

A Study of the Relationship between Leonard B. Meyer and New Musicology:
A Comparison of Meyer's "Critical Analysis" with Joseph Kerman's "Criticism"
KODERA Michiru

This article compares Leonard B. Meyer's "Criticism" or "Critical Analysis" described in *Explaining Music: Essays and Explorations* (1973) with Joseph Kerman's "Criticism" presented as a new discipline in *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology* (1985). The four points Kerman suggests as the reasons why existing musical studies' scope has become too limiting will be used to compare Meyer's and Kerman's perspectives. These points are: (1) the obsession with the D-N model based on Carl Hempel's idea and Arthur Mendel's article, (2) the exclusion of the 'aesthetic experience' from evidence, (3) the solo focus on the internal structure of musical pieces, (4) the neglect of history. Consequently, it is revealed that in Meyer's "Critical Analysis" the structure-oriented approach and dependence upon music theory do not match with Kerman's new field. Namely, Kerman differentiated "Critical Analysis" as a theory-based study from the so called "New Musicology" which he attempted to establish.

In the other words, this examination focuses on the relationships, which have never been fully discussed, between Meyer and the New Musicology at its founding. Kerman did not recognize Meyer as a representative of this new discipline, though Meyer's theory of musical meaning had presented a foundation for the New Musicologists, e. g. Susan McClary and Rose R. Subotnik. After the Society for Music Theory was established and separated from the American Musicological Society in 1977, Kerman further scrutinized and set the framework for the division of history and theory approaches. He labeled this new field of historical study as "Criticism." In contrast, Meyer remained on the theory side.