

Danish Yearbook of Musicology

45 • 2022-24

© 2022-24 by the authors

Danish Yearbook of Musicology · Volume 45 · 2022-24

Dansk Årbog for Musikforskning

Editors

Michael Fjeldsøe · fjeldsoe@hum.ku.dk

Peter Hauge · peterochauge@gmail.com

Thomas Husted Kirkegaard · thk@cas.au.dk

Mikkel Vad · mkv@hum.ku.dk

Asmus Mehul Mejdal · ammejdal@gmail.com

Editorial Board

Lars Ole Bonde, *Norwegian Academy of Music*; Peter Woetmann Christoffersen, *University of Copenhagen*; Bengt Edlund, *Lund University*; Daniel M. Grimley, *University of Oxford*; Lars Lilliestam, *Göteborg University*; Morten Michelsen, *Aarhus University*; Steen Kaargaard Nielsen, *Aarhus University*; Siegfried Oechsle, *Christian-Albrechts-Universität, Kiel*; Nils Holger Petersen, *University of Copenhagen*; Søren Møller Sørensen, *University of Copenhagen*

Production

Hans Mathiasen

Address

c/o Department of Arts and Cultural Studies, Section of Musicology,
University of Copenhagen, Karen Blixens Vej 1, DK-2300 København S

Each volume of *Danish Yearbook of Musicology* is published continuously in sections:

- 1 · Articles
- 2 · Special section, *70th anniversary of the Danish Musicological Society*
- 3 · Reviews
- 4 · Bibliography
- 5 · Reports · Editorial

ISBN 978-87-88328-36-3 (volume 45); ISSN 2245-4969 (online edition)

Danish Yearbook of Musicology is a peer-reviewed journal published by the Danish Musicological Society on <http://www.dym.dk/>

Redigenda curavit KNUD JEPPESEN (Dania) – the Tragic Figure in the 1936 Scenario of *Acta musicologica*?

Thomas Holme

When – in the context of the history of Danish musicology – one is given the opportunity of combining the thematics of ‘Internationalisation and specialisation of music research and its consequences’, ‘The history of music societies’ and ‘Musicological journals’ with ‘Prominent persons in the history of Danish music research’,¹ one person in particular comes to mind, namely Knud Jeppesen (1892–1974). And if the context is further enlarged to span the history – and historiography – of international musicology, Jeppesen also stands out as one of those prominent persons, at least when it comes to the twentieth century.

If, on the other hand, one is given the opportunity to single out a specific event in the first half of the twentieth century as a focal point at which the internationalisation of music research, music societies, musicological journals, and prominent persons were all, literally speaking, at stake, then the choice might very well fall on the third Congress of the *Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft* (the IGMw)² held in Barcelona in April 1936, an event that became one of the last international gatherings of music researchers on European soil before the outbreak of World War II.

At that point in time, the political developments in Germany and the resulting problems on an international level had long penetrated the organization of musicology in Europe, including within the IGMw itself. Several prominent German musicologists, including Alfred Einstein and Curt Sachs, had left Germany out of fear of the Nazi regime, and long before the Congress in Barcelona, the battle lines between representatives of Germany on the one side and their opponents – the ‘allies’ – on the other were strongly drawn. Looking at this event, one gets the impression of pronounced hostility between the parties and an atmosphere marked by rumors and accusations, and one does not have to dig very deep into the pertinent sources to find evidence of outright sabotage and coups in connection with the negotiations at the Congress, with terms like ‘Cold War atmosphere’, ‘conspiracies’, and ‘battlefield’ recurring in the research literature.

1 Cf. ‘Call for papers: Danish Society of Music Research 70th anniversary’ (2023).

2 In the original statutes, the Society was referred to only in German as the *Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft*, and French as the *Société internationale de musicologie*. The officially adopted acronyms for it were I.G.M.W. and S.I.M.; *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft*, 1/2 (1929), 22. The official English title, the International Musicological Society and thus the abbreviation IMS, was first adopted at the first Congress after World War II in Basel in 1949. In the following, the acronym IGMw is used for the Society.

As the only Dane, Knud Jeppesen attended the Congress not only in his capacity as a member of the board of the IGMw, but as the editor of the Society's journal, *Acta musicologica*,³ as well. In this dual role, he was classed with the 'anti-Germans', 'free-masons', 'Judenfreunde', 'emigrants', 'Nazi-haters', and more by the German representatives, and – although with an element of irony – with 'Hitler, Goering und Goebbels' by his own allies in the Society. Only posterity, however, has gone so far as to declare Jeppesen to be the 'tragic figure in this scenario' in his capacity as the editor of *Acta*, when right after the Congress the journal was hit by a 'German boycott', resulting in a 'sudden withdrawal of articles by Germans'.⁴

During the past decades much light has been shed on the history of musicology and musicological institutions before, in between, and since the two world wars, and also on the IGMw,⁵ on the Congress in Barcelona, and on Knud Jeppesen as well. Consequently, this presentation will *not* aim at a comprehensive exposition of any of these topics.

However, the Society's journal, *Acta Musicologica*, along with Jeppesen's editorship during its formative, consolidating, and – should it prove – most problematic years has been described only sparingly.⁶ The present account will therefore supplement what has

- 3 On <https://acta.musicology.org/acta/>, the journal of the International Musicological Society nowadays calls itself *Acta Musicologica*, not *Acta musicologica*. In the present context, though, lower case 'm' will be used. *Acta musicologica* was Knud Jeppesen's original title for the journal, and on Grove Music Online and MGG-Online the acronyms for the journal – whether 'AcM' or 'AMI' – both refer to *Acta musicologica*. Cf. footnote 30 for further comments on 'acta'.
- 4 Pamela M. Potter, 'The Deutsche Musikgesellschaft, 1918–1938', *Journal of Musicological Research*, 11 (1991) (special issue on 'Musicology in the Third Reich'), 151–76, at 164–65.
- 5 Cf. Rudolf Häusler, '50 Jahre Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft', *Acta musicologica*, 49/1 (1977), 1–27, and Dorothea Baumann and Dinko Fabris (eds.), *The History of the IMS (1927–2017)* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2017). Regarding the forerunners of the IGMw, see, for instance, Stefan Keym, 'Austausch und "Truppenschau". Die Internationale Musikgesellschaft (1899–1914) als Forum der frühen Musikwissenschaft', in Melanie Wald-Fuhrmann and Stefan Keym (eds.), *Wege zur Musikwissenschaft. Gründungsphasen im internationalen Vergleich/Paths to Musicology. Founding Phases in International Comparison* (Spektrum Fachgeschichte Musikwissenschaft, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2018), 189–222 (including this publication's valuable 'Synopsis der Gründungsphasen'/'Synoptical Overview of the Founding Phases', *ibid.* 223–28). As to the IGMw in an overall context, see, for instance, Christiane Sibille, 'The Politics of Music in International Organizations in the First Half of the Twentieth Century', *New Global Studies*, 10/3 (2016), 253–81. For a short commentary on Nordic musicology in relation to the IGMw, cf. Thomas Holme, 'Glimt af nordisk musikvidenskab i første halvdel af det 20. århundrede. Knud Jeppesens brevvekslinger som kilder og kontekst' (Glimpses of Nordic musicology in the first part of the twentieth century – Knud Jeppesen's correspondences as sources and context), *Svensk tidskrift för musikforskning / Swedish journal of music research*, 101 (2019), 49–73, at 51–53.
- 6 Frederico Celestini and Philip V. Bohlman, 'Acta Musicologica: A Brief History', in Baumann and Fabris, *The History of the IMS (1927–2017)*, 144–48; and Thomas Holme Hansen, 'Knud Jeppesen (1949–52)', *ibid.* 50–57, at 53–57. The exposition at hand represents a significant elaboration of – but also exhibits certain overlaps with and repetitions of – some of the information given in these two presentations.

already been presented by focusing on some of the aspects where Jeppesen's efforts had a decisive influence, namely on the one hand on the title, design, and content of *Acta*, and on the other hand on the journal's change of publisher and the consequences thereof after the Congress in Barcelona. Hence, the overall purpose will be to assess whether a crisis did actually occur for the journal and to examine more closely whether there is indeed evidence to designate the journal's *redigenda curavit*, Knud Jeppesen, as the 'tragic figure' in this 1936 scenario.

One field of twentieth century musicology that has experienced immense growth in recent decades is research on Germany during – and especially after⁷ – the Nazi period. One characteristic of many of the numerous contributions regarding this troublesome issue is their use of the personal correspondence exchanged between the participants of the events. In many cases, it is only through this unofficial medium – the written letter, typically with only one sender and only one recipient – that one is provided with *the* revealing and decisive facts concerning a specific topic, a sequence of events, personal attitudes, and so forth.

In a similar fashion, this presentation will also incorporate and draw on correspondence to a great extent, especially on the correspondence of Knud Jeppesen: not only the letters he exchanged with his colleagues,⁸ but also with his wife, Alice Jeppesen. Whenever Jeppesen travelled – which was often, throughout his life and

7 See, among a plethora of valuable contributions, Jörg Rothkamm and Thomas Schipperges (eds.), *Musikwissenschaft und Vergangenheitspolitik. Forschung und Lehre im frühen Nachkriegsdeutschland* (Munich: edition text + kritik, 2015), and Wolfgang Auhagen, Thomas Schipperges, Dörte Schmidt, and Bernd Sponheuer (eds.), *Musikwissenschaft – Nachkriegskultur – Vergangenheitspolitik. Interdisziplinäre wissenschaftliche Tagung der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung. Freitag 20. und Samstag 21. Januar 2012* (Mannheimer Manieren – musik + musikforschung. Schriften der Staatlichen Hochschule für Musik und Darstellende Kunst Mannheim, 4; Hildesheim, etc.: Georg Olms Verlag, 2017). The latter work counts among its contributions Pamela Potter's very personal account of her research activities in Germany, cf. Pamela M. Potter, "'Würde schon bearbeitet'. Ein Erfahrungsbericht über meine Archivrecherchen kurz vor der Wende', *ibid.* 339–50.

8 The preserved correspondence of Knud Jeppesen amounts in total to several thousand items, cf. Thomas Holme, 'What is a correspondence, actually? – the different pages of Knud Jeppesen', in Jeanna V. Kniازهva (ed.), *New Documents on the History of Art History. Vol. 3: Epistolary Documents: Current Research and Perspectives* (St. Petersburg: Russian Institute for the History of the Arts, Petropolis, 2021), 21–61, at 39ff. To date, accounts have been given for his letter exchanges with the Danish composers Carl Nielsen and Thomas Laub, and with Jeppesen's colleagues in the Nordic countries, cf. Thomas Holme Hansen, 'Carl Nielsen and Knud Jeppesen: Connections and Collaborations, Influences and Significances', *Carl Nielsen Studies*, 5 (2012), 107–47; *ibid.* 'Thomas Laubs breve til Knud Jeppesen, 1914–1927: en hel fortælling afspejlet i en halv brevveksling?' (Thomas Laub's letters to Knud Jeppesen, 1914–1927 – a complete story mirrored in half a letter exchange?), *Dansk kirkesangs årsskrift* (2007–2013), 19–110; and Thomas Holme, 'Glimt af nordisk musikvidenskab i første halvdel af det 20. århundrede'. Among Jeppesen's correspondences with fellow musicologists, the most comprehensive was that with Guido Adler, cf. Thomas Holme, "Lieber, verehrter Herr Hofrat ..." – *Knud Jeppesen's Correspondence with Guido Adler, 1920–1940* (in preparation).

typically for long periods at a time – the couple wrote to each other on a daily basis, and it is in these letters that Jeppesen sometimes writes about things he does not even mention in his professional correspondence: adding an extra, honest layer to ‘the facts’, so to speak. Hence, with the inherent risk of bias and lopsidedness, the story that follows will be told to a certain extent from Jeppesen’s perspective and in his own words.⁹ In honor of the occasion – the seventieth anniversary of another renowned musicological society – the presentation will also show some bias towards other Danish figures, where appropriate.

Jeppesen and ‘Acta musicologica’

The most significant attempt to reestablish international contacts and collaboration after the end of World War I was the Société “Union musicologique”, formed in 1921 at the initiative of the Dutch musicologist Daniel François Scheurleer.¹⁰ Although it never gained the necessary broad support and was essentially overtaken by the re-founded IGMw,¹¹ the association’s journal, *Bulletin de la Société “Union Musicologique”*, must be considered the most direct precursor to *Acta Musicologica*.

Jeppesen’s involvement in the association was presumably very limited, and he does not appear in the *Bulletin*, which was published between 1921 and 1925 with a total of five volumes.¹² Instead, Angul Hammerich – perhaps as a counterpart to his membership in the association’s board – was a member of the editorial board of eight throughout the period,¹³ and in this context, he published his study on the historical organ in

- 9 For the sake of convenience, the following abbreviations will be used when referring to the libraries and collections holding the well over sixty letters from which are quoted in the following. ‘(DK-Kk)’: The Royal Danish Library, Copenhagen (DK-Kk), Acc. 1979/47; ‘(D-Mbs)’: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München (D-Mbs), Ana 343; ‘(DTÖ)’: Archiv der Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich, DTÖ-Briefarchiv: Briefe 884; ‘(E-Bbc)’: Papers of Higiní Anglès, Biblioteca de Catalunya, Sección de Música, Barcelona (E-Bbc); ‘(EJD)’: Papers of Edward J. Dent, King’s College Archive Centre, Cambridge; ‘(GAC)’: Guido Adler Collection, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Collection, University of Georgia, Athens, US.ATS, Ms 769. All the letters from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen are kept in: The Royal Danish Library, Copenhagen (DK-Kk), The Music Collection, 2204.2000. Hence, no reference will be attached to these letters. All transcriptions and translations are by the author unless otherwise noted. In some few cases, a question mark in brackets, ‘[?]’, indicates that the handwriting is illegible.
- 10 Cf. the Society’s ‘Actes’ and ‘Statuts’, *Bulletin de la Société “Union Musicologique”*, 1 (1921), ix–xix, and François Scheurleer, ‘Introduction’, *ibid.* vii–viii. Cf. Martin Kirnbauer, ‘A “Prelude” to the IMS’, in Baumann and Fabris, *The History of the IMS (1927–2017)*, 11–19, at 15ff.
- 11 The Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft was founded in September 1927.
- 12 Although the intention was a semiannual publication, only the 1922 volume is divided into two issues.
- 13 The composition of the editorial board was constant, and consisted of the promotor Scheurleer, L.P.J. Michielsen, Felipe Pedrell (from *Bulletin de la Société “Union Musicologique”*, 2/2 (1922) replaced by Adolfo Salazar), Karl Nef, Ole Mørk Sandvik, Tobias Norlind, and Johan Wagenaar.

Frederiksborg Castle church.¹⁴ The inaugural volume from 1921 began with a series of ‘comptes rendus relatifs à la musicologie pour la période août 1914–31 décembre 1920’ from 14 European countries, that is, a kind of musicological situation reports, which, along with actual scholarly articles, became a recurring feature of the publication. Regarding Denmark, a total of four reports on Danish music affairs were included, written by Hammerich, Gunnar Hauch, and Fritz Crome.¹⁵ It is worth noting that in the last report, covering 1924, Crome states that ‘auf dem musicologischen Gebiete ist Professor Dr. phil. Angul Hammerich noch unser rüstiger und tatenkräftiger Nestor, um den sich die Schar der jüngeren Musikwissenschaftler versammeln’, while the much-discussed competition for a position as lecturer at the University of Copenhagen in February, and especially its outcome – that among the ‘crowd of younger music researchers’, it was Erik Abrahamsen and *not* Knud Jeppesen who won¹⁶ – is mentioned only in passing.¹⁷

The *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft* (the *Bulletin de la Société Internationale de Musicologie*) was published with its first issue on 1 October, 1928, and the first two volumes of the bulletin, each consisting of four installments, covered the periods from October 1928 to the end of 1929 and the calendar year 1930, respectively. The Society’s first president, Peter Wagner, is listed as the publisher, and no further editorial or advisory personnel are mentioned. A further account of the *Mitteilungen* during Wagner’s two-year editorship lies outside the scope of the present exposition. The following will thus primarily focus on how Jeppesen became editor and how the journal got its permanent name.

The design of the journal was the subject of much debate, including at the IGMw’s second board meeting in Paris in October 1929. Here ‘eine rege Diskussion’ unfolded, especially regarding a greater international significance for the journal. This led to the establishment of a committee consisting of Wagner, Johannes Wolf, and Wilhelm Merian, which, prior to the Society’s first Congress in Liège in 1930,¹⁸ was tasked with

14 Angul Hammerich, ‘Eine historische Orgel auf Frederiksborg Schloss bei Kopenhagen. Mit 11 Abbildungen’, *Bulletin de la Société “Union Musicologique”*, 2/1 (1922), 65–78.

15 Angul Hammerich, ‘Danemark’, *Bulletin de la Société “Union Musicologique”*, 1 (1921), 68–72; Gunnar Hauch, ‘Danemark’, *ibid.* 2/1 (1922), 22–28; *ibid.* 3 (1923), 77–84; Fritz Crome, ‘Danemark’, *ibid.* 5 (1925), 72–82. The reports broadly cover the music scene in Copenhagen – the music associations, Tivoli, concerts, local composers, visits by foreign artists, etc. – and touch upon actual musicological matters only in passing. For example, the lectures given by Erik Abrahamsen, Knud Jeppesen, and Torben Krogh at the University of Copenhagen in the early 1920s are not mentioned.

16 Cf. Thomas Holme Hansen, ‘Konkurrencen om musik-docenturet i 1924: en doku-soap med særligt henblik på Knud Jeppesen’ (The competition for the readership in music in 1924 – a docu-soap featuring Knud Jeppesen), *Cæcilia*, V (1998–2001), 53–110.

17 Crome, ‘Danemark’, 72, 74.

18 The Congress was held on 1–6 September 1930. Regarding the Congress report (including citations of the contributions), cf. James R. Cowdery, Zdravko Blažević, and Barry S. Brook (eds.), *Speaking of Music: Music Conferences, 1835–1966* (RILM Retrospective Series, 4; New York: Répertoire International de Littérature Musicale, 2004), no. 178.

drafting a proposal regarding the journal's future.¹⁹ In the final issue of *Mitteilungen* that Wagner edited, detailed reports from the general assembly were provided.²⁰ As always, financing played a significant role in the publication of the journal, and it was therefore a great help that Breitkopf & Härtel printed the entire first volume of the *Mitteilungen* free of charge before a formal contract with this publisher had entered into effect. However, the desired expansion of the *Mitteilungen* could not be realized without an increase in the membership fee from five to ten Swiss francs, which was therefore adopted.²¹ And without further details, the report concludes with a laconic announcement that:

Der Präsident tritt die Redaktion ab 1. Januar 1931 an das Vorstandsmitglied Herrn Dr. K. Jeppesen ab, der unter Mitwirkung eines Stabs von festen Mitarbeitern den Ausbau alsbald an die Hand nehmen wird.²²

A little supplementary insight into the course of events, however, can be obtained from Jeppesen's correspondence with Alice. From one of his library tours, he arrived – almost reluctantly – in Liège:

... so the journey continues to Liège which I'm not really looking forward to. How much more appealing it is to be able to work with 'inner' things than such a congress where everything is focused on the external. Well, I have to take what comes and I'll manage it.²³

... and much indicates that tensions also arose between the parties involved on this occasion:

19 Wilhelm Merian, 'Bericht über die Sitzung des Direktoriums in Paris', *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft*, 2/1 (1930), 7–8. Jeppesen canceled his attendance at the meeting in Paris but submitted a proposal for the possible establishment of a central location, for example in Basel, where it would be possible to use manuscripts from foreign libraries; a proposal that garnered great interest but remained at the idea stage; *ibid.* 8. The following year in Liège, Jeppesen wrote to Alice that he also on that occasion 'advocated for his idea of a kind of musicological transmission library' ('Jeg slog et Slag for min Idé om en slags musikvidensk. Transmissionsbibliothek'); letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 1 September 1930.

20 W.M. [Wilhelm Merian], 'I. Kongreß der IGMW in Lüttich', *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft*, 2/4 (1930), 97–109.

21 *Ibid.* 104, 106, 108, 109.

22 *Ibid.* 108.

23 '... saa gaar Turen videre til Liège hvortil jeg egenlig [sic] ikke glæder mig. Hvor meget mere tiltalende er det ikke at kunne arbejde med "indre" Ting, end en saadan Kongres hvor alt er indstillet paa det Ydre. Naa jeg maa jo tage, hvad der kommer og skal ogsaa nok gøre det'; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 29 August 1930.

Tomorrow is the General Assembly of the International Society for Musicology. I am quite excited about how it will unfold. Despite his many excellent human qualities, Adler has, through clumsiness, introduced some blasting agents into the negotiations, and it is a question of how significant explosions it will cause. We shall see ...²⁴

The specific foreseeable problems to which Jeppesen refers are unclear, but it is certain that he, along with Rudolf v. Ficker, Albert Smijers, and Higinì Anglès, was elected to a committee tasked with discussing the expansion and editorial aspects of the journal, and that subsequently he was appointed as the editor during the general assembly:

... I [was] elected as Chief Editor for the expanded journal, which is to be issued from January 1st. It is a great and responsible task entrusted to me here, but I don't think I could refuse it. Many will help me with it, not least you.²⁵

That Jeppesen did not undertake the task with great enthusiasm is also evident from a lengthy letter he wrote to Guido Adler later that same year, in which we read:

Leider sind die Schwierigkeiten, womit ich im voraus rechnete (weshalb ich nur sehr ungern die - wie ich glaube - sehr undankbare Aufgabe der Schriftleitung übernommen habe) nicht ausgeblieben.²⁶

In addition to the above-mentioned 'assistance from a team of permanent members of staff', the journal underwent significant formal changes, including a completely new layout and a notable increase in its scope. The title was changed to *Acta musicologica*, although the old designation (*Mitteilungen ... / Bulletin ...*) was retained as a subtitle. And precisely the change in the title represented one of the difficulties that Jeppesen had anticipated in advance. At least two proposals were under discussion.

At the Congress in Liège, André Pirro and Edward Dent had proposed the French title 'Revue internationale de Musicologie', and it was probably also on that occasion that Jeppesen put forward his suggestion for a Latin title. A couple of months later,

24 'I Morgen er Generalforsamling i det int. Selskab for Musikvidenskab. Jeg er ret spændt paa, hvorledes den vil forløbe. Adler har, trods sine mange udmærkede menneskelige Egenskaber, ved ubehændighed bragt en Del Sprængstof ind i Forhandlingerne og det er et Spørgsmaal hvor store Eksplosioner det vil foraarsage. Vi faar at se ...'; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 3 September 1930. Jeppesen refers to Guido Adler.

25 '... jeg [blev] valgt til Hovedredaktør for det udvidede Tidsskrift, som skal udsendes fra 1^{ste} Januar. Det er en stor og ansvarsfuld Opgave, som her er betroet mig; men jeg synes ikke jeg kunde afslaa den. Mange vil hjælpe mig dermed og ikke mindst Du'; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 4 September 1930.

26 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 18 November 1930 (GAC).

however, Dent had endorsed Jeppesen's proposal – 'Als Titel für unsere Zeitschrift finde ich "Acta Musicologica" sehr gut; Latein ist immer international!'²⁷ – while Peter Wagner continued to advocate for the French title. Jeppesen's friend Guido Adler also turned out to be against the Latin title, and therefore, in the letter to Adler cited above, it was essential for Jeppesen to explain why he attached so much importance to choosing that designation.

Firstly, the Latin title is concise, and cannot be confused with 'anderen Titeln der Musikzeitschriften'. Secondly, the Latin title also allows for 'die Rubrikenüberschriften und dgl. lateinisch zu setzen, was praktisch ist und Raum erspart'.²⁸ Here, Jeppesen alludes to a reduction of the bilingual apparatus in the journal.²⁹ And thirdly, Jeppesen states that with a Latin title, the journal enters 'die Reihe modernen intern. Wissensch. Acta-Publ.', which from an external perspective would provide recognition. Jeppesen informs that 'Von Dänemark wird augenblicklich eine ganze Serie inter. Acta-Publ. subventioniert',³⁰ and hints to Adler rather verbosely that although he will not dare to

27 Letter from Edward Dent to Knud Jeppesen, 4 November 1930 (The Royal Danish Library, Copenhagen (DK-Kk), Acc. 1974/105). Cf. Celestini and Bohlman, 'Acta Musicologica: A Brief History', 145: 'The use of Latin for the title of the journal, ... served as a reference to the transnational dimensions of science, and it continues to characterize the format of the journal to this day'.

28 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 18 November 1930 (GAC).

29 The content of the first two volumes is largely influenced by the ongoing post-World War I effects, not only in terms of the desire to initiate international cooperation and exchange of information but also in terms of distributing sun and wind equally in almost every respect, so that no individuals or nations could feel disadvantaged or sidelined. For this reason, all organizational communications in *Mitteilungen* were published in both German and French; cf. the minutes of the first meeting in Frankfurt a. M.: 'Das Bulletin muß auch sprachlich neutral bleiben, die wichtigen offiziellen Mitteilungen sollen alle vorläufig mindestens zweisprachig (deutsch und französisch) erfolgen'; [no author], 'Bericht über die Sitzung des Direktoriums in Frankfurt a. M.', *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft*, 1/2 (1929), 19–22, at 21.

30 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 18 November 1930 (GAC). By 'Acta-publications', Jeppesen almost certainly refers to the growing range of *Acta* journals that the publisher Levin & Munksgaard had begun publishing in 1922, initially only as medical specialty journals but eventually covering many other scientific fields. According to Wilhelm Munthe, Ejnar Munksgaard preferred journal titles in Latin, partly to avoid language preferences and partly because they were neutral and international, considerations that are fully in line with – and some years ahead of – Jeppesen's. Additionally, it was 'characteristic that he did not choose the traditional designations "Annales" or "Archivum". It sounded too retrospective and conservative. There was a completely different élan in "acta", actions in today's research work. And although acta had been used occasionally before, Munksgaard made this title word almost an international recognition signal for *his* journals' ('betegnende at han ikke valgte de tradisjonelle betegnelser "Annales" eller "Archivum". Det lød for retrospektivt og konservatorisk. Da var det en ganske annen élan i "acta", handlinger i dagens forskningsarbeid. Og selv om acta hadde vært brukt leilighetsvis før, så gjorde Munksgaard dette titelord nesten til et internasjonalt kjenningsignal for sine tidsskrifter'), Wilhelm Munthe, *Et verdensforlag bygges opp. Ejnar Munksgaard og hans livsverk* (Oslo: Cammermeyers Boghandel, 1948), 29 (underlining by the present autor). Upon Ejnar Munksgaard's death in 1948, the publishing house thus released 17 *Acta*, *ibid.* 53–54. Cf. Aleks. Frøland,

speak about ‘die Möglichkeit einer solchen Subvention’, he assumes that the path to it will be considerably facilitated with ‘ein titel, wie der von mir vorgeschlagene’. Jeppesen emphasizes that it will be important that ‘gerade Sie ... mit Ihren ganzen grossen Einfluss’³¹ supports him in this matter; just a few days later, Adler writes that he ‘gegen den latein-Titel nichts einzuwenden habe’.³²

It took a little longer to convince Peter Wagner, but in another letter to Adler, Jeppesen thanks Adler for his interest in his ‘Redaktionstätigkeit’ and adds ‘dass ist eine schwere Geburt gewesen. Ich habe den Wagner das kind mit der Zange nehmen müssen’.³³ When Wagner receives ‘die Schrift-Probe der neuen Acta music.’ from Breitkopf & Härtel at the beginning of February 1931, he wishes Jeppesen an ‘aufrichtiges Glückauf’,³⁴ and after receiving the first issue in early April, the outgoing editor – less than three months before his death – writes to the new one: ‘Ich beneide Sie um Ihre Tatkraft, & begrüsse es, dass Sie die Leitung der Acta übernehmen, ich hätte das nicht mehr machen können’.³⁵

With the publication of Jeppesen’s first issue of *Acta Musicologica* (vol. III, fasc. I, covering the months January to March 1931) – ‘Redigenda curavit KNUD JEPPESEN (Dania)’, as stated in the colophon – the greatest problems must have been overcome. In any case, Jeppesen writes, in much more positive terms to Adler, that ‘Ich habe viel Mühe mit unseren “Acta” Glückliche aber dass die Aufgabe mich interessiert und, dass ich daran glaube, dass sie schliesslich gelingen wird’.³⁶

Jeppesen’s Acta musicologica

Acta musicologica became one of the leading musicological journals of the twentieth century, and the twenty-three volumes of the journal edited by Jeppesen (vols. 3–25, 1931–1953) stand out in several significant ways from the preceding two (1928–30) and from the many subsequent ones (1954ff.). However, *in lieu* of the main focus of this presentation – the alleged crisis for *Acta* in the wake of the Barcelona Congress – the following will not delve into detail regarding the more ‘quantitative aspects’ (figures and counts regarding volumes/installments, pages, articles, authors, etc.) of Jeppesen’s volumes but will concentrate on his main objectives for the journal, as well as mentioning a couple of his Danish assistants.

Dansk boghandels historie 1482 til 1945. Med et kapitel om bogen i oldtid og middelalder (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1974), 347. I am grateful to Anne Ørbæk Jensen for directing my attention to these sources.

31 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 18 November 1930 (GAC), underlining is original.

32 Letter from Guido Adler to Knud Jeppesen, 21 November 1930 (DK-Kk).

33 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 29 January 1931 (GAC). At about the same time, Higinì Anglès expresses that ‘Der Name “Acta Musicologica” klingt sehr schön’; Letter from Higinì Anglès to Knud Jeppesen, 13 February 1931 (DK-Kk).

34 Letter from Peter Wagner to Knud Jeppesen, 5 February 1931 (DK-Kk).

35 Letter from Peter Wagner to Knud Jeppesen, 30 April 1931 (DK-Kk).

36 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 29 May 31 (GAC).

In the first issue from 1931, Jeppesen announced what can be considered his manifesto for *Acta*, which partly explains the content of the forthcoming many volumes and partly reveals a very ambitious goal:

Unser Ziel ist vor allem ..., durch diese Zeitschrift allmählich der internationalen Musikwissenschaft ein Forum zu schaffen, einen Versammlungsort, wo die internationalen wissenschaftlichen Problemen zur Diskussion gestellt werden können, und wo die Werte, die jetzt oft nur einzelnen Nationen zugänglich sind, uns allen zugute kommen könnten. ... Ich glaube fest daran, daß die Zukunft uns immer entschiedener zeigen wird, daß eine Zeitschrift, die die oben angegebenen Aufgaben durchzuführen vermag, eine unumgängliche Notwendigkeit ist. Der Weg, den wir jetzt betreten, *muß* eingeschlagen werden.³⁷

As Jeppesen refers to the general meeting's decision to expand the existing journal, a number of conditions are listed that should guide the further publishing process. First and foremost, the journal should, in relation to national journals, have its own distinctive character and select its own tasks, which means that only contributions that will have broader scholarly significance and do not belong to a narrow national or local sphere of interest should be published. Furthermore, one of the main tasks should be to provide a comprehensive international bibliography, which in cases of contributions of a certain significance should not only be registrative but also provide a brief objective summary.³⁸

In relation to the two volumes of the *Mitteilungen*, *Acta* continued the organizational announcements of the Society, still given partly in both German and French, but now under the heading 'Communicationes societatis'; the remainder of the content was composed of innovations. In addition to actual articles, smaller contributions were collected under the heading 'Miscellanea'; the international bibliography was referred to as 'Index novorum librorum', and reviews as 'Iudicia de novis libris'. Finally, under the heading 'Notitiae', various notices could be read, including obituaries, while the section 'Quaestiones' presented various inquiries, for example regarding manuscripts.

Precisely the desire for a continuous bibliographical update had been mentioned many times since the re-establishment of the Society, and the bibliography became one of the most important innovations and cornerstones in the new *Acta*.³⁹ Although Jeppesen's

37 Knud Jeppesen, 'Zur Einführung', *Acta musicologica*, 3/1 (1931), 1–2 [B1931-a]. In the following, index numbers in brackets refer to the systematisation established in Thomas Holme Hansen, *Knud Jeppesen Katalog: skriftlige arbejder, kompositioner og editioner: diskografi og bibliografi* (Knud Jeppesen Catalogue. Writings, Compositions and Editions – Discography and Bibliography), *Fund og Forskning Online* (2011) <http://www.kb.dk/export/sites/kb_dk/da/nb/publikationer/fundog-forskning-online/pdf/kjkatalog.pdf>.

38 Jeppesen, 'Zur Einführung'.

39 Holme Hansen, 'Knud Jeppesen (1949–52)', 55. The bibliography constituted a relatively large part of the journal's content. In a single year, specifically the war year 1941, the share of the bibliography

intention that all received works should be mentioned or reviewed quickly proved impossible to fulfill, it is indicative that in his manifesto, he hastily adds that the reason the first issue does not include the mentioned summaries is solely due to startup issues.⁴⁰

There is no indication that the classification by which the publications were arranged was not the work of Jeppesen himself. After a sort of trial run of the classification in vol. 3, it was adjusted into place in vol. 4 and thereafter kept unchanged until the last published 'Index novorum librorum' in vol. 24 (1952).⁴¹ The classification was as follows: I. Bibliographia, II. Lexica, Miscellanea, Annales etc., III. Acustica, Psychologia, Aesthetica et Philosophia musicae, IV. Historia musicae generalis, V. Historia styli atque generum musicae, VI. Historia musicae usque ad annum 1600, VII. Historia musicae ab anno 1600, VIII. Biographiae, Monographiae etc., IX. Scientia musicae comparativa, X. Musicae sacra, cantus popularis et scholaris, XI. Paedagogia musicae, XII. Theoria musicae, XIII. De instrumentis musicis, XIV. Varia, XV. Scientiae auxiliares, XVI. Novae editiones musicae classicae.

Who compiled the bibliographies for the premiere volume's four issues is not stated, but the following Danish assistants continued the task in which Jeppesen first 'compilavit': Jens Peter Larsen (vols. 4, 5), Karl Bak (vols. 6, 7, 8, 9/1–2), Herbert Rosenberg (vols. 9/3–4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16–17), Søren Sørensen (vols. 18–19, 20, 21, 22/3–4), and Erling Winkel (vols. 23, 24).⁴²

Under the circumstances of the time, it was a colossal task to gather the information for the bibliography. After Guido Adler received word from Jens Peter Larsen in 1933 that he must throw in the towel regarding the compilation of the bibliography, Adler strongly urged Jeppesen not to take on the task himself:

in the total volume of *Acta* descends to nearly 10%, but on average over all the years, it amounts to well over a quarter, and in a few volumes, it even reaches up to 40%.

40 Jeppesen, 'Zur Einführung', 1–2. Compared to the bibliography, the review section in *Acta* was relatively limited. The total number of reviews in Jeppesen's volumes amounts to around 135–140, averaging 8–9 per year. The review section was completely absent in volumes 13 to 16–17 (1941–45).

41 Erling Winkel, 'Index novorum librorum', *Acta musicologica*, 24/3–4 (1952), 202–19. In vols. 22/3–4, 23, and 24, the category 'XV. Scientiae auxiliares' is omitted. The 'Novae editiones musicae classicae' rubric is therefore numbered as 'XV' in these volumes.

42 The single exception regarding the compilers' Danish nationality was Albert Mell who compiled the bibliography in vol. 22/1–2. In the journal itself, it is actually not stated who compiled the bibliography in vols. 5/4 and 6/1. The indication that the compilers were Jens Peter Larsen and Karl Bak, respectively, is based on the information presented in *Acta's* forty-year index: C. Adkins and A. Dickinson, *Acta Musicologica. An index: Fall 1928–Spring 1967* (Basel: Bärenreiter-Verlag, 1970), 70. The index covering volumes 1–25 (1928–1953), which appropriately concludes the last issue edited by Jeppesen, does not provide information on who compiled the many bibliographies; [no author], *Acta Musicologica. Mitteilungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft. Bulletin de la Société Internationale de Musicologie. Tabula generalis Vol. I–XXV (1928–1953)*, *Acta musicologica*, 25/4 (1953), 180–89.

Heute bekomme ich von Larsen ein Schreiben, in welchem er mir mitteilt, dass er die Abfassung des bibliographischen Berichtes wegen seiner Ueberanstrengung zurücklegen musste. Eine arge Verlegenheit für Sie; Gott schütze Ihre Kräfte und übernehmen Sie sich nicht!⁴³

During the war, conditions naturally became even more difficult; but even though Herbert Rosenberg had to report in 1941, 1942, and 1943 that a significant portion of the ‘bibliographic literature’ was inaccessible due to wartime conditions – especially American, English, and Italian publications, as well as German and Italian music editions⁴⁴ – the bibliography was maintained throughout the course of the war. German-born but living in Copenhagen from 1935, Rosenberg himself had fled the Nazis, which is why he worked in Stockholm from 1943. In a letter to Jeppesen from July 1945, he comments on his 40-page ‘Index novorum librorum’, published in *Acta*’s 1944–45 volume – and on some of his personal dilemmas:

The bibliography became quite an extensive work: 738 slips. But it also represents well over four years of English and American literature that had to be gathered. ... Of course, I long intensely for my wife and my children, whom I haven’t seen since October ’43, and some of whom I haven’t seen at all yet (my youngest daughter was born a month after I fled).⁴⁵

Where the *Mitteilungen* had exclusively featured organizational announcements, as well as ‘einer Artikelserie über den Stand der musikwissenschaftlichen Forschung in den einzelnen Ländern’⁴⁶ – a sort of counterpart to the musicological situation reports in the *Bulletin de la Société “Union Musicologique”* – the publication of actual scholarly articles, ‘Dissertationes’, was initiated in *Acta*’s first issue as well, including an article by Jeppesen himself.⁴⁷

43 Letter from Guido Adler to Knud Jeppesen, 28 August 1933 (GAC).

44 Herbert Rosenberg, ‘Index novorum librorum’, *Acta musicologica*, 13/1–4 (1941), 91; *ibid.* 14/1–4 (1942), 94; *ibid.* 15/1–4 (1943), 63.

45 ‘Bibliografien [blev] et ganske digert arbejde: 738 sedler. Men det er ogsaa godt og vel fire aars engelsk og amerikansk litteratur, som skulle indhentes. ... jeg længes naturligvis voldsomt efter min kone og mine børn, som jeg dels ikke har set siden okt. 43, og dels slet ikke har set endnu (min yngste datter blev jo født en maaned [sic] efter min flygt [sic]); letter from Herbert Rosenberg to Knud Jeppesen, 2 July 1945 (DK-Kk). Excerpts from the letter are also quoted in Holme, ‘Glimt af nordisk musikvidenskab i første halvdel af det 20. århundrede’, 69. Cf. Herbert Rosenberg, ‘Index novorum librorum’, *Acta musicologica*, 16–17 (1944–45), 55–95.

46 [no author], ‘Bericht über die Sitzung des Direktoriums in Frankfurt a. M.’, 21.

47 Knud Jeppesen, ‘Die 3 Gafurius-Kodizes der Fabbrica del Duomo, Milano’, *Acta musicologica*, 3/1 (1931), 14–28 [B1931-c]. In the index covering volumes 1–25, both the initial national reports and the many subsequent articles are listed under the designation ‘Dissertationes’; [no author], ‘Acta Musicologica. Tabula generalis Vol. I–XXV (1928–1953)’, 180–83.

During Jeppesen's editorship, no fewer than 130–135 articles (plus approximately twenty-five shorter texts) were published, and perhaps the most characteristic aspect in this regard is that, by all accounts, there were no strict guidelines regarding the themes, types, or lengths of the articles. In many cases, a single contribution – likely due to space constraints – was spread across two issues, and some authors were given space over a longer series of issues.⁴⁸ In one particular case, Jeppesen even provided column space for an actual dispute – about ‘Haydn und das “kleine Quartbuch”’ – which unfolded between Adolf Sandberger and Jens Peter Larsen over several rounds in vols. 7–9 (1935–37), until Jeppesen finally closed the discussion.⁴⁹

The IGMw Congress in Barcelona, 1936

The IGMw's 3rd Congress took place in Barcelona from April 18th to 25th, 1936. Higiní Anglès was the organizer, and it was held – as was also the case in Liège 1930 and at the second Congress in Cambridge, 1933⁵⁰ – in connection with a grand music festival, namely the 14th Festival of the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM). However, this marks the end of some of the similarities with the preceding gatherings.

By 1936, the IMS was threatened with being torn apart in the conflict between German interests and international idealism, which came to a head at the third international congress in Barcelona.⁵¹

For Knud Jeppesen, the Congress in Barcelona was part of a longer – about six weeks long – journey,⁵² which also included many visits to libraries in Spain and Portugal. Most of Jeppesen's letters to Alice from the trip concern the journey itself, the libraries, the cities, the landscape, and the people he meets. It is striking that he only briefly mentions the Congress, but from a letter written on his way home, it appears that he

48 This applies to, for example, Charles van den Borren's ‘Inventaire des manuscrits de musique polyphonique qui se trouvent en Belgique’ (published in six parts in vols. 5–6), Otto Gombosi's ‘Studien zur Tonartenlehre des frühen Mittelalters’ (five parts in vols. 10–12), and Jacques Handschin's ‘Aus der alten Musiktheorie’ (five parts in vols. 14–16/17).

49 Cf. *Acta musicologica*, 7/3 (1935), 111–23; 8/1–2 (1936), 18–29; 8/3–4 (1936), 139–54, and 9/1–2 (1937), 31–41.

50 The Congress in Cambridge was held on 29 July–3 August 1933. Cf. Knud Jeppesen, ‘Der Kongreß’, *Acta musicologica*, 5/4 (1933), 145–46 [B1933-b]. No Congress report was published, but the contributions are listed in Marie Briquet, *La musique dans les congrès internationaux (1835-1939)* (Paris: Heugel, 1961), no. 79.

51 Annegret Fauser, ‘Edward J. Dent (1932–49)’, in Baumann and Fabris, *The History of the IMS (1927–2017)*, 48. Fauser uses the acronym ‘IMS’ (International Musicological Society) for IGMw.

52 Jeppesen returned to Copenhagen on May 26, 1936.

deliberately avoided writing extensively about the events owing to the many problems arising, presumably in order to spare Alice too much bad news:

I haven't been able to bring myself to provide further details about the Congress in Barcelona. I became sick and tired of all the international intrigue flourishing there.⁵³

Obviously, Jeppesen had considerably more on his mind, and considerably more opinions upon those matters, than he had energy to write home about. But what is nevertheless apparent from the letters written during and immediately after the Congress is, firstly, that there had been a significant degree of conflict, and secondly, just who, in Jeppesen's eyes, had been the cause of (almost) all the problems:

However, the preceding days have been difficult. The Germans gradually got on my nerves.⁵⁴

The Congress has had a very nervous and restless course, which quite reflects the current international situation. ... The Germans were – as expected – clearly the element causing unrest – but more on that when I get home again.⁵⁵

The Germans ... played a rather unattractive role here ... – The Germans, who were 'diplomatic': thought they could conceal everything, but said quite a bit more than they themselves were aware of; envoys from a sad world – may it not become the future!!!⁵⁶

As mentioned, this presentation will not provide a thorough exposition of the Congress's detailed proceedings, its musicological content, or the negotiations in the IGMw. But before attention is turned to what was absolutely most important for Jeppesen, namely the situation surrounding *Acta musicologica*, a few comments on the documentation of and the subsequent research regarding the Congress – as well as on the election of the president of the IGMw at the Congress – will be noted.

53 '... jeg [har] ikke har kunnet overvinde mig selv til at meddele nærmere Detailler vedr. Kongressen i Barcelona. Jeg blev led ved al det internationale Intrigevæsen, der blomstrede der'; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 24 May 1936.

54 'De foregaaende Dage har imidlertid været slemme. Tyskerne gik mig efterhaanden på Nerverne'; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 22 April 1936.

55 'Kongressen har haft et meget nervøst og uroligt Forløb, som ganske afspejler den nuværende internationale politiske Situation. ... Tyskerne var – som venteligt – afgjort Uro-elementet – men derom nærmere naar jeg kommer hjem igen'; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 26 April 1936.

56 'Tyskerne ... spillede en lidet tiltalende Rolle her ... – Tyskerne, som var "diplomatiske": troede at skjule alt, men sagde adskilligt mere, end de selv vidste af; Sendebud fra en sørgelig Verden – maatte den ikke blive Fremtidens!!!'; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 28 April 1936.

The proceedings and papers from the Congress were not published. After its conclusion, Higini Anglès began to collect the contributions (some 70–75 papers), and a contract existed to publish a book of 480 pages with the printing press that had printed the Congress programme.⁵⁷ In a letter to Jeppesen, Anglès writes, ‘Bei mir hatte ich fast das gesamte Materiel für den Kongress-Bericht schon in Ordnung’,⁵⁸ but the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in mid-July 1936 halted publication. In the same letter, Anglès (from Munich) recounts how he had to flee from Barcelona on a French warship, unable to visit his apartment or even ‘... meine Mappe mit mir zu nehmen’. Regarding the Congress report, he writes: ‘jetzt ... weiss ich es nicht’.⁵⁹

In *Acta*, Jeppesen – as might have been expected – published a report from the Congress, which – also to be expected – was overall very positively formulated. Aside from a few hints, the report is completely devoid of information about the IGMw’s general assembly and the festering atmosphere at the Congress.⁶⁰ Additionally, he refers to the ‘alles umfassender Kongressbericht’, which was actually being prepared at the time.⁶¹ ‘Officially’, Jeppesen thus found no reason to disclose internal conflicts and problems, a stance that is also evident when he – albeit in a different context – writes to Edward Dent later in the same year: ‘Ich finde, mann sollte in einer offiziellen Bekanntgabe, alles unterlassen, was an innere Unruhe in der Leitung unsere Gesellschaft deuten konnte, und ... einfach nur das positive mitteilen’.⁶²

So there is much that contemporaries ‘did not know’ – to paraphrase Anglès’ rather resigned remark in the letter to Jeppesen – or were not informed about,⁶³ and which

57 César Calmell i Piguillem, ‘El III Congreso Internacional de Musicología en Barcelona 1936, a partir de la documentación guardada en el fondo Higini Anglès de la Biblioteca Catalunya (The ‘3rd International Conference of Musicology’ (Barcelona, 1936), from the documentation preserved in the ‘Fons Higini Anglès’ of the Biblioteca de Catalunya)’, *Anuario Musical*, 70 (2015), 161–78, at 176–77. It is this programme – and therefore not an actual Congress report – that is listed as number 224 in Cowdery et al., *Speaking of Music*.

58 Letter from Higini Anglès to Knud Jeppesen, 9 September 1936 (DK-Kk).

59 Ibid. César Calmell i Piguillem tellingly summarizes his account of the Congress report with ‘... el proyecto quedó para siempre truncado’, that is, the project remained forever abandoned; Piguillem, ‘El III Congreso Internacional de Musicología en Barcelona 1936’, 177.

60 Knud Jeppesen, ‘Der 3. Kongress der internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft, Barcelona 18-25. April 1936’, *Acta musicologica*, 8/1–2 (1936), 2–6 [B1936-e].

61 Ibid. 5.

62 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Edward Dent, 30 December 1936 (EJD).

63 An example is a quite comprehensive report by Max Unger – already published in July 1936 – which only mentions the academic content, concerts, and excursions at the Congress. The report is heavily focused on the German (as well as Swiss and Austrian) contributions; several other prominent participants, including Jeppesen (or indeed Denmark among the participating countries), are not mentioned; Max Unger, ‘Musikwissenschaftliche Tagung in Barcelona’, *Zeitschrift für Musik*, 103 (1936), 824–30. According to Piguillem, it was the editor of *Revista Musical Catalana*, Joan Salvat, who wrote the only contemporary truly exhaustive and detailed summary of the Congress sessions; Piguillem, ‘El III Congreso Internacional de Musicología en Barcelona 1936’, 174.

posterity has therefore had to uncover. And it is striking how poorly and ‘selectively’ the Congress was documented and commented on in the following decades. In Rudolf Häusler’s anniversary article about the IGMw from 1977, for example, the event is passed over, except for a very few programmatic details, in remarkable silence.⁶⁴

The programme of the Congress, its course, and the content of the individual sessions, however, have been addressed in several works – in some cases even with brief comments on individual papers.⁶⁵ The Congress was also a topic at the 19th Congress of the International Musicological Society in 2012.⁶⁶

However, it is only with the renewed interest in and reassessment of Nazi-era German musicology since the 1990s that works have emerged which, by incorporating both ‘Vorbereitungsunterlagen, verschiedene entlegene kongressberichte sowie die persönliche Korrespondenz der beteiligten Personen’ have contributed to ‘eine Rekonstruktion der Umstände’,⁶⁷ that is, to detailed accounts not only of how actions were taken ‘on stage’, but, most importantly, of who was pulling strings behind the scene.

One of the most important starting points – and a sort of departure for this presentation as well – was an article published in 1991 by Pamela Potter. Under the heading ‘The culmination of isolationism’, she gives a brief account of the Congress.⁶⁸ Potter’s overall

64 Häusler, ‘50 Jahre Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft’.

65 Bernat Cabero, ‘El III Congreso de la Sociedad Internacional de Musicología. Barcelona 18-25 de abril de 1936’, in [no ed.], *La Musicología Española en el Contexto Internacional. Los Congresos Internacionales de Musicología* (Madrid: Comunidad de Madrid, 1992), 23–57, including details regarding, for example, the chairmen of the various sessions.

66 Cf. ‘Nationalism and international ideals in music and musicology: Barcelona, April 1936’ (Study Session at the 19th Congress of the International Musicological Society, Rome, 1–7 July 2012); L. Bognetti and D. Macchione (eds.), *Musics Cultures Identities. 19th Congress of the International Musicological Society. Programme and Abstracts* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale di Santa Cecilia, 2012), 175–77. In Baumann and Fabris, *The History of the IMS (1927–2017)*, the Congress is touched upon in several of the individual contributions, for instance, at 22–23, 29–30, 48 and 145–46.

67 Marcel Martínez, “‘Eine deutsche Frage’: Higiní Anglès als Mittler im Umfeld des III. Kongresses der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft in Barcelona 1936’, in Gabriele Buschmeier and Klaus Pietschmann (eds.), *Beitragsarchiv des Internationalen Kongresses der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung, Mainz 2016: “Wege der Musikwissenschaft”* (Mainz: Schott, 2018), 1–5, at 1.

68 Pamela M. Potter, ‘The Deutsche Musikgesellschaft, 1918–1938’, 162–65. Potter also touches upon the Congress in her well-known monograph *Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler’s Reich* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 82–86, and its translation into German *Die ‘deutsche’ der Künste. Musikwissenschaft und Gesellschaft von der Weimarer Republik bis zum Ende des Dritten Reichs* (translated by W. Ette) (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2000), 115–19. It is noteworthy, and indeed well-deserved, that Anselm Gerhard – having established that ‘Nachdem es dem Fach [der universitären Musikwissenschaft im sogenannten ‘Dritten Reich’] gelungen war, bis weit in die 1980er Jahre hinein lästige Fragen nach der Vergangenheit schulbildender Hauptvertreter abzuwehren, sind wir inzwischen ... gut orientiert’ – singles out Potter’s dissertation from 1991 (which became her monograph) as one of three publications that, in this context, primarily deserve to be mentioned; Anselm Gerhard, ‘Musikwissenschaft’; in Frank-Rutger Hausmann

context is ‘The Deutsche Musikgesellschaft, 1918–1938’, and the most significant contributions to uncovering the events before, during, and after the Congress have emerged in presentations that also have other overarching focuses. These presentations include Bernhard Bleibinger’s works on Marius Schneider,⁶⁹ Thomas Schipperges’ research into Heinrich Besseler,⁷⁰ and one of the newest and most thorough accounts, namely César Calmell i Piguillem’s studies of the archives of Higini Anglès.⁷¹ However, a comprehensive account of the event in all its many aspects – which it certainly deserves – has not yet been published.

One aspect of the Congress on which recent research has shed light is the election of the president of the Society, which naturally was one of the most important organizational issues. What is now known regarding the proceedings of the board meetings and the general assembly suggests something close to total chaos. There were doubts about the procedures and the voting results, and in several cases, important decisions simply seemed to be muddled.

The result was the re-election of Edward Dent as president,⁷² and although Theodor Kroyer, the German candidate for the directorate, was elected vice president, this was an undeniable defeat for the German delegation. Dent was the figure who personified the anti-German sentiment, and the Cold War atmosphere between the German delegation on the one side and Edward Dent and the so-called ‘Emigranten’ on the other is clearly evident in the ‘Bericht über den Kongress’ which Heinrich Besseler subsequently authored:

Er [Dent] ist – zusammen mit einigen von ihm stark beeinflussten Kollegen, wie J. B. Trend – Cambridge, Kn. Jeppesen – Kopenhagen, Carleton Sprague Smith

and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner (eds.), *Die Rolle der Geisteswissenschaften im Dritten Reich 1933–1945* (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs: Kolloquien, 53; München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2002), 165–92, at 165–66.

69 Bernhard Bleibinger, ‘Mythos Marius Schneider. Agent im Dienste der Musikwissenschaft, Handlanger der Nationalsozialisten oder verfolgter Emigrant?’, in Isolde v. Foerster, Christoph Hust and Christoph-Hellmut Mahling (eds.), *Musikforschung, Faschismus, Nationalsozialismus. Referate der Tagung Schloss Engers (8. bis 11. März 2000)* (Mainz: Are Edition, 2001), 329–58, at 336–41; *ibid*, *Marius Schneider und der Symbolismo. Ensayo musicológico y etnológico sobre en buscador de símbolos* (Alterias, Münchener ethnologische Impressionen, Vol. 2; München: VASA-Verlag, 2005), 98–110.

70 Thomas Schipperges, *Die Akte Heinrich Besseler. Musikwissenschaft und Wissenschaftspolitik in Deutschland 1924 bis 1949* (Quellen und Studien zur Musik in Baden-Württemberg, Bd. 7; Munich and Berlin: Strube Verlag München, 2005), at 149–54, 398–401, et *passim*.

71 Piguillem, ‘El III Congreso Internacional de Musicología en Barcelona 1936’. For yet a contribution with Anglès as the focal point, cf. Martínez, “‘Eine deutsche Frage’”.

72 When the president of the IGMw, Peter Wagner, unexpectedly died in October 1931, Dent was chosen as his successor, officially as of 1 January 1932; Fauser, ‘Edward J. Dent (1932–49)’, 46–47. At the time of the Barcelona Congress, Dent was also president of the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM).

– New York – der Hauptgegner des neuen Deutschland in der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft.⁷³

Regarding the question of the presidency, Jeppesen seems to have been only marginally concerned, but as a member of the IGMw's board – to which he too was re-elected – he was naturally deeply involved in the negotiations, and he undoubtedly welcomed Dent's re-election.

Judging from the correspondence between Higinì Anglès and Jacques Handschin, it seems possible that Jeppesen had at an earlier stage supported a proposal for a different president than Dent, although it is not clear who might have been under consideration in that case:

Ich bin auch froh, dass Sie entschlossen sind, dass ein anderer Präsident sein muss. Wir haben mit Jeppesen schon ausgedacht, wer es sein muss.⁷⁴

But if Jeppesen had expressed support for a candidate other than Dent at one point, he evidently changed his mind. On the occasion of Dent's 60th birthday soon afterwards, Jeppesen wrote an unequivocal tribute to him in *Acta*, in which he describes Dent as nothing less than 'the salt of great seas, reanimating and refreshing'.⁷⁵ This prompted Handschin to write to Anglès once again, and whereas Jeppesen had previously been counted among Handschin's 'allies', the image of Jeppesen has now completely changed:

In der ersten Nummer der neuen Acta hat Jeppesen gezeigt, was er ist: ein "Dent-ist" Einerseits war es ja gut, dass alle diese Konflikte wegen Protokoll usw. nicht vor der Oeffentlichkeit ausgetragen wurden; aber etwas kritischer hätte der Dentist schon sein dürfen.⁷⁶

On the one hand, Jeppesen's panegyric is too much for Handschin; on the other hand, he acknowledges the common sense in not trumpeting forth the Society's internal conflicts and clumsiness in public.

73 Heinrich Besseler, 'Bericht über den Kongress der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft in Barcelona, 18.-25. April 1936', quoted from Schipperges, *Die Akte Heinrich Besseler*, 400. Cf. Bleibinger, 'Mythos Marius Schneider', 339.

74 Letter from Jacques Handschin to Higinì Anglès, 31 January 1936 (E-Bbc), quoted from Bleibinger, *Marius Schneider und der Symbolismo*, 375 (no. 17). Cf. in addition a letter from which it appears that Handschin has spoken with 'Jeppesen ... über eine andre Lösung'; letter from Jacques Handschin to Higinì Anglès, 27 February 1936 (E-Bbc), quoted from *ibid.* 378 (no. 27).

75 Knud Jeppesen, 'Edward J. Dent, on the Sixteenth of July 1936', *Acta musicologica*, 8/1-2 (1936), 1 [B1936-d].

76 Letter from Jacques Handschin to Higinì Anglès, 13 October 1936 (E-Bbc), quoted from Bleibinger, *Marius Schneider und der Symbolismo*, 385 (no. 45).

Returning to Jeppesen's correspondence with his wife, it seems by and large as if he breathes a sigh of relief when the Congress – 'with all its international mendacity and diplomacy'⁷⁷ – is over, and he can once again devote himself to work in various libraries. Before departing from Barcelona, he writes the following:

Today I've had a day as I love them: worked without fuss and nonsense at the library and accomplished a lot – it suits me better than all sorts of conferences – finally alone.⁷⁸

But before Jeppesen could get that far – amidst all the fuss and nonsense – the situation regarding *Acta musicologica* had to be addressed.

Acta's shift of publishing company

Along with the election of president and board members, the future of *Acta musicologica* was among the most important points of discussion at the Congress in Barcelona. For Jeppesen, the most crucial decision to be taken was to switch the publisher of *Acta* from the reputable Leipzig publishing house Breitkopf & Härtel to the much less known Levin & Munksgaard in Copenhagen, where *Acta* stayed for the remainder of Jeppesen's editorship, that is, until 1953.⁷⁹

Already in the early 1930s, the journal's publishing affiliation had given rise to discussions and considerations regarding a potential switch. Like the first two volumes of the *Mitteilungen*, which had been edited by Peter Wagner, *Acta's* volumes 3–7 (1931–1935) had been published by Breitkopf & Härtel, an arrangement that had, however, caused some dissatisfaction within the IGMw, particularly due to the perceived high cost. *Acta* was primarily intended to be produced for the membership subscriptions of the IGMw, and there is a clear indication that the contract with Breitkopf & Härtel consumed most, if not all, of the funds available.⁸⁰ Since 1932, the IGMw had therefore been exploring the possibility of switching to another, more affordable publisher. In that context, offers had been solicited from Germany, Switzerland, and Denmark, including from the publisher Levin & Munksgaard.

77 'med alt den internationale Forløjethed og Diplomatie'; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 1 May 1936.

78 'Jeg har i Dag haft en Dag, som jeg elsker dem: arbejdet uden Vrøvl og Sludder paa Biblioteket og faaet dygtigt fra Haanden – det passer mig bedre end alle mulige Konferencer – endlich allein'; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 28 April 1936.

79 With the last installment (fasc. IV) of vol. 10 (1938), Levin & Munksgaard changed its name to Ejnar Munksgaard, cf. Munthe, *Et verdensforlag bygges opp*, 13.

80 At one point, Jeppesen wrote to Guido Adler, that 'Wir zahlen augenblicklich jährlich bei Breitkopf & Härtel 4000 Schw. Fr. für die "Acta". In Kopenhagen sollen wir ca. 3000 Fr. zahlen. Wir haben ca. 300 Abonnenten a 10 Fr.'; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 27 December 1935 (GAC).

To delve into the details of the chain of events involving all the parties and many aspects concerned is beyond the scope of this presentation. However, just a couple of Jeppesen's and Adler's exchanges of letters indicate how prospects could change rapidly. *Acta* had also been discussed at the Society's Congress in Cambridge in 1933. Guido Adler had been unable to attend, and in response to an inquiry to Jeppesen about how the Congress had unfolded, Jeppesen paints – in a letter from early September 1933 – an almost rosy picture of the negotiations in the IGMw:

Es ist alles, besonders musikalisch und gesellschaftlich sehr schön dort gewesen. In den Verhandlungen des Vorstandes ist nichts Aufsehenserregend gewesen. Man hat mich schön für meine Arbeit mit den "Acta" gedankt, und die Zukunft der Zeitschrift scheint vorläufig gesichert. Die Verhandlungen sind alle glatt und freundschaftlich verlaufen und von Intrigen hat man jedenfalls nichts gespürt.⁸¹

Acta's future therefore seemed assured, at least for the time being. But already a few months later, in January 1934, Adler speaks in one of his letters to Jeppesen almost grandiloquently about 'einem neuen Abschnitt in der musikwissenschaftlichen Zeitschriftenorganisation', after he has been informed by Egon Wellesz about 'die Möglichkeit eines dänischen Verlages'.⁸²

During 1935, with the prospect advancing of the upcoming Congress and thus the general assembly in Barcelona, the explorations and considerations were still in full swing. For example, Jeppesen wrote to Anglès at the beginning of December 1935 informing him that the January issue of *Acta* would probably be delayed due to the negotiations.⁸³ By the end of February 1936, the situation had not been clarified,⁸⁴ and the upshot was that Jeppesen, for the first time since taking over the editorship in 1931, had to abandon the quarterly publication of the installments and instead resort to combining two issues (vol. 8/1–2).⁸⁵

Several aspects concerning the production and publication of *Acta* played into these negotiations. In a lengthy letter to Otto Ursprung written later in 1936, Jeppesen outlined the five most important economic-practical aspects:

1. Due to currency restrictions in Germany, it is practically impossible to have an international journal located in this country, as payments only reach the employees with great difficulty and significant delays.

81 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 4 September 1933 (GAC).

82 Letter from Guido Adler to Knud Jeppesen, 17 January 1934 (DTÖ).

83 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Higinì Anglès, 6 December 1935 (E-Bbc).

84 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Higinì Anglès, 24 February 1936 (E-Bbc).

85 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Higinì Anglès, 4 April 1936 (E-Bbc), where Jeppesen expresses his deep regret over not being able to publish an article submitted by Anglès before the Congress takes place (cf. footnote 116).

2. In addition to *Acta*, Breitkopf & Härtel also publish the *Archiv für Musikforschung*, which has constantly led to mutual delays.
3. Munksgaard is significantly cheaper than Breitkopf & Härtel, even though the latter has lowered its offer by twenty-five percent.
4. It is a significant practical relief that the printing press is located in Jeppesen's immediate vicinity, which saves a lot of correspondence.
5. The only support *Acta* receives comes from Danish sources, specifically from the Rask-Ørsted Foundation.⁸⁶

In addition, as indicated in several other letters, there was great concern about the continued 'freedom of action' of the journal, should it become subjected to political conditions in the event of German rather than Danish support. For example, Jeppesen asked the IGMw's secretary, Wilhelm Merian, whether a possible German subsidy 'nicht von Bedingungen politischer Art abhängig gemacht werden, die wir, gerade als internationale Korporation, nicht annehmen können?'⁸⁷

Throughout the entire process, Jeppesen emphasized time and again that the change of publisher had to occur solely for economic reasons, and he also stressed the importance of openly evaluating the various offers, including of course the one from Breitkopf & Härtel. In another letter regarding the matter – this time to the IGMw's treasurer, Theophil Speiser-Riggenbach – Jeppesen concluded as follows on the situation as he saw it in mid-February 1936:

Obwohl ich sehr zufrieden mit der immer sehr angenehmen Zusammenarbeit mit Br. & H. bin, und besonders die Präzision und Gründlichkeit Ihrer Druckerarbeit ausserordentlich schätze, sehe ich nicht ein, wie es ökonomisch möglich für uns sein wird, die "Acta" bei Br. & H. zu belassen. Soweit ich sehe, stehen im Augenblick nur zwei Möglichkeiten uns offen: entweder die "Acta" eingehen zu lassen, oder sie bei Levin & Munksgaard unterzubringen.⁸⁸

Furthermore, it appeared that potential German support for the journal would be contingent on *Acta* essentially remaining under German control – about which, as mentioned, Jeppesen had strong reservations.

86 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Otto Ursprung, 3 September 1936 (D-Mbs). The Rask-Ørsted Foundation had been established in the early 1920s with the purpose of supporting Danish participation in international research collaborations, and from this fund, IGMw received an annual subsidy of 1000 CHF for *Acta*, cf. letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 27 December 1935 (GAC).

87 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Wilhelm Merian, 14 November 1935 (E-Bbc). From the content of the letter it is obvious that Jeppesen's dating '14 October 1935' is a mistake.

88 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Theophil Speiser-Riggenbach, 12 February 1936 (E-Bbc), with copies to Anglès, Dent, Merian, Pirro and Wolf.

After reading this letter – which Jeppesen sent in copy to the IGMw’s president, vice presidents, and secretary – Dent sent a letter to Anglès in which, referring to Jeppesen’s arguments, he clarified the concerns about the implications of staying with Breitkopf & Härtel: unacceptable conditions from the German government, rejection of Jewish contributions to *Acta*, and generally uncertain economic conditions:

You will also notice what Jeppesen says about the German grant. ... If we were to accept the German grant, it is more than likely that the German government would impose intolerable conditions on us; B & H might refuse to print communications from Jewish authors etc. Moreover, we have only certainty that the German subsidy would be paid for a period of a few years. In Denmark, we will be free.⁸⁹

Breitkopf & Härtel had previously declined a request from the IGMw to reduce the cost of *Acta*’s production. As the situation developed, however, in March 1936 they suddenly lowered their offer by twenty-five percent. Upon receiving this offer, Jeppesen wrote in another context to Guido Adler, expressing that things are happening behind the scenes and that remaining with Breitkopf & Härtel is now probably unavoidable, making it even more important to be financially independent:

Mit den “Acta” steht es so, dass der dänische Verleger 8 Rm. pro Heft verlangte, Breitkopf & Härtel dagegen 10 Rm. Plötzlich hatten Br. & H. ihren Preis um 25% gesenkt (also 7,50 Rm. pr. Expl.) und jetzt werden wir wohl nicht umhin können bei ihnen zu bleiben, Mir ist dies nicht ganz heimlich; denn ich spüre dahinten reichdeutsche Intrigen. Wir müssen aber jetzt sehen, dass wir ökonomisch so stark werden, dass wir von einer nazistischen Subvention unabhängig werden, denn sonst wäre alles aus.⁹⁰

It appears that Jeppesen, until shortly before the Congress, actually took for granted that a change of publisher could not be pushed through at the Congress, as indirectly indicated by the message he sent home to Alice after the general assembly: ‘It seems as if ‘Acta’ after all will come to Copenhagen. Hopefully, something good will come of it.’⁹¹

89 ‘Vous remarquerez aussi ce que Jeppesen dit à propos de la subvention allemande. ... Si nous acceptions la subvention allemande, il est plus que probable que le Gouvernement allemand nous imposerait des conditions intolérables; B & H pourrait refuser d’imprimer des communications des auteurs juifs etc. Puis, nous n’avons point de certitude que la subvention allemande serait payée pour une période de quelques ans. En Danemark nous serons libre’; letter from Edward Dent to Higinì Anglès, 18 February 1936 (E-Bbc), quoted from Bleibinger, *Marius Schneider und der Symbolismo*, 374 (no. 14).

90 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 12 March 1936 (DTÖ).

91 ‘Det synes som om “Acta” alligevel skal komme til Kbhvn. Forhaabentlig kommer der noget godt ud deraf’; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 22 April 1936 (underlining by the present author).

And something good did come of it. All in all, the Congress in Barcelona meant a victory for the anti-German forces on all fronts, *Acta* rejected offers of German subsidies,⁹² and the contract with Levin & Munksgaard was signed around 1 July, 1936. ‘Der neuen Acta’ – as Handschin called it – became a reality.

As had been the case following the conference in Cambridge in 1933, Guido Adler now once again received a report from Jeppesen, which – despite Jeppesen’s initial statement that ‘Es war ganz schön zu Barcelona’ (!) – this time must paint a much darker picture:

Aber es lässt sich nicht verhe[?]len, dass die ganze jetzige internationale politische Unruhe leider auch innerhalb unsere Faches in verstimmender Weise sich fühlbar machte. Es würde beschlossen, dass die “Acta” jetzt in Kopenhagen erscheinen sollen. Die reichsdeutschen waren darüber sehr ungehalten, aber ich glaube, dass es doch das beste so sein wird.⁹³

Adler also received a report of the Congress from Edward Dent, who, however, does not hide his enthusiasm or the significance he, along with Egon Wellesz, attributes to Jeppesen, even when it comes to the government of the Society:

... wir haben die “Acta” aus Deutschland weggebracht, und Jeppesen wird in kurzer Zeit eine neue Nummer in Kopenhagen herausbringen. ... es ist mir jetzt ganz klar, das wir drei Wellesz, Jeppesen und ich, die ganze Gesellschaft regieren müssen – etwa wie Hitler, Goering und Goebbels!⁹⁴

Overall, the chaotic negotiations and tendentious voting subsequently provoked severe criticism from various quarters. In a letter to Edward Dent, Jeppesen openly and honestly acknowledges his share of responsibility for ‘den etwas unregelrechten Verlauf der Generalversammlung’; at the same time, however, he maintains a strictly professional standpoint and is willing to stake his position as *Acta* editor on this:

Ich persönlich werde keine Anti-Politik, auch keine Anti-deutsche, treiben. ... Ich stehe oder gehe als Leiter unserer Zeitschrift mit dieser rein sachlichen Haltung. Ich

92 Annegret Fauser emphasizes – with reference to a letter that Egon Wellesz wrote to Guido Adler in August 1936 – IGMw’s precarious financial situation at that time: ‘To guarantee the journal’s continued publication, Dent contributed the then considerable sum of £150 from his own pocket to cover the Society’s deficit after the rejection of German subventions’; Annegret Fauser, ‘The Scholar behind the Medal: Edward J. Dent (1876–1957) and the Politics of Music History’, *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 139/2 (2014), 235–60, at 242.

93 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 11 June 1936 (DTÖ).

94 Letter from Edward Dent to Guido Adler, 15 July 1936, quoting from Fauser, ‘Edward J. Dent (1932–49)’, 48.

werde es mir dann gefallen lassen, dass die “Volksangehörigen” mich als deutschfeindlich stempeln, und dass die gegner des dritten Reiches mich vielleicht für Crypto-Nazi halten – ich kann nicht dafür.⁹⁵

German boycott

That a change of publisher would inevitably be perceived as nothing less than embarrassing is evident from a circular letter issued by Heinrich Bessler even before the Congress: ‘Ein peinlicher Eindruck in Deutschland sei jedoch unvermeidlich, wenn als erstes sichtbares Ergebnis des Kongresses der Verlagswechsel mitgeteilt würde.’⁹⁶ The decision to leave Breitkopf & Härtel – the first observable result of the Congress – therefore represented yet another glaring and entirely unacceptable defeat for the German delegation.

Nor did the reaction from the German side fail to materialize. A couple of weeks after the new contract with Levin & Munksgaard entered into force, Heinrich Bessler issued a confidential circular letter, reproduced here *in extenso*:

streng vertraulich!

Sehr geehrter Herr Kollege!

Dem Vernehmen nach hat der Präsident der IGMW den Vertrag mit Breitkopf & Härtel über den Verlag der “Acta musicologica” gekündigt. Die Acta sollen künftig in Kopenhagen bei Levin & Munksgaard erscheinen.

Wir haben in Barcelona vor diesem Schritt gewarnt und eine Zusammenarbeit in neuer Form mündlich und schriftlich angeboten. Der Verlag Breitkopf & Härtel teilt mit, er habe anlässlich der fälligen Vertragserneuerung seinerseits alle Wünsche der IGMW erfüllt. Unter diesen Umstände bedeutet der Verlagswechsel eine unfreundliche Handlung gegen uns. Es erscheint geboten, vorläufig jede deutsche Mitarbeit an den Acta einzustellen und zu verhindern. Nach den gemachten Erfahrungen ist besonders gegenüber dem Präsident der IGMW größte Zurückhaltung zu empfehlen. Unsere endgültige Stellungnahme zur IGMW solle bei nächster Gelegenheit in einer gemeinsamen Aussprache erörtert und festgelegt werden.

Mit deutschem Gruß

Heil Hitler!

(gez.) Bessler⁹⁷

⁹⁵ Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Edward Dent, 11 June 1936 (EJD).

⁹⁶ Letter from Heinrich Bessler to [no recipient], 15 May 1936 (E-Bbc), quoted from Bleibinger, *Marius Schneider und der Symbolismo*, 385 (no. 44).

⁹⁷ Letter from Heinrich Bessler to [no recipient], 17 July 1936 (D-Mbs), underlining is original.

Bessler did actually have the authority to issue a formal prohibition on German cooperation with *Acta*, and a genuine boycott thus became a reality. Considering that the Germans in general were very dissatisfied with Edward Dent, it is not surprising that the president of the Society is personally singled out in the letter. However, it is noticeable that even though it would have been logical (also) to mention the editor of *Acta* in the same context as the journal itself, Bessler refrains from singling out Jeppesen personally. It is unclear to how many individuals this letter was circulated;⁹⁸ but everything indicates that Bessler – and with him the other German colleagues – at no time informed Jeppesen of this decision.

It must therefore have come as an incomprehensible – and, surely, shocking – surprise to Jeppesen when his good friend and colleague, Otto Ursprung, wrote to him at the end of July to withdraw an article he had submitted to *Acta*:

Nun aber ergab sich ein Aenderung, deretwegen ich Sie bitten muss, mir meinen für die *Acta* zugeordneten Aufsatz “Die Ligaturen usw.” zurückzugeben. Ich darf aber doch sicher sein, dass Sie mich recht verstehen und unsere Freundschaft deswegen keine Trübung erfährt.⁹⁹

Jeppesen returned the article, even though, as he notes, it was already in the process of being printed. Evidently unaware of Bessler’s decree, he asks Ursprung to tell him honestly the reason for his action.¹⁰⁰ In his detailed response, Ursprung does not hide the fact that the change of publisher can only be perceived as an anti-German act, and that in the current situation he therefore cannot appear in the pages of *Acta* with a major article. Ursprung will therefore await further negotiations between the IGMw and the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft*. Although Ursprung apparently also expresses his own personal dissatisfaction – and not just that imposed by Bessler – with the change of publisher, he also absolves Jeppesen of blame and points to Dent as the sole responsible party for the change of publisher – ‘... ein Werk des Präsidenten D e n t’ – for which Jeppesen must unfortunately now bear the brunt:

Während Dent eben dadurch in dem Hintergrund verschwindet, sind Sie, lieber Freund, derjenige, der für den andern “den kopf hinhalten” soll. Und das tut mir für Sie leid.¹⁰¹

98 According to Potter, the letter was sent to ‘German musicologists’; Potter, ‘The Deutsche Musikgesellschaft, 1918–1938’, 164. Schipperges quotes from a copy of the letter sent to Otto Ursprung; Schipperges, *Die Akte Heinrich Bessler*, 129.

99 Letter from Otto Ursprung to Knud Jeppesen, 25 July 1936 (DK-Kk).

100 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Otto Ursprung, 7 August 1936 (D-Mbs).

101 Letter from Otto Ursprung to Knud Jeppesen, 16 August 1936 (D-Mbs).

Jeppesen replies at the beginning of September 1936 with the letter already cited containing the five arguments for the change of publisher. In addition to pointing out that Levin & Munksgaard – contrary to some assertions – was not a Jewish publisher, Jeppesen emphasizes that he will always listen to and adhere to well-founded criticism – which, however, has *not* been presented – and that he does not understand Ursprung’s point of view. If anyone is attacking the person rather than the issue, it is certainly not him:

Also ich weiss sehr wohl, was ich tue. Will jemand mir den Kopf abhauen, sei es ihn gegönnt, ich habe ihn aber nicht von selbst verloren.¹⁰²

It appears that Jeppesen still is not aware of Bessler’s circular – ‘Ich weiß – bis jetzt – nur aus Ihren Brief, dass man in Deutschland Bedenklichkeiten hegt gegen Mitwirkung in den “Acta”’ – and if it appears that a boycott from his German colleagues is looming, it is something he greatly regrets. However, Jeppesen hints at the end that he is well aware of the true context of the situation – namely, that Ursprung was more or less forced to act as he did – and furthermore, he does not want to dwell on such ‘trifles’:

Wie es aber auch sei, bitte ich Sie davon überzeugt zu sein, ... dass solche Kleinigkeiten, zu dem Sie sicher von Verhältn., die ich nicht zu beurteilen vermag, gezwungen worden sind, mir belanglos scheinen.¹⁰³

Ursprung promptly reported Jeppesen’s extensive letter to Bessler, who, unsurprisingly, upheld the announced guidelines and immediately offered Ursprung alternative publication for his article in the *Archiv für Musikforschung* instead.¹⁰⁴

Whatever the other intermediary steps in this chain of events, it is noteworthy that as early as January 1937, Ursprung was to write to Jeppesen, stating that:

Die prinzipielle Frage der Mitarbeit an den Acta wie bisher ist nun, dank der Vermittlung unseres Freundes Anglès, zu gegenseitiger Befriedigung gelöst. Nachdem hier der alte status quo wiederhergestellt ist, ...¹⁰⁵

102 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Otto Ursprung, 3 September 1936 (D-Mbs).

103 Ibid.

104 Letter from Heinrich Bessler to Otto Ursprung, 15 September 1936 (D-Mbs), cf. Schipperges, *Die Akte Heinrich Bessler*, 130. As official organ of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft*, the *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, which had been published since 1918, was renamed *Archiv für Musikforschung* in 1936 and issued with the support of the Nazi-controlled *Staatliches Institut für Deutsche Musikforschung*; *ibid.* 127; cf. Fabian R. Lovisa, *Musikkritik im Nationalsozialismus. Die Rolle deutschsprachiger Musikzeitschriften 1920-1945* (Neue Heidelberger Studien zur Musikwissenschaft, Band 22; Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 1993), 90–92, 110–13, 117–18.

105 Letter from Otto Ursprung to Knud Jeppesen, 19 January 1937 (D-Mbs).

Ursprung immediately offers his assistance regarding potential reviews and asks if he may resubmit the article he withdrew, which, according to his own account, due to other work commitments he ‘has not at all worried about in the meantime.’¹⁰⁶ In other words, it appears that Anglès has acted in a mediating role, and it is probably this to which Jeppesen refers in a roughly contemporaneous letter to Anglès, in which he thanks him for ‘Ihre Bestrebungen, zwischen unsere deutschen Kollegen und die “Acta” ein gutes Verhältnis anzubahnen, wozu Sie ganz besonderes befähigt sind.’¹⁰⁷

‘... reichdeutsche Beiträge in Fülle’

It is Pamela Potter who, in her aforementioned seminal article on ‘The Deutsche Musikgesellschaft, 1918–1938’, has designated Jeppesen as ‘the tragic figure in this scenario’. The reasons given are not only that ‘the German musicologists voluntarily cut themselves off from an international periodical’ in what was essentially a ‘German boycott’, but also that ‘a sudden withdrawal of articles by Germans’ should have resulted.¹⁰⁸

It is highly likely that a boycott from the German side did indeed take place, but it would be purely speculative to assess the extent and duration to which (some of) the German musicologists *might* have refrained from submitting contributions to *Acta*. A comprehensive and comparative study of all surviving correspondences might provide more nuanced answers, but there are strong indications that in the event the boycott did not develop into a significant problem for Jeppesen. Beyond the one article by Ursprung that Jeppesen actually returned, Potter cites no further specific examples of withdrawn articles,¹⁰⁹ and whether Jeppesen ever experienced a genuine shortage of material for the journal is doubtful.

Already in his five-point letter to Ursprung from September 1936, Jeppesen stated that he has ‘reichdeutsche Beiträge in Fülle vorrätig’ and that he continues to receive them, even from ‘sehr offiziellen Vertreter der deutsch. Musikwissenschaft.’¹¹⁰ In response to Ursprung’s renewed goodwill towards *Acta* in early 1937, Jeppesen replies that

106 Ibid.

107 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Higin Anglès, 2 January 1937 (E-Bbc).

108 Potter, ‘The Deutsche Musikgesellschaft, 1918–1938’, 164–65.

109 According to Thomas Schipperges, however, Heinrich Bessler mentions in mid-September 1936 that Jeppesen still has some contributions ready for printing that can *no* longer be withdrawn, specifically by Joachim Moser, Hans Engel, and ‘zwei weiteren Kollegen’; Schipperges, *Die Akte Heinrich Bessler*, 129. Based on what was actually published in *Acta*, for Engel, this can only concern the article ‘Marenzios Madrigale und ihre dichterischen Grundlagen’, the first part of which appeared in the second installment of the 1936 volume (vol. 8/iii–iv; the second part was published the following year), and for Moser, it must be two book reviews (one in each of vol. 8’s two installments) and the article ‘Daniel Speer’ in vol. 9 (1937). The ‘two other colleagues’ could refer to several German authors in *Acta*’s vol. 8ff, among them Otto Ursprung.

110 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Otto Ursprung, 3 September 1936 (D-Mbs). Regrettably, Jeppesen does not name the ‘very official representatives of German musicology’.

he must have patience ‘da wir z. Z. an einer Überfülle von noch ungedr. Mss. leiden’,¹¹¹ that is, ‘at the moment we have an abundance of unpublished manuscripts’. Ursprung’s article, along with three reviews, was therefore not printed in *Acta* until 1939.¹¹²

On the other hand, it may seem striking that it was precisely at the end of 1936 that Jeppesen asked Edward Dent whether it might be possible to publish the best contributions from the Cambridge IGMw Congress of 1933.¹¹³ Jeppesen frequently made inquiries of this kind – from his correspondence, it appears that he routinely asked his colleagues about potential contributions to *Acta* – but asking Dent for Congress papers from three years ago could indicate a shortage of material for *Acta*.

Jeppesen’s reasoning, however, is that ‘es fehlt mir an englischen und französisch. Beitr.’¹¹⁴ a point reiterated in slightly altered form in a later letter: ‘es [ist] schwierig für mich Beiträge in nicht-deutscher Sprache zu erhalten.’¹¹⁵ In light of the relationship between the two scholars, it is hard to imagine that Jeppesen would fail to alert Dent to any potential shortage of contributions to *Acta*. Such a shortage, however, cannot be ruled out (and Jeppesen undoubtedly took great pride in keeping *Acta* running without resorting to forms of artificial resuscitation), but it is considerably more likely that he did indeed have ‘reichdeutsche Beiträge in Fülle’ and that his inquiry to Dent was just one of several attempts to establish a more equitable balance between the languages of publication in *Acta*.

The fact that the only article written by Anglès for *Acta* was published in French rather than German occurred at Jeppesen’s direct request,¹¹⁶ and it is also evident on several other occasions that Jeppesen is of the opinion that the German language – although it is the one he is best at and clearly prefers – occupies too dominant a position in relation to the international efforts he has always aimed for with *Acta*:

Die “Acta” wirklich international zu gestalten und eine mehr gerechte Verteilung der 3 Hauptsprache anzubahnen, ist immer mein Ziel gewesen.¹¹⁷

111 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Otto Ursprung, 2 February 1937 (D-Mbs).

112 Otto Ursprung, ‘Die Ligaturen, ihr System und ihre methodische und didaktische Darstellung. zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Musikunterrichts’, *Acta musicologica*, 11/1–2 (1939), 1–16.

113 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Edward Dent, 30 December 1936 (EJD).

114 Ibid.

115 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Edward Dent, 5 April 1937 (EJD). That Jeppesen, during World War II, asks Anglès if he could write an article for *Acta*, perhaps is more understandable; Letter from Knud Jeppesen til Higini Anglès, 24 July 1942 (E-Bbc).

116 Cf. letter from Knud Jeppesen to Higini Anglès, 18 March 1932 (E-Bbc), where Jeppesen expresses his preference for the article to be written in French rather than in German: ‘Würde Sie es französisch verfassen? Wenn es Ihnen nämlich gleichgiltig ist, ob Sie deutsch oder franz. schreiben, möchte ich das letztere vorziehen, weil ich die Sprachen ein bisschen mengen [?] möchte und so wie so reichlich deutsche Beiträge bringe’. The article was not published until four years later: Higini Anglès, ‘Un manuscrit inconnu avec polyphonie du XV^e siècle conservé à la cathédrale de Ségovie (Espagne)’, *Acta musicologica*, 8/1–2 (1936), 6–17.

117 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Edward Dent, 11 June 1936 (EJD).

Furthermore, an overabundance of one language could risk hindering the recruitment of new members to the IGMw.

In an unreserved letter to Dent, written while the *Acta* discussions were heated after the Barcelona Congress, Jeppesen *also* notes that while the English are always full of poor excuses and the French are generally greedy and unreliable, the ‘problem’ with the Germans – especially the German ‘emigrants’, i.e., colleagues who have fled Nazi Germany and therefore cannot publish in German journals – is that they are eager to write for *Acta*:

Die grosse Schwierigkeit bei der Sache ist aber, dass während die Deutschen und besonders die Emigranten (die keine andere Möglichkeit haben) äusserst gern für uns schreiben, sind englische und französische Beiträge recht schwierig zu haben. Die Engländer antworten immer sehr freundlich, bedauern aber meistens, dass sie ... nicht Definitives versprechen dürfen, die Franzosen fragen zunächst nach unsere Honorarsätze ..., und schweigen dann gewöhnlich nachher.¹¹⁸

Tragic or victorious?

In conclusion, it must be assessed as highly doubtful whether the decision taken at the Barcelona Congress to change publishing company actually resulted in a real crisis for *Acta*, and – most importantly – whether Jeppesen ‘in this scenario’ can be said to have occupied a position as ‘the tragic figure’.

At no point does there seem to have been any professional criticism of Jeppesen’s role as editor of *Acta*, nor were there any requests for him to resign from this position. The majority of statements made about him – and, it should be added, by him – indicate that through his professional and widely recognized editorship of the first volumes of *Acta*, Jeppesen had the upper hand and could still count on significant (that is, sufficient) support from colleagues in Europe (that is, from outside Nazi Germany) and in the United States. Judging from both official and published sources as well as his private correspondence, Jeppesen remained unwavering in his commitment to the impartiality of the journal and was, if necessary, willing to sacrifice his position as editor for the cause. A couple of years after the events in Barcelona – and in a context related to funding for the journal – Jeppesen once again emphasizes in a letter to Edward Dent

¹¹⁸ Ibid. Regarding ‘the great emigration of scholars into the USA because of National-Socialism’, it is estimated that ‘among those scholars from Germany, Austria and neighboring countries who fled the Hitler regime were more than one hundred musicologists’, of course depending on ‘how the term “musicologist” is defined’; Glenn Stanley and Philine Lautenschläger, ‘American Musicology. The Strength of Tradition and the Energy of Innovation’, in Wald-Fuhrmann and Keym (eds.), *Wege zur Musikwissenschaft*, 126. Their work includes a table of 25 ‘Immigrant Musicologists at Colleges and Universities in the USA’ (ibid. 127), among whom are Alfred Einstein and Curt Sachs, who were mentioned at the beginning of this presentation.

that he is prepared to resign from the editorship if the independence of the journal is challenged:

Wenn wir deshalb nicht, ausser der staatlichen Subvention Dänemarks noch weitere offizielle Subventionen erreichen können, bin ich dafür die Herausgabe aufhören zu lassen. Jedenfalls bin ich bereit zu jeder Zeit die Schriftleitung niederzulegen, wie ich Ihnen schon früher gesagt habe.¹¹⁹

However, the change of publisher had some personal consequences for Jeppesen nonetheless. Already in 1927, Jeppesen's first publication at Breitkopf & Härtel, namely his edition of *Der Kopenhagener Chansonnier*, had been published;¹²⁰ and in the year preceding the Congress in Barcelona, they had released both his textbook, *Kontrapunkt*, in German translation, and his extensive Petrucci edition.¹²¹ As Jeppesen pointed out to, among others, Guido Adler, a not insignificant aspect of the *Acta* affair was that the rupture with Breitkopf & Härtel necessarily had the effect of ruining the good relationship he had previously enjoyed with the publisher:

Selbst werde ich dabei das gute Verhältnis zu Br. & H. verderben; aber ich muss die Interessen unserer Gesellschaft in erster Reihe treten lassen.¹²²

Jeppesen was also honest with Ursprung about the dilemma he faced, and about the personal consequences the split with Breitkopf & Härtel would necessarily have:

..., wenn ich nur auf meine persönlich. Interessen geschauet hätte, wäre ich vielleicht nicht mitgegangen. Es ist mir immer klar gewesen, was es für mich bedeutet mit einer Firma wie Br. & H. die Verbindung abbrechen zu müssen. Ich stehe aber

¹¹⁹ Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Edward Dent, 18 September 1938 (EJD).

¹²⁰ Knud Jeppesen (ed.), *Der Kopenhagener Chansonnier. Das Manuskript Thott 2918 der königlichen Bibliothek Kopenhagen* (Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard / Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1927) [E1927].

¹²¹ Both publications had been long in the making. Already in November 1930, Jeppesen wrote to Adler that 'Breitkopf hat jetzt das Buch ["Kontrapunkt"] für Deutschland erworben' (letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 26 November 1930 (GAC)), and after visiting and negotiating with the publisher in Leipzig, he informed Adler about a month later that 'Mein "Kontrapunkt" und die grosse Laudenausgabe werden voraussichtlich zum Herbst bei Breitkopfes erscheinen' (letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 29 January 1931 (GAC)). However, several years would still elapse before the publication of both the textbook, Knud Jeppesen, *Kontrapunkt. Lehrbuch der klassischen Vokalpolyphonie* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1935) [B1935-a], and 'the big laude edition', Knud Jeppesen (ed.), *Die Mehrstimmige Italienische Laude um 1500. Das 2. Laudenbuch des Ottaviano dei Petrucci (1507) in Verbindung mit einer Auswahl mehrstimmiger Lauden aus dem 1. Laudenbuch Petrucci's (1508) und aus verschiedenen gleichzeitigen Manuskripten* (Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard / Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1935) [E1935-b], became a reality.

¹²² Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Guido Adler, 11 June 1936 (DTÖ).

hier mit der Verantwortung gegenüber unserer internationale Sache, die für mich eine ernste Realität ist, und da dürfen meine persönliche Vorteile gewiss nicht in erster Reihe kommen.¹²³

Whether the loss of ‘my personal advantages’ – that is, the opportunity to publish with Breitkopf & Härtel – caused Jeppesen any problems is difficult to assess, partly because the years and indeed the decade that followed were anything but business as usual. But neither was it a tragedy. In 1956, Breitkopf & Härtel published the second edition of Jeppesen’s counterpoint book (and several subsequent editions),¹²⁴ and otherwise, his publications after 1936 were released by other publishers.

The ‘tragic figure’ may indeed have ended up as the victorious figure in the overall scenario of *Acta musicologica*. Although the scope of the journal shrank and the frequency of publication became less stable in the period after 1936, *Acta* not only survived but was published in the years up to, during, and after World War II, and this was not just as a medium for *Mitteilungen* of scholarly information, but because:

... the principal task of *Acta* during the 1930s and 1940s was to retain the values and the practices of international cooperation during a period of fascism, radical nationalism, and global conflict.¹²⁵

And international cooperation, as per Jeppesen’s manifesto of 1931, continued throughout all these years to be a characteristic of Jeppesen’s editorship. The previously mentioned ‘team of permanent members of the staff’ – that is, the editorial board – had from the beginning consciously comprised the widest possible geographical composition. If *Acta Musicologica*’s ‘collaboratores principales’ in vols. 3–25 (1931–53) are listed – alphabetically, indicating the year in which the individual last participated – no less than seventeen nations (excluding Denmark) are represented: Boris Assafieff (Russia, vols. 16–17), Higiní Anglès (Spain, vol. 27), Gaetano Cesari (Italy, vol. 7), Adolf Chybinski (Poland, vol. 4), Edward J. Dent (England, vol. 25), Carl Engel (USA, vol. 15), Rudolf v. Ficker (Austria, vol. 5/3), Otto Gombosi (Hungary, vol. 25), Toivo Haapanen (Finland, vol. 22/1–2), Wilhelm Merian (Schweiz, vol. 25/1–3), Carl-Allan Moberg (Sweden, vol. 27), Zdeněk Nejedlý (Czechoslovakia, vols. 16–17), André Pirro (France, vol. 14),

123 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Otto Ursprung, 3 September 1936 (D-Mbs). In a contemporaneous response to an inquiry from Zoltán Kodály about a possible Hungarian translation of Jeppesen’s textbook, Jeppesen wrote that Breitkopf & Härtel ‘z. Z. [zur Zeit] mir böse sind, weil die “Acta Musicologica” nicht mehr bei ihnen, sondern in Kopenhagen erscheinen sollen’; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Zoltán Kodály, 11 August 1936 (Kodály-Archives, Budapest (*H-Bkema*), Jeppesen-epist. 7). However, the Hungarian translation was not published until 1975: Knud Jeppesen, *Ellenpont. A klasszikus vokális polifónia tankönyve* (Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1975, 2nd ed. 1988) [B1975a].

124 Cf. Holme Hansen, *Knud Jeppesen Katalog*, 30.

125 Celestini and Bohlman, ‘Acta Musicologica: A Brief History’, 146.

Ole Mørk Sandvik (Norway, vols. 16–17), Albert Smijers (Holland, vol. 25), Charles van den Borren (Belgium, vol. 25), Egon Wellesz (Austria/England, (from vol. 5/4) vol. 27), and Johannes Wolf (Germany, vols. 16–17).¹²⁶

... a day as I love them: worked ... and accomplished a lot

There are several principal characters in this story, and based on Jeppesen's correspondences, several other interesting and relevant stories could be told about his relationships with the various parties involved, about the IGMw and about postwar musicology in general.

Regarding Edward Dent, it appears that they – letter-wise – ceased to have contact shortly after the end of World War II. In one of the last (preserved) letters from September 1945, at a time when the 'German problem' was even more intractable and difficult to handle in an international spirit, Jeppesen's attitude towards *Acta* – that no one, as long as their engagement was academically valuable and politically neutral, should be excluded from the journal's pages – is again clearly expressed. After receiving a letter from Dent – 'indeed, the first breath from the great free world I had after this dark time' – Jeppesen writes that during this long period he has heard almost nothing from German colleagues, and that it is now completely impossible to write to Germany. Despite the circumstances, Jeppesen expresses hope, both for the continued existence of *Acta* and for maintaining the journal's impartial line:

The relation to this country [Germany] will, at all, form a difficult problem for our "Acta" (if it, as I hope, will be possible to continue with the publication); but I hope you think as I do, videl. that we can't exclude neither [sic] the Germans nor [sic] any other people from our review.¹²⁷

Jeppesen's correspondence with Heinrich Bessler spans three decades from the mid-1920s to the beginning of the 1950s, at least. In 1931, for instance, Jeppesen invited

¹²⁶ While sixteen members are listed from the first installment of the third volume, Assafieff (this spelling of his name was used consistently in *Acta*) enters with the publication of the second installment. The only new name added to the original seventeen during the twenty-three years was when Egon Wellesz replaced Ficker in 1933. Some of the contributors (Chybinski and Ficker) were active for only a few volumes, a handful (Cesari, Engel, Haapanen, Merian, and Pirro) remained in their positions until their passing, a small handful (Assafieff, Nejedlý, Sandvik, and Wolf) stopped at the end of World War II, while the rest remained in the group until Jeppesen stepped down (Dent, Gombosi, Smijers, and van den Borren), with three of them even continuing for a few more volumes (Anglès, Moberg, and Wellesz). This resulted in a steady decrease in the group, first slightly from seventeen to thirteen (vols. 16–17), then dropping to nine (vols. 18–19), ending with seven in Jeppesen's final volume.

¹²⁷ Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Edward Dent, 26 September 1945 (EJD). The letter is a rare example of Jeppesen writing in English; 'videl.' is Jeppesen's abbreviation for 'videlicet', that is 'viz.'.

Bessler to contribute to *Acta*. There is a world of difference between the unattractive way Bessler undoubtedly acted in connection with the Barcelona Congress – among other things characterized as ‘Besonders unappetitlich ist ... Besslers Rolle als konspirativer Informant über die Aktivitäten anderer Kollegen bei internationalen Kongressen’¹²⁸ – and his subsequent exchange of letters with Jeppesen. It is thus noteworthy that immediately after Jeppesen’s return from Barcelona, Bessler responds – quite ‘neutrally’ – to a query from Jeppesen regarding some old handwritten manuscripts.¹²⁹ During the war, too – between June 1941 and April 1942 – they also exchange several letters, exclusively about manuscripts; there are no signs of ‘Heil Hitler’ or of politics.¹³⁰ Their contact after the war, the first since 1942, is initiated by Bessler in April 1946: ‘... seit langem sind wir von aller Welt abgeschnitten. Da nun endlich der Auslandsverkehr wieder eröffnet ist, möchte ich Ihnen sogleich einen Gruß senden’¹³¹ – and in the subsequent years, the letters also predominantly revolve around manuscripts and the journal.

The main figure behind the Congress in Barcelona, Higiní Anglès, played a central role in the tense relationship between the German delegation and the anti-German Congress participants. But he also held a special position in relation to Jeppesen. Initially, much indicates that Anglès was more sympathetic towards the Germans and thus less critical of the representatives of the Nazi regime within musicology, than the majority of Congress participants. Bernhard Bleibinger assesses that Anglès’ efforts were probably primarily diplomatically oriented,¹³² while Pamela Potter judges him harshly, namely – frankly – as the unconditional ally of the German delegation.¹³³ Perhaps Marcel Martínez comes closest to the truth: ‘Anglès blieb Anwalt der Vertrauens vieler Kollegen und pflegte seine Beziehungen zwischen den konkurrierenden Strömungen.’¹³⁴

Regardless of what Jeppesen may have been aware of, the correspondence between him and Anglès contains virtually no traces of these intrigues; his attitude towards Anglès was apparently always one of unconditional respect and positivity. Anglès, who was roughly the same age as Jeppesen, was apparently one of the colleagues with whom Jeppesen maintained particularly good contact, and their extensive correspondence spans some forty years, from 1925 into the 1960s. From the letters, it appears, among

128 Gerhard, ‘Musikwissenschaft’, 168. Gerhard, on the other hand, does not hesitate to proclaim Bessler as ‘sicher eine der größten Begabungen der deutschen Musikwissenschaft überhaupt’; *ibid.* 179.

129 Letter from Heinrich Bessler to Knud Jeppesen, 23 May 1936 (DK-Kk).

130 In the first letter since 1936 Bessler writes that ‘wir haben lange nichts mehr voneinander gehört, und ich hoffe, daß es Ihnen auch unter den gegenwärtigen Umständen wohl geht’; letter from Heinrich Bessler to Knud Jeppesen, 15 June 1941 (DK-Kk).

131 Letter from Heinrich Bessler to Knud Jeppesen, 6 April 1946 (DK-Kk).

132 Bleibinger, ‘Mythos Marius Schneider’, 339–40; Bleibinger, *Marius Schneider und der Symbolismo*, 103, 104, 110.

133 Potter, ‘The Deutsche Musikgesellschaft, 1918–1938’, 156, 163.

134 Martínez, ‘“Eine deutsche Frage”’, 4.

other things, that Anglès was extremely helpful to Jeppesen on several occasions regarding advice, guidance, and recommendation letters to many Spanish libraries, some of them difficult to access: for example, during Jeppesen's travels after the Congress in Barcelona.

It is also noteworthy that immediately after the Congress – where in the letters home to Alice he expressed his unreserved opinions, especially about the German delegation – Jeppesen felt compelled to write: 'Anglès is magnificent, I think he is the colleague I like best ... He is the exact opposite of the Germans'.¹³⁵ During the period leading up to the first IGMw Congress after the war, Jeppesen made it clear to Anglès that he believed him to be the most suitable candidate to become the new president of the IGMw:

Wie ich Ihnen schon gesagt habe, glaube ich, dass Sie die am besten geeignete Persönlichkeit sind, wenn es gilt einen neuen Präsidenten der Gesellschaft zu gewinnen, und dass es sehr glücklich sein würde, wenn Sie die Leitung übernehmen würden.¹³⁶

Jeppesen's admiration and respect for Anglès, however, are most evident from the fact that in early 1946 he nominated him for membership in the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. Supported and co-signed by the well-known linguist Carsten Høeg, Jeppesen formulated a six-page long and extremely laudatory recommendation, from which the following passage is taken:

Professor Higini Anglès ... is not only the most significant musicologist within his nation, but is indeed one of the few living, perhaps the only one, who measures up to the great personalities of the previous generation within musicology. ... His scholarly output, although exclusively focused on Spanish music, is of an almost monumental magnitude. ... The quality of Professor Anglès' works corresponds entirely to their almost unimaginable number and scope.¹³⁷

135 'Anglès er storartet, jeg tror, han er den af mine Kolleger, jeg synes bedst om Han er lige Mod-sætningen til Tyskerne'; letter from Knud Jeppesen to Alice Jeppesen, 28 April 1936.

136 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Higini Anglès, 12 May 1947 (E-Bbc).

137 'Professor Higini Anglès ... er ikke blot den betydeligste Musikvidenskabsmand indenfor sin Nation, men er i det hele taget en af de faa nulevende, ja maaske den eneste, der staar Maal med forrige Generations store Personligheder indenfor Musikvidenskab. ... Hans videnskabelige Produktion er, endskønt den udelukkende udfolder sig indefor spansk Musik, af et næsten kæmpemæssigt Omfang. ... Kvaliteten af Prof. Anglès' Værker svarer ganske til deres næsten usandsynlige Tal og Omfang'; Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, K.D.V.S. Prot. Nr. 1243-1946. Jeppesen's recommendation is dated 4 February 1946.

In 1943, Jeppesen himself had been the first musicologist admitted to the Society; he now took the opportunity to have Anglès elected as the first foreign musicologist, on April 12, 1946.¹³⁸

As with Dent, Bessler, and Anglès, Jeppesen continued to play a leading role in the IGMw in the years following the Congress in Barcelona. The Society's next Congress, with Jeppesen as the main organizer, was scheduled to be held in Copenhagen in September 1939 but was not realized because of the outbreak of war.¹³⁹ More than ten years would elapse before, following a meeting in Basel in May 1948, the Society could once again reconvene. At the fourth IGMw Congress in 1949,¹⁴⁰ Jeppesen was elected President for the period 1949–1952. He formally resigned from the Directorium in 1964 (after thirty-seven years of service), but retained an advisory function in the Society until his death in 1974. Jeppesen thus left his mark not only through his groundbreaking dissertation,¹⁴¹ his counterpoint textbook,¹⁴² and his other scholarly works, but also as a personality highly engaged in the activities of the IGMw, and not least in the editorship of *Acta Musicologica*. Overall, this last may have constituted the single largest and most enduring task in his life.

Although Jeppesen by all appearances was not particularly interested in adorning himself with medals and decorations, it is worth noting in parenthesis that, unlike several other major figures such as Merian, Dent, and Anglès, Jeppesen himself was *not* appointed an honorary member of the IGMw. However, there has never been any doubt about the significance of Jeppesen's endeavours, and he is repeatedly highlighted as one of the individuals who, with unwavering dedication, made a difference in the history of the IGMw and its journal, *Acta musicologica*. This was emphasized once again in 1987 when the editor of the journal at the time, Lorenzo Bianconi, announced (yet) another new strategy and thus changes in *Acta*, including a rule limiting the editor's term to a maximum of five years:

138 Letter from Knud Jeppesen to Higinì Anglès, 15 July 1946 (E-Bbc), in which Jeppesen adds that he is pleased with 'diese Akt der Gerechtigkeit'.

139 Cf. Thomas Holme, 'Glimt af nordisk musikvidenskab i første halvdel af det 20. århundrede', 62–63.

140 The Congress was held in Basel on 29 June to 3 July 1949. Cf. Manfred Bukofzer, 'The Fourth Congress of the International Musicological Society, Basel, June 29–July 3, 1949', *Acta musicologica*, 21 (1949), 1–7. Regarding the Congress report (including citations of the contributions), cf. Cowdery et al., *Speaking of Music*, no. 289.

141 Knud Jeppesen, *Palestrinastil med særligt Henblik paa Dissonansbehandlingen* (Copenhagen, 1923) [B1923], translated into *Der Palestrinastil und die Dissonanz* (Leipzig, 1925) [B1925-a], and *The Style of Palestrina and the Dissonance* (Copenhagen, 1927, rev. 1946) [B1927-a].

142 Knud Jeppesen, *Kontrapunkt (Vokalpolyfoni)* (Copenhagen and Leipzig, s.a. [1930]) [B1930-a], translated into *Kontrapunkt. Lehrbuch der klassischen Vokalpolyphonie* (cf. footnote 121), *Counterpoint. The Polyphonic Vocal Style of the Sixteenth Century* (New York, 1939) [B1939-a], and subsequently into Japanese, Romanian, Finnish, Hungarian, Slovenian, Chinese, and Greek, cf. Holme Hansen, *Knud Jeppesen Katalog*, 28.

Until now, the continuing health and prosperity of *Acta Musicologica* has derived, above all, from the enthusiasm and dedication of a relatively limited number of outstanding scholars who, like Knud Jeppesen (1931–54) and Hellmut Federhofer (1961–86), have offered literally decades of professional skill and devotion to the scientific and editorial success of the journal.¹⁴³

That is, as Jeppesen expressed it fifty years earlier in Barcelona: ... worked ... and accomplished a lot.

¹⁴³ Lorenzo Bianconi, 'Editoriale – Editorial', *Acta musicologica*, 59/1 (1987), 4.

Abstract

The article explores the pivotal role played by Danish musicologist Knud Jeppesen (1892–1974) as editor of the renowned international journal *Acta musicologica* during the 1930s and 1940s. It emphasizes Jeppesen's involvement in the 1936 Congress of the *Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft* in Barcelona, which took place during a period of escalating political tensions in Europe, marked by pronounced hostility between German musicologists aligned with the Nazi regime and their international counterparts. At the congress, a decision was made to transfer the journal's publisher from the prestigious Leipzig firm Breitkopf & Härtel to the smaller Danish publisher Levin & Munksgaard in Copenhagen – a move that represented a significant victory for those resisting German dominance in musicological circles. Pamela Potter argues that the subsequent German boycott of *Acta musicologica* posed considerable challenges for the journal, leading her to characterize Jeppesen as the 'tragic figure' in this context. Drawing on Jeppesen's personal correspondence with musicologists from both hostile camps, the article examines the sequence of events and the consequences of the German boycott, concluding that – although the boycott likely influenced submissions – the full extent and duration of its impact remain uncertain. Despite personal difficulties, including strained relationships with Breitkopf & Härtel, Jeppesen's editorship ensured that the journal not only survived – even amidst the disruptions of World War II – but also continued to serve as an important platform for global musicological research.

The author:

Thomas Holme, Associate Professor, PhD, School of Communication and Culture – Musicology,
Aarhus University, Langelandsgade 139, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark · musthh@cc.au.dk