring “master bakers, dairymen, students, music dealers, unemployed shop clerks, etc.” for journalistic positions.³³ Such negative judgments were widely shared around 1900, reflecting an absence of clearly defined professional standards for journalism.

Yet for many observers, beyond the musical world as well, journalists held the keys to solve almost any kind of crisis. As experts in language and communication, journalists were in the best position to unleash the “spiritual powers of a nation,” possessing as they did an “abundance of intellectual power and broad-based knowledge.”³⁴ Journalists were the “knowers” who could enlighten the “not-knowers” and thus act as the guardians of social cohesion.³⁵ For contemporaries, the newspaper served as an “encyclopedia of the everyday,” a universal compendium to summarize all aspects of social life. As part of the newspaper, the feuilleton encapsulated this mission by offering space to report and reflect, entertain and educate at the same time. The language that was employed for such purpose was journalistic—based on everyday observation and aiming for intelligibility, it made information and interpretation available in essayistic style and used the imaginative potential of literary language.³⁶ This is the sense in which feuilletons were seen as “cognitive tools” to observe and reform a culture that increasingly relied on the media to organize itself.³⁷ Music’s speechlessness, Kretzschmar believed, could be effectively confronted by establishing a suitable feuilletonistic language.

31. It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss contemporary psychophysiological research on associative listening, for example, by Sigmund Exner.

32. S. D. Gallwitz, “Lokalpatriotismus und Kritik,” *Die Musik* 2, no. 7 (1903): 31–35.

33. Hermann Kretzschmar, “Allerhand Musikunfug” (1884), in *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik und Anderes aus den Grenzboten* (Leipzig: Grunow, 1910), 150.

34. “Ein Loblied auf die Tätigkeit der Journalisten,” *Die Redaktion* 9, no. 12 (1910): 91.

35. Johannes Frizenschaf, *Die Praxis des Journalisten: Ein Lehr- und Handbuch für Journalisten, Redakteure und Schriftsteller* (Leipzig: Fiedler, 1901), 17. An extensive metadiscourse on the role of journalism was pursued in the handbooks and journals of the time.

36. Kernmayer and Jung, *Feuilleton*.

37. Lauster, *Sketches*, 3.

THE FEUILLETON AND THE RISE OF MUSICAL HERMENEUTICS

The feuilleton's dual function of observing and resolving the crisis of music was made possible by the wide distribution of newspapers and general-interest journals toward the end of the nineteenth century. Kretzschmar was intimately acquainted with this publishing world and its opportunities to influence the public sphere. He spent significant parts of his professional life in Leipzig, a city noted for its rich resources in musical culture and scholarship. Nineteenth-century Leipzig was home to many publishing houses and to musical newspapers and journals and was often portrayed at that time as Germany's musical capital. The city offered a wealth of institutional resources, a large bourgeois audience, and a thriving music publishing business. It encapsulated the musical world of Germany, centered on the symbiotic relationship between the press and music culture that had arisen since the eighteenth century.³⁸ When a new market for listening guides, program notes, pocket scores, and popular journals arose, Kretzschmar was in the perfect location to make use of these new channels of communication.³⁹ He began to publish widely, in venues ranging from feuilleton contributions on Bayreuth opera performances for the *Leipziger Zeitung* in 1876 to his successful *Führer durch den Concertsaal* (Guide through the concert hall). This began as cheap program leaflets for concert halls, then became a three-volume book that was reissued in various editions until 1939.⁴⁰ Kretzschmar's publishing activities exemplified the fluidity of the nineteenth century media world, which favored writing in small formats and allowed an effortless transgression of genre types—notes, newspapers, journals, books, and sometimes a combination of all those formats.

38. Antje Pieper, *Music and the Making of Middle-Class Culture: A Comparative History of Nineteenth-Century Leipzig and Birmingham* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2008), 45. The following publishing houses and periodicals specializing in music were based in Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel (founded in 1719), C. F. Peters (1800), Hofmeister (1807), Kistner (1823), and the journals *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung* (1848), *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* (1834), *Signale für die musikalische Welt* (1842), and *Musikalische Wochenblatt* (1870). See Marion Recknagel, "Musikstadt Leipzig—die silberne Zeit," in *Geschichte der Stadt Leipzig, Band 3: Vom Wiener Kongress bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*, ed. Susanne Schötz (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2018), 742.

39. Christian Thorau, "Führer durch den Konzertsaal und durch das Bühnenfestspiel—Hermann Kretzschmar, Hans von Wolzogen und die Bewegung der Erläuterer," in *Hermann Kretzschmar: Konferenzbericht Olbernhau 1998*, ed. Hermann Loos and Rainer Cadenbach (Chemnitz: G. Schröder, 1998), 93–107.

40. Hermann Kretzschmar, *Führer durch den Concertsaal*, vol. 1, *Sinfonie und Suite*; vol. 2, *Kirchliche Werke: Passionen, Messen, Hymnen, Psalmen, Motetten, Cantaten*; and vol. 3, *Oratorien und weltliche Chorwerke* (Leipzig: A. G. Liebeskind, 1887–90); second and subsequent editions were published by Breitkopf & Härtel of Leipzig.

It was in these leaflets of program notes and feuilletons that Kretzschmar established a language of literary imagination to attribute meaning to musical experiences, one that can now best be studied in his collected volumes. He explained musical themes for the readers by translating a musical theme into his own invented stories or attributing themes to particular moods and settings. Children, angels, or landscapes were imagined and then imbued with sentiments, such as happiness or disappointment, that could be transposed into entire tales of heroes or other narrative constructs. Kretzschmar created a language of musical criticism that resembled the language of tourist guides, and helped the reader to spot the main aspects of the music in a way that resembled sightseeing—what Christian Thorau has recently described as “touristic listening.”⁴¹ In short, Kretzschmar translated the experiences and images of musical themes and forms into literary language.⁴²

His use of language not only synthesized music with the life experiences of the listeners, but also pursued a universalist mission in the public sphere by crossing social boundaries. This accorded with the intention of the journalistic publications with which he was affiliated. Many of these journals, such as the conservative, Christian family magazines *Daheim* (founded in 1864) and *Gartenlaube* (1862), served the political and educational purpose of disseminating Protestant, socially homogeneous, and nationalist messages.⁴³ They also acted as social and intellectual networks to gather like-minded editors and journalists. Kretzschmar belonged to the network of *Grenzboten* (1842), shaped by the editorship of Gustav Freytag, a writer, politician, and playwright who made the journal a highly influential voice for a conservative readership that supported Bismarckian political and social models. The *Grenzboten* writers were, as music critic Alfred Heuß remarked, among the “most knowledgeable of the fields in which they have chosen their vocation,” who “reject all kinds of narrow specialization” in order to remain “closely connected with the general cultural life.”⁴⁴ This anti-specialist spirit resonated with Kretzschmar’s universalist ambitions.

Those ambitions became obvious not only in Kretzschmar’s guides, but also in his feuilleton writing on music. He offered knowledge about many facets of the music by

41. Christian Thorau, “‘What Ought to Be Heard’: Touristic Listening and the Guided Ear,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, ed. Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), 207–31.

42. See Botstein, “Listening through Reading,” 141.

43. On Leipzig’s new liberal journals, see Kirsten Belgum, *Popularizing the Nation: Audience, Representation, and the Production of Identity in Die Gartenlaube, 1853–1900* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 11–12. For a comprehensive bibliography of Kretzschmar’s writings, see Sommer, *Praxisorientierte Musikwissenschaft*, 102–9.

44. Alfred Heuß, “Vorwort des Herausgebers,” in Hermann Kretzschmar, *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik und Anderes aus den Grenzboten* (Leipzig: Grunow, 1910), v.

writing about the origin of the piece, its history, genre, and style, and by evaluating the performance and judging it against the composer's intentions. But in true *feuilleton* fashion, this knowledge was supplemented by observations of the actual performance, enriching the article with the details of a concert-going experience. For example, in an article on a concert by the Gewandhaus orchestra in 1903, Kretzschmar criticizes the quality of the orchestra's performance and asks what it meant for the experience of listeners in the auditorium. His report also tries to explain exactly how emotions become attached to the experience of listening to sounds. He walks his readers through the emotions in the music, artfully meandering between musical work and emotions, then explains why the "procession of the affects" in Beethoven's *Eroica* relies on a particular management of tempi if the piece is to move the listener to tears or pleasure.⁴⁵ If that fails (as was the case in the symphony concert he describes), the musicians lose the accuracy of their rhythm and the listener can feel neither triumph nor grief. A concert visit then becomes a hodgepodge of emotional experiences, each of the different music pieces having its own "effects." From visiting a sawmill to watching starlight or imagining a political triumph, Kretzschmar gives his readers an all-embracing *feuilletonistic* account by combining personal observation of the actual event, context, and literary tools.

Kretzschmar felt the need to justify and legitimize his own mixed approach—partly because of the insufficiencies of writing and listening that he deplored, partly in order to gain recognition in the scholarly field. He attempted to address the academic audience by publishing two methodological articles in the yearbook of the reform-minded music library *Musikbibliothek Peters*, a new Leipzig initiative to make sheet music and books accessible to a popular audience.⁴⁶ Kretzschmar's articles aim to lay new foundations for a musical hermeneutics, to be used as a "preparatory school of musical aesthetics" in which details of the musical work, theoretical expertise, and the listener's personal experience can be brought together. Understanding music, Kretzschmar argues, is not a matter of "somnambulant" abilities, but requires "the highest spiritual clarity" and can be learned.⁴⁷ Each musical work evokes emotions that can be detected not by subjective interpretation, but by objective reasoning about the musical material itself. His frequent references to the "rigorous" and "objective" quality of his work underline his goal of securing both academic credibility and journalistic accessibility.

This endeavor is supported by references to theological, philosophical, and musical traditions, although some of the historical lineage is only "retrospectively appropriated"

45. Hermann Kretzschmar, "Zehntes Gewandhauskonzert," in *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik und Anderes aus den Grenzboten* (Leipzig: Grunow, 1910), 545 (first published in *Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten* during the 1903–4 season).

46. Emil Vogel, "Vorwort," *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters* 1 (1895): 4.

47. Kretzschmar, "Anregungen," 173.

to musical hermeneutics, as Ian Bent has remarked.⁴⁸ Kretzschmar returned to the eighteenth-century discourse on affects as a model for modern hermeneutics, thus avoiding the term “feelings,” which he saw only as an expression of the subjective; “affect” seemed to carry the value of objective expression that was contained in the musical material and could be captured by words. Affects were supposedly universally human and almost naturally present. In a second step, Kretzschmar asked listeners to map the structure of these affects onto terms that they knew from their own experiences, impressions, or memories, all of which might originate outside the concert hall. Despite Kretzschmar’s claims for a universal language to understand musical sounds, however, the listening process he describes demands individual erudition. Deciphering music, like doing algebra, requires knowledge and practice, but the language of musical hermeneutics can make it intelligible: “[music] gives the initiate pictures of the essence and inner life of the objects that are of a richness and subtlety of which it alone is capable. . . . It is in the faculty of language that the prime value of music lies. . . . This linguistic faculty of tones is other than that of words. It is less autonomous and less distinct.”⁴⁹ Kretzschmar then offers evidence from musical examples, especially by eighteenth-century composers, and hopes also to give some practical advice to his readers.

At first sight, Kretzschmar’s project seemed to have convinced his contemporaries by providing a theoretical framework and an accessible language that suggested an immediate legibility of emotional experiences. Kretzschmar’s ideas were much debated, especially around World War I, when interest in hermeneutics surged and interpretations of symphonies could easily be used to distribute political messages within the concert hall.⁵⁰ They were the subject of journalistic interest, scholarly attention, and practical application, albeit not always in tune with Kretzschmar’s own intentions. For many observers, the concert hall had become a space that resembled the opera or theater, evoking associations and dramatic figures.

One of the most fervent proponents of hermeneutics was Kretzschmar’s student Arnold Schering, who began his career as a feuilleton writer for Leipzig’s newspapers, also

48. Bent, “Hermeneutics,” sec. 3. For an intellectual history account of Kretzschmar’s approach, see Rothfarb, “Hermeneutics and Energetics,” 43–68.

49. Kretzschmar, “Anregungen,” 172.

50. Examples of the general discourse on musical hermeneutics during World War I include Ernst Ludwig Schellenberg, “Ueber musikalische Hermeneutik,” *Neue Musik-Zeitung* 38, no. 16 (1917): 249–50; Otto R. Hübner, “Intellektuelle Musik,” *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung* 41, no. 16 (1914): 543–45; and Robert Müller-Hartmann, “Musikalische Deutekunst,” *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung* 61, no. 51 (1914): 1295–96. For more examples of the practical application of hermeneutics by music critics at the time, see Hansjakob Ziemer, “Listening on the Home Front: Music and the Production of Social Meaning in German Concert Halls during World War I,” in *Sounds of Modern History: Auditory Cultures in 19th- and 20th-Century Europe*, ed. Daniel Morat (New York: Berghahn, 2014), 201–27.

studied with Wilhelm Dilthey in Berlin, and, as a professor of music history, was famed for his radically nationalistic hermeneutic interpretations in the 1930s. Schering explained in 1914 that listeners became internally engaged with the musical performance not only psychologically, but also physically. The series of notes become living entities that perform a “meaningful drama,” Schering observes, containing escalations, conflicts, and solutions: we are the “compassionate viewer.”⁵¹ Schering thus emphasizes, even more than Kretzschmar, the listeners’ active participation in the performance as they fill the projection space offered by the piece with their own fantasies. His and similar models “reflected an entire generation’s appetite for the dramaturgic and theatrical in all areas of life,” no less so in the interpretation of musical sound in the concert hall.⁵²

The attempt to elevate the feuilletonistic language of sounds and music by means of the “new discipline” of musical hermeneutics ultimately failed when Romantic approaches to music were increasingly supplanted by the New Sobriety. Musical hermeneutics lost its credibility and popular appeal. Even though the practice of associative listening still continued in the 1920s and 1930s, offering as it did the potential to transmit radical political views, a growing tension between the general public and the specialized, scholarly public was now becoming visible.

KNOWLEDGE TERRITORIES

Paradoxically, the attempt to establish a universal language of musical hermeneutics deepened the emerging rift between the fields of musicology and music journalism, and indicated their hierarchical relationship.⁵³ As Pierre Bourdieu observed, “to exist in a field—a literary field, an artistic field—is to differentiate oneself”; being an intellectual essentially means existing “by virtue of difference from other intellectuals.”⁵⁴ The debates surrounding musical hermeneutics and Kretzschmar’s stance on music, education, and journalism proved an opportunity to exercise just such identity work. Historically, musicological scholarship had been closely associated with journalistic publishing, and blurred boundaries between academia and the feuilleton were the rule

51. Arnold Schering, “Zur Grundlegung der musikalischen Hermeneutik,” *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 9 (1914): 170.

52. Charles S. Maier, “Mahler’s Theater: The Performative and the Political in Central Europe, 1890–1910,” in *Mahler and His World*, ed. Karen Painter (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), 56.

53. Martin Mulsow, “History of Knowledge,” in *Debating New Approaches to History*, ed. Marek Tamm and Peter Burke (London: Bloomsbury, 2019), 159, 176.

54. Pierre Bourdieu, “The Political Field, the Social Science Field, and the Journalistic Field,” in *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*, ed. R. D. Benson (Cambridge: Polity, 2005), 39–40.

rather than the exception. Around 1900, however, each profession intensified its attempts to become recognized on its own account, establishing rules for inclusion and exclusion in its field. As a “belated discipline” within the humanities, still dogged by doubts as to whether it deserved academic status at all, musicology was caught up in institutional quarrels about legitimacy until well into the twentieth century.⁵⁵ Feuilleton writing took an active part in those skirmishes over professional identity, by using this format as a space to reflect and a stage for attack.

Kretzschmar was anything but an outsider in an increasingly specialized musicological world that nevertheless still staked claims to an accessible and universal language. This is illustrated by the decision-making process in his two university appointments. When the University of Leipzig had to decide whether to promote him to professor extraordinary in 1891, the evaluators praised his dissertation but raised doubts about the scholarly value of his popular work as a journalist and the author of the celebrated *Führer durch den Concertsaal*. In the end, they argued that his work on the history of genre could be “equated with strictly scholarly work,” and recommended appointment.⁵⁶ But reservations persisted. When he applied for the professorship in Berlin, the committee acknowledged his success as a “writer to his core,” though they distinguished between his scholarly, popular, and “semi-popular” writings.⁵⁷ In both instances, the committees agreed that his journalistic work on music was not strictly distinct from the goals of scholarship. His universal approach could still be accepted within the institutional hierarchies.

Despite this success in Leipzig and Berlin, Kretzschmar’s broad approach to music and listening practices faced increasing resistance from a field battling to prove its scholarly rigor and depth—for the study of music as a research object urgently required public legitimacy and funding. Musical hermeneutics was soon labeled “unscholarly” by Hugo Riemann, one of the most influential musicologists of his time, who became Kretzschmar’s major adversary in the public arena.⁵⁸

55. Anselm Gerhard, ed., *Musikwissenschaft—eine verspätete Disziplin? Die akademische Musikforschung zwischen Fortschrittsglauben und Modernitätsverweigerung* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2000); Pamela Potter, *Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler’s Reich* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).

56. A summary of the report and the quote can be found in Tatjana Böhme, “Wege von der Kunst zur Wissenschaft: Hermann Kretzschmars Wirken in Leipzig,” in *Hermann Kretzschmar: Konferenzbericht Olbernhau 1998*, ed. Hermann Loos and Rainer Cadenbach (Chemnitz: G. Schröder, 1998), 43.

57. Martin Pfeffer, *Hermann Kretzschmar und die Musikpädagogik zwischen 1890–1915* (Mainz: Schott, 1992), 251.

58. Heinrich Zöllner, “Über Erklärung von Instrumentalmusik,” *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* 32, no. 22 (1905): 397, and “Die ‘Loreley’: Eine Motivstudie,” *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* 32, no. 18 (1902): 275–76.

Initially, the two men's career paths had shown similar patterns and concerns. Like Kretzschmar, Riemann was at home in Leipzig's musical world, yet he struggled to gain recognition for his scholarship, never received a full tenured professorship, and was made professor extraordinarius at Leipzig University only in 1905.⁵⁹ Again like Kretzschmar, he took advantage of Leipzig's vast publishing opportunities, beginning to write for *Grenzboten* in the 1880s and becoming known for his "Catechism on Music," a series on general aspects of music history and aesthetics published by the Max Hesse publishing house. Riemann also shared with Kretzschmar a concern about the state of listening, complaining in 1872: "The days of blind faith are over; we want to understand . . . what we hear."⁶⁰ But the two scholars differed in their answers to this challenge. Whereas Kretzschmar sought to face the problem by returning to the eighteenth-century doctrine of the affects and defending bourgeois listening traditions, Riemann pursued a systematic and encyclopedic agenda that culminated in his monumental *Musiklexikon*, published in 1882 with nine revised editions in his lifetime.⁶¹

Riemann took particular issue with Kretzschmar on the role for musicology that was implied in his writings on hermeneutics and more explicitly in his general cultural reflections. According to Kretzschmar, hermeneutics ought to be a *Hilfswissenschaft*, an auxiliary science or discipline: "it is a born auxiliary art [*Hilfskunst*]," since music needs the help of language to be understood and explained.⁶² This aligned with his broader vision of musicology, set out in a series of articles in *Grenzboten* in 1902,⁶³ in which he presents musicology itself as an auxiliary science dedicated to the teaching and dissemination of music. Riemann rejected that argument, fearing that auxiliary status would cement an assumption of musicology's inferiority and would mean musicologists ceding music aesthetics to the psychologists and physiologists, music history to the historians, and acoustics to the mathematicians and physicists. The study of music would then be left to teachers rather than to academically trained musicologists—yet "higher academic training" was vital in order to prove the "power and significance of absolute music" on the basis of a defined, scholarly terminology of "purely musical

59. See Alexander Rehding, *Hugo Riemann and the Birth of Modern Musical Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 4–5; Michael Arntz, "Nehmen Sie Riemann ernst? Zur Bedeutung Hugo Riemanns für die Emanzipation der Musik," in *Hugo Riemann (1849–1919): Musikwissenschaftler mit Universalanspruch*, ed. Tatjana Böhme-Mehner and Klaus Mehner (Cologne: Böhlau, 2001), 12–14.

60. Hugo Riemann (writing as Hugibert Ries, 1872), quoted in Arntz, "Nehmen Sie Riemann ernst?," 14.

61. Hugo Riemann, *Musik-Lexikon: Theorie und Geschichte der Musik, die Tonkünstler alter und neuer Zeit mit Angabe ihrer Werke, nebst einer vollständigen Instrumentenkunde* (Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1882).

62. Kretzschmar, "Anregungen," 172.

63. Reprinted in Kretzschmar, *Musikalische Zeitfragen*.

expression.⁶⁴ Riemann's notion of music as absolute or pure contradicted Kretzschmar's idea of music as a language, which, Riemann believed, belittled music: if Kretzschmar ever managed to translate his ideas into practice, musicology would be rendered "useless" and "dispensable" and ultimately be reduced to the mere teaching of music theory and biographical anecdotes—downgrading it within the humanities and drastically diminishing its scope and goals.⁶⁵ Riemann added that for musicology to survive, the state needed distinct criteria for funding it, and "how can the state take up a position on a discipline whose objectives are so unclear, the demarcation of whose tasks is so contradictory?"⁶⁶

Aside from this disagreement on substance, both Kretzschmar and Riemann were aware that the only way to succeed institutionally was to establish a curriculum. However, only Riemann came close to making a lasting contribution to a university degree program, by establishing his theory of harmony as an "institutionally accepted doctrine in German musicology," as Alexander Rehdig has shown.⁶⁷ Kretzschmar, in turn, tried to establish musical hermeneutics through his teaching at the University of Berlin and certainly contributed to the general reconsideration of the role of emotions in the humanities at the time.⁶⁸ But during the institutionalization of musicology, philological methods and the analysis of textual sources were favored, leaving hermeneutic frameworks little chance of being incorporated into the discipline.

In the end, Kretzschmar was not able to gather enough intellectual and institutional support to continue developing his methods. His own teaching style appears to have borne the marks of his writing, leading some of his students to describe it as rather improvised, anecdotal, and less directed by methodological or overarching systematic goals.⁶⁹ Students of Kretzschmar's such as Hans Mersmann, Georg Schünemann, Hermann Abert, and, most notably, Arnold Schering carried on some of his ideals in musicological practice and refined his ideas about understanding,⁷⁰ but they had to deal

64. Hugo Riemann, "Die Musik und der Staat: Auch eine musikalische Zeitfrage," *Die Musik* 3, no. 7 (1902): 13–14.

65. Riemann, "Die Musik und der Staat," 14. He also criticized Kretzschmar's article on hermeneutics in the third edition of Hugo Riemann, *Grundlinien der Musik-Ästhetik (Wie hören wir Musik?)* (1888; Leipzig: Hesse, 1911), iii–vi.

66. Riemann, "Die Musik und der Staat," 13.

67. Rehdig, *Hugo Riemann*, 17.

68. On Dilthey's treatment of emotions, see Daniel Morat, "Verstehen als Gefühlsmethode: Zu Wilhelm Diltheys hermeneutischer Grundlegung der Geisteswissenschaften," in *Rationalisierungen des Gefühls: Zum Verhältnis von Wissenschaft und Emotionen 1880–1930*, ed. Uffa Jensen and Daniel Morat (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2008), 101–19.

69. Sommer, *Praxisorientierte Musikwissenschaft*, 60.

70. See their homage to their teacher, *Festschrift Hermann Kretzschmar zum Siebzigsten Geburtstag überreicht von Kollegen, Schülern und Freunden* (Leipzig: Peters, 1918). On Schünemann, see Viktoria Tkaczyk's contribution in this issue.

with claims that Kretzschmar lacked scholarly rigor. Hermann Abert defended him against the accusation that his personality did not fulfill the “demands of modern, rigorous scholarliness [*Wissenschaftlichkeit*],” and downplayed the issue of scholarliness altogether: “Hermeneutics in the way he pursued it was knowledge, and it was truly capable of educating, whether or not one wishes to accord it the name of scholarship.”⁷¹

In Abert’s eyes, Kretzschmar mastered the short essay rather than the lengthy scholarly book. He had “the virtue of brevity,” and it was the format of the essay that allowed him to present “the gold of his knowledge in small change,” making it accessible to “the broadest segments of the nation.”⁷² Despite all Abert’s efforts to harmonize Kretzschmar’s various activities, however, the spheres of journalism and musicology continued to grow apart.

MUSICOLOGY AND THE FEUILLETON DIVIDED?

In conclusion, we can see how Kretzschmar was a migrant between the fields of journalism and academia in the musical world of the late nineteenth century, a world in which such practice was rendered useful, necessary, and acceptable. The feuilleton proved to be a suitable format in this migration for reflecting and responding, for sharing and propagating his views and thoughts. It was here that he formulated solutions to music’s assumed speechlessness, which was both the cause of and the redemption for an assumed fundamental social crisis in German society. For Kretzschmar, the feuilletonistic language was an ideal opportunity to convey such thoughts on music and sound. Not only did it offer literary tools to convey meaning on an ephemeral subject, but it also guaranteed a large audience in and outside the concert hall to read his views on reform and to be reformed themselves by the very act of reading.

Kretzschmar’s popular writing can also be viewed from a theoretical perspective. The knowledge that Kretzschmar shared in the newspaper or popular journals was, to adapt James Secord’s insight, not a preexisting entity that was already codified, transmitted, and “popularized”; it was the outcome of communicative acts and not merely an example of top-to-bottom circulation.⁷³ It was in these acts—adapting, sharing, observing, describing, and others—that the feuilleton actualized its potential as frame and space. Feuilletons offered Kretzschmar the opportunity to act as a mediator between academic knowledge and the knowledge of the everyday observation in the concert hall. While—among historians—the role of journalism has often been downplayed in the rise of humanities and reduced to the lower ranks in the knowledge hierarchy, a closer

71. Hermann Abert, “Zum Gedächtnis Hermann Kretzschmars,” *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters* 31 (1925): 20.

72. Abert, “Zum Gedächtnis,” 17.

73. James Secord, “Knowledge in Transit,” *Isis* 95, no. 4 (2004): 661, 665–66.

look at the feuilleton—not only as an aesthetic but as a cultural phenomenon—sheds light on this historically specific intersection of sound, language, and knowledge and how it contributed to the evolution of the humanities, for example by advancing new methods and approaches.⁷⁴ Paradoxically, the feuilleton also served as a location to execute “boundary-work”—in the words of Matt Carlson—for journalists to establish and cross boundaries between fields of knowledge.⁷⁵ In allowing professional identity struggles, marked knowledge fields, and established hierarchies, the feuilleton contradicted the newspaper’s universalist ideals and ambitions, values which Kretzschmar shared.

This story of this boundary-drawing continued. From 1900 onward, German writers accorded heightened attention to the potential tensions between academic study and journalistic writing, a distinction that was already informing debates on musical hermeneutics. In this discourse, journalists and scholars were portrayed as different species with different needs, talents, and physical circumstances for conducting their professions. Journalist and music historian Walter Niemann identified a “mutual aversion” between “proper scholars and academics or nonacademics who work in the daily newspapers, whom the learned men, without further ado, place in the very last row as mere ‘journalists.’”⁷⁶ Niemann argued that there seemed to be a natural distinction between the two groups, separating their personalities and working styles: “artistic and academic talent seldom unite harmoniously.”⁷⁷ In his opinion, the two fields could not be reconciled.⁷⁸

This debate was not restricted to musicology, but also characterizes journalism’s relationship with other humanities disciplines at the time. The Germanist Konrad Burdach, for example, remarked on the growing divide between journalism and German studies despite the fact that, in an ideal world, scholars and journalists should be thought of as “brothers.”⁷⁹ By the end of the 1920s, the rift had deepened and become manifest in public talk. In 1931, economist and journalist Leo Benario used the now well-established

74. Recent scholarship by historians of science on the public sphere historicizes these boundaries. See, e.g., Erika Lorraine Milam, *Creatures of Cain: The Hunt for Human Nature in Cold War America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019); Susanne Schmidt, *Midlife Crisis: The Feminist Origins of a Chauvinist Cliché* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2020).

75. Matt Carlson, “Introduction: The many boundaries of journalism,” in *Boundaries of Journalism: Professionalism, Practices and Participation*, ed. Matt Carlson and Seth C. Lewis (London: Routledge 2015), 1–19. Carlson is adapting here the original concept of “boundary-work” by Thomas F. Gieryn.

76. Walter Niemann, “Künstler und Kritiker: Eine musikalische Zeitfrage,” *Signale für die musikalische Welt* 64, no. 64 (1906): 1125.

77. *Ibid.*, 1123.

78. On the physical requirements, see Wallaschek, “Das ästhetische Urteil,” 64–65.

79. Konrad Burdach, “Wissenschaft und Journalismus: Betrachtungen über und für Hermann Bahr,” *Preußische Jahrbücher* 193, no. 1 (1923): 17–19, reproduced in *Die Zeitung: Deutsche Urteile und Dokumente von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. Elger Blühm and Rolf Engelsing, 230–32 (Bremen: Carl Schünemann, 1967), 231.

trope of scholars searching for quietness, thoroughness, eternal truth, and complexity while journalists searched for everyday reality, immediacy, and interpretation.⁸⁰ Benario's hope was that the newly founded discipline of newspaper studies, *Zeitungswissenschaft*, would be the place to reconcile these divided languages—the specific and the universal, the reflected and the real, the scholarly and the journalistic. Despite such idealistic goals, similar boundary-work took place in other disciplines as well—such as sociology, anthropology, history, or law—often reinforcing such binary opposites rather than resolving them.

When Benario was writing, the feuilleton of the Weimar Republic was still in full swing, but it had already become more complex to fulfill the ideals of Kretzschmar's feuilleton practice, to find a language that was accessible and universal, both rooted in scholarly knowledge and offering guidance to readers and listeners. The center of gravity in the public discourse on music now shifted toward academic journals, where, as Pamela Potter has shown, musicologists claimed a crucial role as social commentators and used it to “redefine their purpose in German society by addressing contemporary issues.”⁸¹ Those music-related issues were less and less discussed in the broad-based public arena of the feuilleton. Kretzschmar's feuilleton language exemplifies a universalist vision of making sense of sounds for a general audience, sounds that could be read about in the papers. Yet the disputes that it caused illustrate a deepening rift between humanities and journalism as well as the two fields' struggle for professional identity. It also reminds us, however, of the significance of places beyond the academy in the search for words on sounds.

WORKS CITED

- Abert, Hermann. 1925. “Zum Gedächtnis Hermann Kretzschmars.” *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters* 31:9–25.
- Applegate, Celia. 2017. *The Necessity of Music: Variations on a German Theme*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Arntz, Michael. 2001. “‘Nehmen Sie Riemann ernst?’ Zur Bedeutung Hugo Riemanns für die Emanzipation der Musik.” In *Hugo Riemann (1849–1919): Musikwissenschaftler mit Universalanspruch*, edited by Tatjana Böhme-Mehner and Klaus Mehner, 9–17. Cologne: Böhlau.
- Belgum, Kirsten. 1998. *Popularizing the Nation: Audience, Representation, and the Production of Identity in Die Gartenlaube, 1853–1900*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Benario, Leo. 1931. “Journalistische und wissenschaftliche Methodik.” *Zeitungswissenschaft* 6:343–48.
- Bent, Ian D. 2001. “Hermeneutics (Ger. *Hermeneutik*).” In *Grove Music Online*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

80. Leo Benario, “Journalistische und wissenschaftliche Methodik,” *Zeitungswissenschaft* 6 (1931): 343–48.

81. Potter, *Most German of the Arts*, 57.

- Blühm, Elger, and Rolf Engelsing, eds. 1967. *Die Zeitung: Deutsche Urteile und Dokumente von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. Bremen: Carl Schünemann.
- Böhme, Tatjana. 1998. "Wege von der Kunst zur Wissenschaft: Hermann Kretzschmars Wirken in Leipzig." In *Hermann Kretzschmar: Konferenzbericht Olbernhau 1998*, edited by Hermann Loos and Rainer Cadenbach, 41–55. Chemnitz: G. Schröder.
- Bonds, Mark Evan. 2019. "Turning *Liebhaber* into *Kenner*: Forkel's Lectures on the Art of Listening, ca. 1780–1785." In *The Oxford Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, edited by Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer, 145–63. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Botstein, Leon. 1992. "Listening through Reading: Musical Literacy and the Concert Audience." *19th-Century Music* 16 (2): 129–45.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2005. "The Political Field, the Social Science Field, and the Journalistic Field." In *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*, edited by R. D. Benson, 29–47. Cambridge: Polity.
- Burdach, Konrad. 1923. "Wissenschaft und Journalismus: Betrachtungen über und für Hermann Bahr." *Preußische Jahrbücher* 193 (1): 17–19.
- Carlson, Matt. 2015. "Introduction: The many boundaries of journalism." In *Boundaries of Journalism: Professionalism, Practices and Participation*, edited by Matt Carlson and Seth C. Lewis, 1–19. London: Routledge.
- Csiszar, Alex. 2018. *The Scientific Journal: Authorship and the Politics of Knowledge in the Nineteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dahlhaus, Carl. 1975. "Vorwort." In *Beiträge zur musikalischen Hermeneutik*, edited by Carl Dahlhaus, 7–11. Regensburg: Bosse.
- "Ein Loblied auf die Tätigkeit der Journalisten." 1910. *Die Redaktion* 9 (12): 91.
- Festschrift Hermann Kretzschmar zum Siebzigsten Geburtstag überreicht von Kollegen, Schülern und Freunden*. 1918. Leipzig: Peters.
- Fritzsche, Peter. 1996. *Reading Berlin 1900*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Frienzschaf, Johannes. 1901. *Die Praxis des Journalisten: Ein Lehr- und Handbuch für Journalisten, Redakteure und Schriftsteller*. Leipzig: Fiedler.
- Gallwitz, S. D. 1903. "Lokalpatriotismus und Kritik." *Die Musik* 2 (7): 31–35.
- Gerhard, Anselm, ed. 2000. *Musikwissenschaft—eine verspätete Disziplin? Die akademische Musikforschung zwischen Fortschrittsglauben und Modernitätsverweigerung*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Gooley, Dana. 2011. "Hanslick and the Institution of Criticism." *Journal of Musicology* 28 (3): 290–325.
- Gratzer, Wolfgang, and Siegfried Mauser, eds. 1995. *Hermeneutik im musikwissenschaftlichen Kontext: Internationales Symposium Salzburg 1992*. Laaber: Laaber-Verlag.
- Hesse, Hermann. (1943) 2002. *The Glass Bead Game*. Translated by Richard Winston and Clara Winston. New York: Picador.
- Heuß, Alfred. 1910. "Vorwort des Herausgebers." In Hermann Kretzschmar, *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik und Anderes aus den Grenzboten*, v–vii. Leipzig: Grunow.
- Hübner, Otto R. 1914. "Intellektuelle Musik." *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung* 41 (16): 543–45.
- Kernmayer, Hildegard, and Simone Jung, eds. 2017. *Feuilleton: Schreiben an der Schnittstelle zwischen Journalismus und Literatur*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Korstvedt, Benjamin M. 2011. "Reading Music Criticism beyond the Fin-de-Siècle Vienna Paradigm." *Musical Quarterly* 94 (1–2): 156–210.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015.
- Kretzschmar, Hermann. 1881. *Über den Stand der öffentlichen Musikpflege in Deutschland*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- . 1887–90. *Führer durch den Concertsaal*. 3 vols. Leipzig: A. G. Liebeskind.

- . 1903a. “Falsche und richtige Zeitfragen.” In *Musikalische Zeitfragen: Zehn Vorträge*, 1–11. Leipzig: Peters.
- . 1903b. *Musikalische Zeitfragen: Zehn Vorträge*. Leipzig: Peters.
- . 1910a. “Allerhand Musikunfug” (1884). In *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik und Anderes aus den Grenzboten*, 142–50. Leipzig: Grunow.
- . 1910b. “Fünftes Gewandhauskonzert.” In *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik und Anderes aus den Grenzboten*, 525–28. Leipzig: Grunow.
- . 1910c. “Zehntes Gewandhauskonzert.” In *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik und Anderes aus den Grenzboten*, 543–48. Leipzig: Grunow.
- . 1911. “Anregungen zur Förderung musikalischer Hermeneutik.” In *Gesammelte Aufsätze aus den Jahrbüchern der Musikbibliothek Peters*, 168–92. Leipzig: Peters.
- Lauster, Martina. 2007. *Sketches of the Nineteenth Century: European Journalism and its Physiologies, 1830–50*. New York: Palgrave.
- Maier, Charles S. 2002. “Mahler’s Theater: The Performative and the Political in Central Europe, 1890–1910.” In *Mahler and His World*, edited by Karen Painter, 55–87. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Matala de Mazza, Ethel. 2018. *Der populäre Pakt: Verhandlungen der Moderne zwischen Operette und Feuilleton*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Mausser, Siegfried. 1996. “Hermeneutik.” In *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik begründet von Friedrich Blume*, edited by Ludwig Finscher, 4:262–70. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- McBride, Patrizia C. 2020. “The Edge of the Page: Alfred Polgar, the Feuilleton and the Poetics of the Small Form.” *German Quarterly* 93 (1): 1–18.
- McCull, Sandra. 1996. *Music Criticism in Vienna, 1896–1897: Critically Moving Forms*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Mersmann, Hans. 1916. “Musikalische Hermeneutik und Musikunterricht (Teil 1).” *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung* 43 (38): 499–503.
- Meunier, Ernst. 1930. “‘Feuilletonisierung’ der modernen Presse.” *Der Zeitungs-Verlag*, June 14.
- Milam, Erika Lorraine. 2019. *Creatures of Cain: The Hunt for Human Nature in Cold War America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Morat, Daniel. 2008. “Verstehen als Gefühlsmethode: Zu Wilhelm Diltheys hermeneutischer Grundlegung der Geisteswissenschaften.” In *Rationalisierungen des Gefühls: Zum Verhältnis von Wissenschaft und Emotionen 1880–1930*, edited by Uffa Jensen and Daniel Morat, 101–19. Munich: Wilhelm Fink.
- Müller-Hartmann, Robert. 1914. “Musikalische Deutekunst.” *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung* 61 (51): 1295–96.
- Mulsow, Martin. 2019. “History of Knowledge.” In *Debating New Approaches to History*, edited by Marek Tamm and Peter Burke, 159–89. London: Bloomsbury.
- Niemann, Walter. 1905. “Musikalische Auslegekunst.” *Die Grenzboten* 64:254–58.
- . 1906. “Künstler und Kritiker: Eine musikalische Zeitfrage.” *Signale für die musikalische Welt* 64 (64): 1121–26.
- Nowak, Adolf. 1975. “Dilthey und die musikalische Hermeneutik.” In *Beiträge zur musikalischen Hermeneutik*, ed. by Carl Dahlhaus, 11–27. Regensburg: Bosse, 1975.
- Pfeffer, Martin. 1992. *Hermann Kretzschmar und die Musikpädagogik zwischen 1890–1915*. Mainz: Schott.
- Pieper, Antje. 2008. *Music and the Making of Middle-Class Culture: A Comparative History of Nineteenth-Century Leipzig and Birmingham*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Potter, Pamela. 1998. *Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler’s Reich*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Recknagel, Marion. 2018. "Musikstadt Leipzig—die silberne Zeit." In *Geschichte der Stadt Leipzig, Band 3: Vom Wiener Kongress bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*, edited by Susanne Schötz, 733–42. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.
- Rehding, Alexander. 2003. *Hugo Riemann and the Birth of Modern Musical Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reimer, Eric. 1990. "Hermann Kretzschmars musikalische Hermeneutik und die Tradition des assoziativen Hörens." *Die Musikforschung* 43 (3): 211–21.
- Riemann, Hugo. 1882. *Musik-Lexikon: Theorie und Geschichte der Musik, die Tonkünstler alter und neuer Zeit mit Angabe ihrer Werke, nebst einer vollständigen Instrumentenkunde*. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut.
- . (1888) 1911. *Grundlinien der Musik-Ästhetik (Wie hören wir Musik?)*. Leipzig: Hesse.
- . 1902. "Die Musik und der Staat: Auch eine musikalische Zeitfrage." *Die Musik* 3 (7): 3–14.
- Rothfarb, Lee. 1992. "Hermeneutics and Energetics: Analytical Alternatives in the Early 1900s." *Journal of Music Theory* 36 (1): 43–68.
- Saussy, Haun. 2017. "Languages as Knowledge Reservoirs." *KNOW* 1 (2): 259–72.
- Schellenberg, Ernst Ludwig. 1917. "Ueber musikalische Hermeneutik." *Neue Musik-Zeitung* 38 (16): 249–50.
- Schering, Arnold. 1914. "Zur Grundlegung der musikalischen Hermeneutik." *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 9:168–75.
- Schmidt, Susanne. 2020. *Midlife Crisis: The Feminist Origins of a Chauvinist Cliché*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Secord, James. 2004. "Knowledge in Transit." *Isis* 95 (4): 654–72.
- Sommer, Heinz-Dieter. 1985. *Praxisorientierte Musikwissenschaft: Studien zu Leben und Werk Hermann Kretzschmars*. Munich: Emil Katzbichler.
- Tadday, Ulrich. 1993. *Die Anfänge des Musikfeuilletons: Der kommunikative Gebrauchswert musikalischer Bildung*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Thorau, Christian. 1998. "Führer durch den Konzertsaal und durch das Bühnenfestspiel—Hermann Kretzschmar, Hans von Wolzogen und die Bewegung der Erläuterer." In *Hermann Kretzschmar: Konferenzbericht Olbernhau 1998*, edited by Hermann Loos and Rainer Cadenbach, 93–107. Chemnitz: G. Schröder.
- . 2019. "'What Ought to Be Heard': Touristic Listening and the Guided Ear." In *The Oxford Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, edited by Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer, 207–31. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thorau, Christian, and Hansjakob Ziemer. 2019. "The Art of Listening and Its Histories: An Introduction." In *The Oxford Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, edited by Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer, 1–37. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vogel, Emil. 1895. "Vorwort." *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters* 1:4.
- Wallaschek, Richard. 1904. "Das ästhetische Urteil und die Tageskritik." *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters* 11:57–67.
- Ziemer, Hansjakob. 2014. "Listening on the Home Front: Music and the Production of Social Meaning in German Concert Halls during World War I." In *Sounds of Modern History: Auditory Cultures in 19th- and 20th-Century Europe*, edited by Daniel Morat, 201–27. New York: Berghahn.
- . 2019. "The Crisis of Listening in Interwar Germany." In *The Oxford Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, edited by Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer, 97–121. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zöllner, Heinrich. 1902. "Die 'Loreley': Eine Motivstudie." *Musikalisches Wochenblatt* 32 (18): 275–76.
- . 1905. "Über Erklärung von Instrumentalmusik." *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* 32 (22): 395–97.