
Academic publications are supposed to add to existing research. The usual procedure is the choice of an appropriate area, to discuss previous research in the field in order to show that there is a substantial one-sidedness or even a lacuna which justifies the publication, and then to go about to balance the one-sidedness or fill the gap. Viol does all of this in his doctoral thesis in a highly competent way, at times with amazing self-confidence, yet not always with the fairness and accuracy one could wish for.

The field chosen by Viol is a currently much-discussed object of research, namely intermediality or more precisely, the relationship between "Music and Literature", which he discusses in depth in his introductory chapter (ch. 1). He concentrates in particular on forms and cultural functions of music in contemporary British fiction, including attempts at a 'musicalization of fiction'. To give Viol his due, he has really found a remarkable one-sidedness in research: on perusing the texts written by the 'doyens' in the field (Viol does the reviewer the honour to count him among this distinguished group), one will find a predilection for 'high-brow' fiction, e.g. by Forster, Joyce, Woolf, Beckett, Burgess, Josipovici and others, and one will hear a lot about classical musical forms and classical composers. Although this 'classicism' is certainly not obsolete, in spite of what Viol, from his partisan position, seems to suggest¹, pop music does play an increasing role in today's fiction, as Rushdie's *The Ground Beneath Her Feet*, amongst other contemporary novels, has shown. Unfortunately, Viol refrains from providing a clear definition of pop music in his chapter 2, where he deals with its "Textual Forms and Cultural Meanings", but there is no doubt that it deserves the attention he has dedicated to it.

1 The detailed references to just such music in McEwan's *Saturday*, Rose Tremain's *Music and Silence*, Vikram Seth's *An Equal Music*, Josipovici's *Goldberg: Variations* or Nancy Huston's *Les Variations Goldberg* testify to this.
It is illuminating, though not entirely surprising, to learn through Viol's study that attempts at musicalization that refer to pop music only rarely rely on structural analogies to music, given "pop music's structural simplicity" (246, cf. 69). Instead, in these cases the musicalizing device is predominantly what Viol aptly calls "sound-tracking" (63): the triggering of musical memories, together with their performative contexts (which are particularly important in pop music), in the recipient's mind through the quotation of song texts. In Viol's somewhat idiosyncratic terminology of musicalizing techniques this device, which creates the impression of a musical accompaniment of a text, is classified as "transmedial musicalisation" (161) and appears to be opposed to an "intertextual use" of music (151) – he actually means 'explicit intermedial reference' to music – as well as to "intermedial parallels between musical and literary structure" (151). For the part of Viol's book that is dedicated to these various techniques of a "Musicalisation" of Contemporary Fiction" (ch. 3), the portmanteau title Jukebooks is particularly felicitous, since the texts selected by Viol may indeed be "like jukeboxes: consumers can make them sound, they provide musical pleasure, and are subject to culturally determined (and determining) processes of selection" (10).

The title is, however, somewhat less graphic for chapter 4, which goes beyond the concern of musicalization. Focussing on novels such as Rushdie's The Ground Beneath Her Feet, Kureishi's The Buddha of Suburbia and Hornby's High Fidelity, this chapter generally deals with the "Representations of Popular Music in Contemporary Fiction", including discussions of the use of music for the "Crossing of Boundaries" (ch. 4.1.1), for the construction of "Memory" and the "Past" (ch. 4.1.2) as well as for "Musico-Literary Identities" (ch. 4.2) and the overall "Making of Sense" (ch. 4.2.3) in literary texts. It is nevertheless interesting to see how Viol manages to combine the various ways in which the novels discussed refer to (pop) music with an expert discussion of the social and cultural functions of such references, for instance as a stabilization of youthful identities, as a means of the in-/exclusion of certain reader groups, as a device for the indirect introduction of social "protest and subversion" (11) into the fabric of the texts, and as "period markers" (143).

In contrast to his convincing additions to musico-literary studies as well as to (popular) culture studies, Viol's treatment of previous research in the field as a basis to his own study is considerably less convincing, since it is largely characterized by inaccuracy or even distortion. This applies, firstly, to the alleged "claim that structural analogies are the only true and proper forms of 'musicalisation'" (245). Even a cursory reading of, e.g., Steven Paul Scher's research shows that such a claim cannot be substantiated, and that, e.g., 'word music' (words approaching the condition of music through the foregrounding of sound at the expense of referential meaning) is equally important as a musicalizing device, let alone Scher's category of 'verbal music' (a form of musical ekphrasis), which Viol himself discusses at length. In addition, research has described further forms of musicalization, among them "imaginary content.

---

2 In a curious self-contradiction, Viol, however, states elsewhere that "[s]imple" is not an "apt description for popular music's texture" (86).

3 Viol's terminology does not take into account recent intermediality research (e.g. by Irina O. Rajewsky. Intermedialität. Tübingen: Francke, 2002), where 'transmedial' is defined differently, and continues the confusing blurring of 'intertextuality' and 'intermediality' of older research.
analog[ies]" (the attempt to produce analogous effects as a given or imagined musical composition through verbal imagery).4

The second major inaccuracy in Viol's assessment of existing word-music research – besides his unjustly reproaching it with the "inability to engage [...] with the primary quality of music, i.e. sound, or with [...] related characteristics such as [...] its [...] emotive powers" (60) – is what he considers the failure of "word-and-music scholars"5 to "recognize [...] let alone discuss [...] "the musico- medial implications of such direct reference" as in "'sound-tracking' techniques" (62f.). 'Sound-tracking', according to Viol, re-presents music much more directly than structural analogies, which he denounces as "the most 'unmusical' of all possible interrelations" (60),6 and it is mostly by virtue of this 'direct' technique that he hears music in the "jukebooks" interpreted by him. One should not, however, overrate this directness nor the 'unmusical quality of structural analogies', since the evocation of music through 'sound-tracking' – Viol himself concedes that "fiction cannot have a separate soundtrack" (150) – occurs as much in the reader's mind as through structural analogies. For language is indeed generally unable to "actually make the reader hear music" (84) of whatever kind (regardless of Viol's stubborn claim to the contrary [see ibid.]). And if it is true, as Viol seems to accept, that general references to music tend to be filled by concrete examples from the recipient's range of knowledge, it is not only song texts that can evoke music but certain structures, too (although admittedly less specifically so).7 As for the alleged absence of a discussion of 'sound-tracking' in past research, Zack Bowen, for instance, remarked in 1993 with reference to the many quotations of songs in Joyce's Ulysses that "we read the passages as if we hear the music as well as words",8 and I myself have dedicated an entire chapter to "Forms of evocation of music through [the] associative quotation" of the texts of vocal music,9 although – with an eye to the texts discussed by Viol – I can no longer hold that this form is "in practice not as important as [the] thematicization and imitation"10 of music. Actually,

6 In another self-contradiction, Viol, however, says elsewhere that it is indeed the "intertextual use of pop music" that "must be considered the least 'musical'" (151).
7 Viol's sharp criticism of musical form and structure as musicalizing device (in which context he at one point confuses 'musical' as noun and 'musical' as an adjective [70]) is all the more amazing as he himself treats this aspect at some length in ch. 3.5. He is right to emphasize that structure is only a secondary quality of music and therefore cannot be relevant to all kinds of intermedial imitations of this medium. However, his own definition of music as "organised sound unfurling [...] through time" (60) introduces an idea of musical 'organisation' that is curiously reminiscent of Hanslick's famous formalist definition of music as "töndewegte Formen." It would indeed be crippling for intermediality research to disregard music's structural quality, because, owing to its importance in classical compositions, this quality has had a noteworthy influence on other media trying to approach the condition of music, including, incidentally, painting and even (experimental) film.
9 Wolf (see note 4), ch. 4.5. Viol quotes this form but fails to identify it with his own concept of 'sound-tracking' (see 91).
10 Ibid. 69.
'sound-tracking' – which in literature is not restricted to references to pop music – may on second thought be called a liminal form of intermedial imitation (and not "thematisation", as Viol classifies it [39]), since like intertextuality it re-presents a constituent of the 'pre-text' and thus amounts to what one may call with Irina Rajewsky "partial intermedial reproduction".¹¹ So what is new about the device under discussion is a catchy name, hardly the concept as such. Therefore, Viol's feeling that "pop music's occurrence in (popular) literature cannot be sufficiently accounted for by existing models" (245) is misleading, to say the least.

A third misrepresentation of previous research is used by Viol in order to emphasize his alignment with cultural studies (see 12f.), namely what he calls the blindness to "cultural concerns" which allegedly prevented scholars from "ask[ing] important questions as to why certain music was taken up in certain literary texts" (245). He seems to be unaware that there is in fact research in the field, e.g. in a volume on Cultural Functions of Intermedial Explorations (2002),¹² which includes essays on musico-literary relationships and their function and shows that they go well beyond the 'merely' aesthetic. Here, as on several other occasions, distorting and attacking previous research is entirely unnecessary for the validity of Viol's highly pertinent findings in the field of fiction – pop music relations.¹³ Particularly interesting from an intermedial point of view is, for instance, his highlighting of the recent practice of combining novels and CDs or of illustrating book covers so that they look like CDs (see ch. 3.1).

Where Viol appears to become most strident and indeed "too polemical", as he himself admits (71), is in the 'analysis' of the motivations of previous researchers for privileging references to classical music. According to him, "the quest for classical musical parallelisms in literature is a sure indicator of the sociocultural position of those who undertake it" (71). Viol identifies this 'position' with a conservative class of academics who live in "DWEMsville" (69), practice "aesthetic elitism" (ibid.), and are out of touch with real life and 'cultural practice', people who through their "aesthetic prejudices" (72) persist in an uncritical and outdated belief in "expert craftsmanship" and aesthetic value and who consequently fail to see that it is "quite inadequate" to distinguish between "high and low art" (69). Besides the fact that such polemic, which also includes a reference to the alleged "serious handicaps resulting from one's (advanced) age, (high) social status, and (academic) milieu" (12), is again entirely unnecessary and indeed disqualifying, the underlying reservations, not to say iconoclasm, concerning cultural heritage,¹⁴ the aesthetic, academia as well as an intell-

¹¹ Rajewsky (2002), see note 3. 103.
¹³ This is also true concerning Viol's curious rejection of Scher's distinction between verbal references to real and to fictitious works of music (see 33). Here, it seems, Viol's (postmodernist?) diffidence towards "the positions of author and artistic object" (ibid.) makes him run into devaluing his own contention, namely that it is reference to existing and well-known pop songs (and not to fictitious music) that forms a crucial part of the musicalization of the "jukebooks" discussed.
¹⁴ This hostility towards what Viol conceives of as "old-fashioned" (15) leads him to gross misjudgements right on the first page, where he claims that "[m]odern writers [...] are no longer inspired by classical or biblical themes – or not even by any kinds of literary models at all" (9); one wonders how this sweeping remark fits the works of, e.g., Julian Barnes, who dedicated an entire chapter of his History of the World in 10 ½ Chapters (1989) to the biblical episode of Noah's ark, of Margaret Atwood,
lectural focus on form is curious in a book that itself is well formed, testifies to a powerful intellect and, as a doctoral thesis, functions itself as an entry portal into a kind of academic elite. It is perhaps impossible to convince anyone who does not want to be convinced that there may be a qualitative difference between music produced by Kurt Cobain and music composed, e.g., by J.S. Bach; but for a literary scholar it should at least be clear that there is a difference in the challenge presented by attempts at approaching the condition of music by means of some quotations of song texts as opposed to modelling an entire novel (such as Burgess's *Napoleon Symphony*) on a musical structure. The complexity of the latter device should at least justify critical efforts aiming at clarifying it.

In spite of its weaknesses, Viol's book is a good complement to existing research in the field and can be recommended to anyone interested in up-to-date word-music relations as mirrored in contemporary fiction in English as well as to readers who want to be thoroughly informed about forms and functions of today's (musical) subcultures. It would have been an even better book if it had been written with more accuracy concerning previous research and with less arrogant polemic as a means of expanding word and music studies. For this field has no fixed borders that would exclude certain texts or certain kinds of music, and, after reading *Jukebooks* no one would deny that this field has in fact substantially been extended by Viol.
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