

PUBLICATIONS IN THE FIELD OF MUSICOLOGY
sponsored by
The American Council of Learned Societies

A Bibliography of Periodical Literature in Musicology and Allied Fields and a Record of Graduate Theses Accepted. No. 1: October 1, 1938-September 30, 1939. Assembled for the Committee on Musicology of the ACLS by D. H. Daugherty.

Washington, D. C.: ACLS, 1940. \$.40 (out of print)

A Bibliography of Periodical Literature in Musicology and Allied Fields. No. 2: October 1, 1939-September 30, 1940. Assembled for the Committee on Musicology of the ACLS by D. H. Daugherty, Leonard Ellinwood, and Richard S. Hill.

Washington, D. C.: ACLS, 1943. \$1.00

A Report on Publication and Research in Musicology and Allied Fields in the United States, 1932-1938. Compiled for the Committee on Musicology of the ACLS.

Washington, D. C.: [ACLS] 1938. (out of print)

Research in Primitive and Folk Music in the United States. A Survey by George Herzog. (ACLS Bulletin No. 24, April, 1936)

Washington, D. C.: [ACLS, 1936] \$.25 (out of print)

State and Resources of Musicology in the United States. A Survey made for the ACLS by W. Oliver Strunk. (ACLS Bulletin No. 19, December, 1932)

Washington, D. C.: [ACLS, 1932] \$.25 (out of print)

Music in American Life, by Jacques Barzun. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1956. \$2.75

The Place of Musicology in American Institutions of Higher Learning, by Manfred Bukofzer. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, Inc., 1957. \$.75

Some Aspects of Musicology. Three Essays by Arthur Mendel, Curt Sachs and Carroll C. Pratt. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, Inc., 1957. \$1.25

Fourscore Classics of Music Literature, by Gustave Reese. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, Inc., 1957. \$1.25

THE PLACE OF MUSICOLOGY
In American Institutions of Higher Learning

By MANFRED BUKOFZER

THE LIBERAL ARTS PRESS
NEW YORK

COPYRIGHT©, 1957
THE LIBERAL ARTS PRESS, INC.

Published at 153 West 72nd Street, New York 23, N. Y.

Printed in the United States of America

The AMS has made every effort to obtain electronic publication rights for this work from the copyright holder, but we were unable to locate representatives of this publisher. If you are able to provide information on the copyright holder of any of this title, please notify us as soon as possible at ams@sas.upenn.edu.

FOREWORD

Manfred Bukofzer, brilliant musicologist and humanist, was born on March 27, 1910, and died on December 7, 1955. With his untimely death American scholarship sustained a heavy loss. Coming to this country in 1939, he quickly won the affection, admiration, and respect of his colleagues. His teaching career was rich in achievement. He was a valued member of the faculty of the University of California (Berkeley), and he was recognized as a gifted leader in expanding frontiers of musical learning. All of his writings reflected a soundness of knowledge, a passion for discovery, and a thoroughness in research which other scholars found exemplary. His editings of old music provide a model for persons similarly occupied. His *Music in the Baroque Era* and *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Music* (and many more) are masterly treatises exploring historical and stylistic phenomena. But he wore his learning lightly, enjoying social fellowship with a host of friends who appreciated his real worth both as a man and as a savant. It can be truly said of him—he was irreplaceable.

At the time of his passing and for several years before, Dr. Bukofzer was a most esteemed member of the Committee on Musicology of the American Council of Learned Societies. This Committee, desirous of advancing the cause of musicology in the United States and of attracting increased support for it, devised a series of brochures which might partially achieve these objectives. Realizing the importance of the goal, Professor Bukofzer volunteered at the expense of his own important research to write the initial essay, which is presented to the American public herewith. (It is not, however, the first to be issued; Jacques Barzun's *Music in American Life* appeared in May 1956.) It is a distinguished state-

ment, an expression of strong personal conviction based upon wide experience and erudition.

Musicology, as Professor Bukofzer admits, has enjoyed an amazing development in this country. Nevertheless, its clear identity among the humanities is not fully established, and its rightful place in the academic scene is not permanently located. The author forthrightly describes the current situation as he saw it. His essay, his final scholarly contribution, explains the essence of musicology, warns what it is not, and defines the frame of reference within which it should be studied. Administrators in institutions of higher learning, as well as Mr. Bukofzer's professional colleagues, should profit greatly from his eloquent exposition.

The members of the ACLS Committee on Music and Musicology (until September 30, 1956, called the Committee on Musicology) are Jacques Barzun (Columbia University); Edward Downes (*The New York Times*); Gustave Reese (New York University); Leo Schrade (Yale University), secretary; Edward N. Waters (Library of Congress), chairman. (At the time this paper was planned and prepared, Manfred Bukofzer was a member of the Committee, Carroll C. Pratt of Princeton University was its chairman, and the undersigned was its secretary.) To this group have come the invaluable aid, counsel and collaboration of Dr. D. H. Daugherty, Assistant to the Director of the ACLS. The Committee takes pride and satisfaction in Dr. Bukofzer's essay, one of several written to broaden our understanding of the art and science of musicology.

EDWARD N. WATERS

CONTENTS

1. *The Progress of Musicology*, 3
2. *The Recognition of Music in the College*, 5
3. *Education for Music and Education in Music*, 6
4. *The Traditional Curriculum of Music Instruction*, 8
- 5. *The Conservatory and the Music School*, 13
- >6. *The Academic Music Department*, 15
7. *The Fallacy of the Compromise Solution*, 18
8. *The Place of Musicology in Music Instruction*, 21
9. *Music and Musicology*, 23
10. *Aims of Musicology*, 26
11. *The Study of Musical Styles*, 29
12. *Musicology, a Graduate Study*, 31
13. *Analogy to the Study of Languages*, 36
14. *The Pressure for Degrees*, 38
15. *European and American Plans of Instruction*, 40
16. *Musical Scholarship and "Science,"* 42
17. *Musicology and the Other Humanistic Disciplines*, 43
18. *The Study of Non-Western Music*, 46
19. *Tools and Aids*, 48
20. *Prospects of Musicology*, 49
21. *Summary*, 51

THE PLACE OF MUSICOLOGY
In American Institutions of Higher Learning

THE PLACE OF MUSICOLOGY IN AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

1. *The Progress of Musicology*

In the course of the last three decades the study of musicology in the United States has evinced a development that in certain respects, is spectacular. Virtually nonexistent in the early twenties, it has since that time grown to be a recognized field of study in some of our leading academic institutions; and it is still growing. The rapid pace of this development can be gauged from a comparison of the number of musicological dissertations written in different years. A survey of *Doctoral Dissertations in Musicology*, compiled by a joint committee of the Music Teachers National Association (MTNA) and the American Musicological Society (AMS),¹ indicates the sharp rise. There were three doctoral theses in 1926-1927 and forty-two in 1950-1951. Moreover, only a few of the earlier dissertations can be said to belong to musicology proper, although they may have an important bearing on it. It is noteworthy that most of the earlier theses were sponsored not by music departments, but by departments of psychology, history, or one of the languages.

Musicology thus entered the American university by the backdoor, by way of established nonmusic departments. It is but a natural consequence of the fact that the recognition of music itself as an academic discipline was and still is a slow and sometimes roundabout process. Musicology has merely repeated the pattern of music instruction in general. The latter, too, entered the American university by the back door, either as an extracurricular activity or by way of the band, the choir, or the glee club. Once music had a foot in the door, even the back door, it could press for further

¹ Edited by Helen Hewitt, Denton, Texas, 1952.

recognition. The irregular and somewhat "illegitimate" entry music and musicology made into the academic field is ultimately the reason for the widely divergent status of music in our academic institutions today.

The recognition of musicology, in academic and related circles, was slow in coming. This may be seen in the results of what probably was the first survey of musicology in America: *State and Resources of Musicology in the United States*, published in 1932 by the American Council of Learned Societies for its Committee on Musicology (formed in 1929)? The best-known musical periodical of this country: *The Musical Quarterly*, opened its first issue, in 1915, with an article entitled "On Behalf of Musicology." A new stage was reached with the founding in 1934 of the American Musicological Society, whose activities now include publication of the *Journal of the American Musicological Society*. In 1951 the AMS became a constituent member of the ACLS and was thus recognized as a learned society in the field of the humanities. Some members of the AMS are now also holding office on the board of directors of the International Musicological Society. This international recognition would have been impossible without vigorous activity and the appearance of a number of important musicological publications in this country.

While there is certainly reason to review with satisfaction what has been achieved so far, the actual development has nevertheless not fully realized the potentialities. Lacking a general program or plan, musicology has grown by fits and starts. It has profited, sometimes vicariously, from a larger movement, the academic recognition of music in general; but it has at the same time inherited certain problems of college music which have in the long run tended to impede its progress.

² American Council of Learned Societies Bulletin No. 19, edited by Oliver Strunk, Washington, D. C., 1932.

2. *The Recognition of Music in the College*

The recognition of music as an academic subject in the undergraduate college is a rather recent and, we should add, a specifically American achievement. Since the first World War there has been a tremendous increase in musical activity both in the public schools and in the colleges. The almost incredible expansion in public-school music is undoubtedly an outgrowth of the vital interest in music shown by the American public generally. This phenomenon is unique. Only in this country has the idea of a general musical education been combined with the comprehensive school system of an industrial and democratic society. The sociological reason for this unforeseen expansion is not any secret formula for musical organization but the fact that the schools, especially those of the urban areas, offer a degree of mass education not equalled in any other country. It should be noted that the idea of musical opportunity for everybody was not prompted by technological progress, as has often been assumed. The phonograph and more especially the radio were developed as true means of mass distribution of music only after the idea of mass education in music had already been conceived and put into action. But their usefulness was seen at once and they have given the movement its tremendous impetus, undreamed of by its initiators.

Once the idea of equal musical opportunity was firmly implanted in the schools it naturally was extended to the colleges and from there finally to the graduate schools. The far-reaching implications of all this have not been clearly realized. Obviously, this type of musical education was not intended for the training of professional musicians, although this may not have been entirely clear to its early proponents. Its logical aim could only be to foster more intelligent listening habits in the same way as a general education seeks to produce a more intelligent human being. It is therefore the idea of music as a liberal art, of music as part of the humanities, that underlies the idea of mass education in music.

3. *Education for Music and Education in Music*

In musical education two aims must be distinguished: education *for* music and education *in* music. The goal of the former is to bring the young and the adult into contact with music, to lead them to an understanding of and intelligent response to it, to enable them to have a broad artistic experience, and to sharpen the senses and the mind for cultural values in general. The musical experience just described corresponds to the experience of great masterpieces of literature and the fine arts. There is no more thought of making the listener a composer than there would be of making the student of literature a poet. An intense musical experience calls for a certain amount of education *in* music, all theories of certain music educators to the contrary notwithstanding. It is a fallacy to assume that musical illiteracy can be overcome purely by "talent," "intuition," and receiving inspirational lectures. The listener needs familiarity with the rudiments of musical structure, though opinions may differ as to the necessary extent of this familiarity. Education *for* music thus always to some degree overlaps education *in* music, but this overlap should not obscure the difference in goals.

Education *in* music naturally covers also all the technical knowledge an intelligent listener needs for a well-rounded education *for* music, but its aim is more limited and is that of a much smaller number of people. In its purest and highest forms education in music means the training of the three most specialized representatives in the field: the composer, the virtuoso performer, and the musicologist. Both the "cultural" and the "professional" aims are necessary and justified; though they differ in nature, they are in fact interdependent.

Education for music is an old idea. It is ultimately derived from the Renaissance ideal of the well-educated gentleman whose education would be considered incomplete without some ability in music. The importance of music in the

general education of that time is perhaps best known to the humanist from Castiglione's book, *The Courtier*. It should be recognized that the idea of a general education that should include music was originally an aristocratic ideal. Indeed, some of our latter-day "educators" have decried it for this very reason as "undemocratic." They have failed to understand that in the course of the nineteenth century the social basis of general education was broadened and destined to become the essential support of an enlightened, democratic society. The transformation of the aristocratic ideal into a democratic one has not been a steady process and has not been free from contradictory tendencies. Further expansion of the social basis has raised the problem of mass communication in an industrial society. Considerations of quality, which should always be decisive in matters concerning education, are in danger of being replaced by those purely of quantity. Opportunities for good music are then confused with opportunities for any kind of music, good, bad, or indifferent.

With the shift toward the quantitative, the musical experience loses exactly those qualities that make it valuable from the cultural point of view. In other words, music ceases to be a qualitative experience and becomes a means of inconsequential entertainment. Overemphasis upon the idea of entertainment in the arts has indeed vitiated the fundamentally favorable opportunities of the present situation. But even if education for music has not been turned to the best account, its underlying idea is sound and belongs to the best tradition of the humanities.

It is this humanistic background that determines the proper place of music in the college. Here education was from the beginning firmly grounded in the liberal arts, although music had to be satisfied at first with a marginal existence. For a long time music was regarded more as a genteel ornament than as a discipline, an attitude still to be found in a not inconsiderable part of the academic world. The recognition of music in the liberal arts college was in-

evitable, however, if the idea of a liberal arts education was to be taken up in earnest.

Sincere concern for the humanities was only one of the factors that brought music into the college. Coexistent with that concern was the development of vocational education, which manifested itself in the introduction of "practical" courses, such as home economics. The subsequent gradual rapprochement between the liberal arts college and the professional school has tended to blur the distinction between types of education that were at one time considered valuable in their own right precisely because they existed independently of one another. In music the result has been an increased and one-sided emphasis on practical music, identified essentially with performance or what has lately been called "applied music." This unfortunate term reveals a misconception of what music is.

The perplexing situation in which music instruction in academic institutions finds itself is due to the fact that complementary aspects have developed in opposite directions. The proper relations of these various aspects to the whole of music can be maintained only if the place of music in higher education is clearly understood. What with the prevailing confusion concerning the integration of music among the other academic disciplines, it is not surprising that a consistent policy cannot easily be formulated. Since the development of musicology in this country has been affected, a discussion of the place of the discipline and its function must first consider the framework of music instruction in which it operates.

4. *The Traditional Curriculum of Music Instruction*

The study of music as it is pursued in American colleges is customarily divided into four large areas: Theory, History, Performance ("Applied Music"), and Music Education. The latter two are newcomers, which in certain schools have

begun to encroach on the traditional and more legitimate areas. The usual subdivisions are as follows:

A. Theory

- musicianship, rudiments of notation, scales, ear training, and solfege;
- (2) written exercises and some keyboard practice in harmony (diatonic and chromatic); counterpoint (modal and tonal); instrumentation and orchestration; composition (sometimes regarded as a separate branch subject);
- (3) analysis (harmonic and formal);

B. History

- (1) survey of music history (as an orientation course);
- (2) history of single periods and styles (Renaissance, Baroque, Classical, etc.);
- (3) history of media and forms (choral music, symphony, etc.);
- (4) supplementary courses and courses preparatory to majors, usually called "appreciation";

C. Performance

- (1) group performance; vocal (choral, smaller ensembles); instrumental (orchestra, chamber music, band); mixed ensembles (*collegium musicum* and opera workshop);
- (2) individual instruction in voice and instruments;

D. Music Education

- (1) "methods" courses (vocal and instrumental);
- (2) courses in "materials and techniques" for elementary school, high school, etc.;
- (3) supervised practice teaching.

While not all institutions offer all these subjects with equal emphasis, the above outline includes nearly all that is usually

taught in the undergraduate college. Graduate study is essentially a continuation of the courses just specified (with the exception of the most elementary ones) and offers substantially the same type of courses in an "advanced" form.

Where does musicology come in? Most frequently it is offered among the graduate courses as an added specialized pursuit. In some institutions musicology is introduced also at the undergraduate level, usually in the area of history and under the title of "elementary musicology." To assign to musicology a tagged-on position of this kind shows, as will be seen below, a misunderstanding of its nature, due to the customary division of the field into four compartments. This division has frequently been under fire, though not always for sound reasons. A large field must obviously be subdivided and originally the divisions were no more than a pedagogical device to keep related material together and to teach it in a rational and efficient manner. What must be criticized is not so much the division itself as the gradual compartmentalization of subjects. With a decreasing circulation of ideas a hardening of the arteries has set in which has fatally affected the entire system. It is precisely the relation of one subject matter to the others that helps to give all of them their validity.

To relieve the situation, various remedies have been tried without success. The same elements can be arranged in a different order, in a different time sequence, or can be combined in one big "integrated" course; but these mechanical attempts at improvement do not strike at the root of the evil. The divisions have their pedagogical justification, and neither their abolition nor their rearrangement can by itself guarantee results. It is the teacher of these courses who must constantly bring out the vital interrelations between the specialized subjects and thus lead the student to an understanding of them and, as far as possible, of the whole. A teacher unaware of them or too inarticulate to present them will fail to do this no matter how perfectly the curriculum may be arranged on paper.

What is actually taught in the theory as opposed to the so-called "practice" of music is not by any means a basic musical theory in the sense of an underlying philosophy, but a set of rules derived from an artificially restricted number of models. In harmony the student rarely gets beyond the rules derived from the style of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Similarly, the instruction in counterpoint is limited to what is vaguely called "strict writing" (modal counterpoint, roughly the equivalent of sixteenth-century style) and "free writing" (tonal counterpoint, eighteenth-century style). Little or no attempt is made to interpret these rules as generalizations of living musical styles, which represent mutually exclusive principles of musical structure. Yet these stylistic principles form in turn the basis for an intelligent teaching of both composition and analysis. The principles of stylistic analysis are valid also for the actual writing of music. Properly understood, analysis is composition in reverse.

The subject matter of music history embraces also the study of relationships, not of isolated dates, titles, and biographical anecdotes. Its first prerequisite is a thorough knowledge of the music itself. No amount of historical minutiae can substitute for it. For the understanding of a composition is at the same time both technical and historical, and the technical aspects of its structure cannot be completely grasped without considering the position of the music in its own time and in relation to earlier and later compositions. History without theory is as blind as theory without history is arid. In other words, history and theory, while easily separable in the abstract, are in fact completely interdependent.

Performance seems at first sight to be more self-sufficient than the two disciplines just discussed, but this is a delusion fostered by the huge amount of time spent on practice and external drill. The preoccupation with problems of muscular co-ordination and with memorizing a small number of pieces is the chief cause of the dangerous isolation of this art. The

prevalent cult of the "personal" manner leads away from the music and encourages the performer to play all styles in the same manner. Only a few teachers of performance insist on the simple truth that performance, too, is subject to the laws of musical style and that interpretation must grow out of the music itself.

Another typical attitude is the unmusical separation of "technique" from "style" in performance. It can be illustrated most palpably by the student who told a well-known pianist: "I have acquired all the technique I need; now I am coming to you to learn style and interpretation."

Lastly, the unhealthy specialization in the subject known as music education is especially noteworthy. Surely the danger point has been reached when the knowledge of teaching methods becomes more important than the knowledge of music itself; when the alternative is posed whether a music teacher should be primarily a good teacher or a good musician; and when musicianship is relegated to "subject-matter orientation." It is true that there is ample room for improvement in the teaching of music, especially in the lower grades, but it is questionable whether this will be brought about by methods relying on faulty information. A glance at the textbooks which supply the "method" with "subject-matter background" discloses a frightening degree of studied or involuntary ignorance in matters of music history and theory.

Equally unhealthy is the tendency to stress the entertainment aspect of music and to pretend that music, or any other humanistic discipline, can be learned without sustained effort. Music education falls short of its objective if it fails to afford a genuine musical experience that will make the student like and understand music for its own sake. Instead, he is coaxed into liking music for irrelevant reasons which will ultimately work against music. What has just been stated about a good performance applies also to music education; it must grow out of the music itself. Those who believe otherwise treat music as though it were a bitter pill that needed sugar-coating.

The four areas outlined above are completely covered in almost no one curriculum. Two patterns of selection have become norms, that of the conservatory or professional music school, and that of the academic department of music.

5. *The Conservatory and the Music School*

The professional musician used to receive his training at the conservatory, which has a long and respectable tradition outside the university. It is only recently that it has been urged that conservatory training be offered also at the university or the college. This trend has been gaining rapidly and has led to the establishment of professional schools at universities under the name of "School of Music." The rise of the School of Music at state universities has had a profound effect on music instruction. The private music teacher and the private school, which so far had had complete control over professional instruction, suddenly found themselves faced with a tax-supported competitor. At the same time the School of Music could offer reasonably secure jobs to private teachers. Yet some large and distinguished conservatories continued to exist outside the universities as independent institutions.

Given its essentially practical aim, a conservatory or School of Music cannot make it its business to supply a general education any more than can, say, a School of Mining or of Medicine. The special arts and techniques required in these fields call for high concentration and thorough training, which take up a great amount of time. This means that the conservatory must take the cultural values of music for granted. In other words, the student at a professional school should already possess a general education or should be in the process of acquiring one concurrently at institutions best suited to this purpose.

Technical drill and constant repetition are necessary in order to insure muscular co-ordination and gradually make performance part of the habitual and subconscious make-up

of the student. The enormous number of hours spent in practice is alone sufficient proof that performance is not a humanistic discipline, but it is nevertheless a rigorous and demanding study that has an integrity of its own. Much the same is true of the seemingly endless written exercises that are supposed to lead to mastery and to culminate in original composition. In sum, a careful distinction of aims must be made; the student may perform and write music in order to achieve technical proficiency or as a means of gaining an understanding of its structure and its cultural values.

The conservatories are geared to the musical life as it exists in the present and must satisfy the demands of orchestral musicians, singers, arrangers, conductors, and composers on all levels of music. The curriculum emphasizes mainly the doing, that is performance, and to a lesser degree the writing of exercises. This fare may be complemented by a dose of music education. Notoriously the weakest area is that of history which, if it is taught at all, is presented without proper relation to the music performed, and by teachers who lack thorough training. The music taught in performance courses is limited largely to the so-called "current repertory" and, as a result, the student's musical knowledge is restricted to a set number of "pieces" which go under the loose designation of "classics." It has often been observed that the broader aspects of musical literature are consistently neglected. This is understandable in view of the professional approach, though not excusable.

The production of competent professionals takes a great deal of time. The training of a virtuoso extends nearly always from early childhood to his twenties and even early thirties. For composers even more time may be required for the maturing of their creative abilities. This point, which every serious musician will readily concede, is decisive in any discussion of the differences between the conservatory and the School of Music.

The conservatory is not bound by a strict time limit. Its

master classes are open only to those who are ready for them regardless of how many years have been spent in preparation. But the often-voiced criticism that the discrimination of musical styles is neglected or sacrificed to performance remains true. The danger that the conservatory may turn out superbly trained technicians without intellectual grasp of the music they perform is always a very real one. It can be overcome only by a sound general education in music.

A School of Music, on the other hand, operates within the normal four years of a college curriculum. Now, it is generally agreed among musicians that professional competence cannot possibly be developed within this period, not even with a graduate year added. Yet the Schools of Music claim to do just this and even pretend to supply in addition some kind of general education, all within the same time. The consequences of this mixed program will be discussed later. At present it will suffice to state that even under ideal conditions a School of Music can only make a pretense of carrying out its program; it envisages too many disparate activities over too short a period. There is an inner contradiction in its conception that makes it a permanent problem child of the university. In the conservatory, on the other hand, no such contradiction exists—at least, none need exist.

6. The Academic Music Department

A Music Department, called "academic" (in the favorable sense of the word), is primarily concerned with music as a liberal art. Such a department stands on a level with the other departments of the humanities. Music instruction at a liberal arts college is based on the premise that an educated perception of the arts is an indispensable part of a general education. Music is introduced therefore not with the aim or the pretense of training future musicians but of giving the students a broad aesthetic experience in music. The general courses are intended essentially for those who will form the

future audience of our concert halls and opera houses. Instruction is directed at the future supporters of our musical life, on which in turn professional musicians depend.

An understanding of the importance of cultural values must be inculcated early in the education of the comparatively few who will eventually dedicate their lives to music. Hence, the musical offering in a liberal arts college emphasizes the relation of music to the other arts and its position in history and society. Special attention is paid to the changes of ideas that underlie the changes of musical styles and to the different attitudes toward music in different historical periods. In the largest context it will finally show the principles and limitations of Western music as compared with those of the music of non-Western civilizations.

Music as a liberal art must be seen as a manifestation of the human spirit, as a part of the history of ideas. Hence, the technical side of music is taught not for its own sake, but as the indispensable means for gaining an insight into the workings of the musical medium, even as grammar gives insight into language. The grammar of music is only a part of a more comprehensive picture; it is the starting point for more specialized and technical investigations for those who want to become specialists, whether composers, performers, or musicologists.

No matter what the specialization intended, it can flourish only if founded on a liberal arts education. This objective justifies offering of the so-called "appreciation courses." These courses have been much maligned in the past and, unfortunately, often with good reason. If they teach music as a means of indulging habits of sentimentality or as a scheme for the support of the recording industry, they are indeed worse than no music course at all. Yet, the principle of a course in intelligent listening is in full accord with the conception of liberal education. Appreciation courses are therefore not only defensible but necessary. It is the choice of principle that matters. Bad teaching can be corrected, a bad principle cannot. Some institutions have recognized this and

have assigned their most mature staff members to such courses. This policy will in the long run pay high dividends. Performance also has its rightful place in the liberal arts college. It serves as a means whereby the student obtains first-hand knowledge of the literature of music and has the experience of performing in a group, an experience quite different from that of listening either to performance by others or to a record. It will make the student aware of the difference between active listening and that kind of passive listening which takes the form of turning on the radio "to concentrate" on something else. Performance courses also supplement the repertory of professional concerts, which give but a small fraction of the entire musical literature, and may be made to supplement the much more extensive one available on records. Learning the literature and participating in group activity form the ultimate justification for having performance courses such as orchestra, chamber music, chorus, and collegium musicum at a liberal arts college. But this does not mean that there is a place there for individual instruction in voice and instruments.

The position of performance at the liberal arts college seems paradoxical only to those who do not understand the idea behind it. The performances cannot and should not claim professional finish, but on the other hand the standard should not be deliberately low. The danger of taking a certain snobbish delight in flouting professional standards has not always been avoided. Contrariwise, performance in the college has repeatedly been criticized as "amateurish" on the tacit and false assumption that it is supposed to compete with or substitute for professional concerts. Judging college music by the yardstick of professional performance has done it great harm. It seems that the "professional's fallacy" exists only in regard to music, since nobody would dream of maintaining that only established dramatists and actors can understand Shakespeare.

Both the Music Department and the conservatory fulfill important functions, which need in no way be antagonistic.

The two institutions complement each other, and the author of these lines, speaking as one who has been educated in both concurrently, can state that he has greatly profited from both. Difficulties are bound to arise only when the one invades the realm of the other and when their respective means and goals become confused.

7. *The Fallacy of the Compromise Solution*

Music instruction at our universities expanded so rapidly that the question of its legitimate place has received little or no attention. Certain institutions decided upon the establishment of a School of Music, others set up a Music Department. Moreover, many institutions adopted a compromise between liberal arts and professional orientation, with the result that it made little difference whether the curriculum was organized nominally as a School or a Department. At some universities a School of Music exists side by side with a Department, each complete within itself. This always involves wasteful overlap and duplication.

The gradual assimilation of curricula is a peculiarly American phenomenon, but a most questionable form of singularity. The mixing of aims makes it impossible to pursue a clear policy, and the result may be that neither a general musical education nor professional competence can be achieved. The idea of offering a little of everything, which obviously satisfies only the requirements of the lower levels of music education, is an attempt at organized mediocrity. It can be overcome only by the most talented and determined students working against the system. If there is any prevailing danger in our national music education today, it is what may be called the department-store conception of music instruction, in which the essentials of both curricula are reduced and offered at bargain prices.

The department-store conception has taken many different forms. In academic departments it has led to accepting more

and more credit points in performance toward a nominally academic degree. It has opened the college to teachers in semiprofessional courses who do not understand the function of performance in the liberal arts college.

In the Music Schools the same assimilation is urged from the opposite end. It has already been shown that the really fundamental error in the conception of a Music School is not that its aim is professional (what else could it be?) but the fact that in both its curriculum and its administration it is senselessly and artificially patterned after a college. It is a plain truth that the graduates of a Music School who are termed Bachelors of Music are neither competent professionals on their instruments nor finished products of a liberal education. Technical proficiency can be indicated not by an academic or pseudo-academic degree but only by actual attainment (which can be certified by a diploma). A good violinist proves himself not by a series of letters after his name, but by his playing; a composer does so by his compositions.

The external imitation of the college has in effect supplanted honest certificates by specious degrees in an effort to profit from the prestige of genuinely academic institutions. The notorious "upgrading" that has taken place at Music Schools has most frequently taken the form of interlarding professional courses with so-called "cultural" courses in languages, literature, and other fields. These are frequently but the window-dressing of an essentially unchanged, though watered-down, professional curriculum. The substitute courses have generally proved to be poor because there are lacking a special faculty, proper library facilities, and, not infrequently, a congenial academic climate. On the other hand, they take away much needed time from the professional training, so that the door is opened to what can really be called amateurish standards. Unfortunately, even some conservatories have followed this trend and reorganized themselves after the pattern of the School of Music. Here

again the new "collegiate department," which cannot compare with the genuine article, has been established at the expense of high professional standards.

The unthinking imitation of the college pattern shows itself perhaps most glaringly in the adoption of the academic ladder ranging from instructor to full professor. A delicate problem arises when an Assistant Professor of Trombone is to be promoted to Associate Professor of Trombone. Since he was engaged in the first place because of his mastery of his instrument, it is difficult to find valid grounds for promotion except for quantitative ones such as length of service.

The compromise solution is obviously not the answer. A far more efficient realization of either goal can be achieved if each maintains its own identity and integrity. This does not mean that each should be isolated from the other and exist in a vacuum. If the collegiate departments of conservatories were really first-rate colleges on a level with others, the above criticism would naturally not apply. Some serious efforts in this direction are being made, but there is apparently great difficulty in getting rid of the idea that one can cut corners in a liberal education. A course in English literature, for example, makes definite demands which it would be preposterous to "adjust" to the level of future engineers or musicians. A liberal education is one and indivisible for everybody regardless of the future specialization of the student.

A Music Department cannot pretend to do more than give undergraduates a solid general education in music. No professional musician can dispense with it, since it is the foundation for the technical competence which he acquires at a professional school. This school may exist outside and independently of a university or may be run as a nonacademic adjunct in the University Extension or some similar organization working in harmony with, but not within the confines of, the Music Department.

8. *The Place of Musicology in Music Instruction*

It follows from the foregoing discussion that institutions in which professional and academic goals are mixed or confused will also misrepresent or misunderstand the place and function of musicology. This is why musicology is so often thought of as just another isolated set of courses that can be tagged on to any type of existing curriculum. Actually, musicology presupposes a liberal arts curriculum in music, to which it is related as a comprehensive method is to its subject matter. The scholarly study of music-this is the briefest and least pretentious definition of musicology-embraces all aspects of music and is therefore not an isolated field but an encompassing *approach* through which one may make close contact with any musical manifestation. It is consistent with this definition that musicology is a specialized pursuit or field only in so far as this approach may become the subject of a special study.

With regard to the four areas of music instruction, the encompassing nature of musicology means that the discipline formulates and furnishes the underlying ideas and principles which tie the separate areas together into a whole. Thus it is clear why it would be a mistake to advocate that musicology be added in the undergraduate college as an area additional to the existing four. To do so would only add to the general confusion. To institute a course in undergraduate musicology would mean that the student would be attempting to take the second step before having taken the first. This is the reason why it was necessary to outline the existing music instruction in such detail. Prospective musicologist will need all that is offered in the general music instruction of the college, provided-and this proviso is of the utmost importance-that the instruction is given not in a narrow and prematurely professional but in a humanistic spirit. Here again it is the attitude, not the external organization, that is decisive. Undergraduate music courses, if properly

taught, cannot help being preparatory and introductory courses to musicology. Neither can they help giving the student of performance and composition a firm foundation for and a better understanding of his special interest.

The thought that the humanistic and the musicological approaches coincide calls for illustration. Evidently, it is one thing to teach diatonic harmony according to the rules of a textbook, in order to achieve proficiency in writing music, and another to teach it as a means for gaining insight into the structure of classical music. A teacher unaware of the stylistic limits and the historical position of the classical style and unable to show the changing relations between it and the preceding and following styles will not succeed in extracting from the rules a live musical experience. Now there is nothing wrong with "rules" so long as they are taught as generalizations of stylistic principles. These latter are the main business of musicology, however comprehensive the sum of its functions may be. Any teacher of music should be familiar with the principles of style in order to make his specialty musically meaningful, be it theory, composition, performance or education. This does not postulate that all music teachers should be musicologists, but that they should be familiar enough with musicological method to arrive at stylistic principles for themselves.

What has been said of the teaching of diatonic harmony applies equally to the teaching of the other subdivisions of theory as well as to "practical" music. Many teachers of performance and theory have the uneasy suspicion that musicology exhausts itself in the minutiae of music history and has no relation whatever to their daily work. This is due in part to ignorance and in part to the type of music history to which these teachers were themselves exposed. They are in this respect the victims of their own system. Stylistic criticism and the history of styles have been severely neglected in the past because they were taught by persons unfamiliar with musicological method and incapable of demonstrating the vital connections between music and music history.

An enlightened conception of musical theory, one that has profited from the results of musicology, goes far beyond what the term is normally supposed to include. Musical theory according to such a conception can be defined broadly as the method of explaining the structure of music. It has already been shown that only a very small segment of the musical structures of the past is taught at present in our theory classes. There are many others that cannot be explained by the commonly accepted rules of modal or tonal counterpoint or diatonic and chromatic harmony. This is one reason why music from other centuries—and even some music of our own century—proves to be such a constant source of embarrassment to our music instruction. This embarrassment would not arise if each musical style were to be analyzed and explained in its own terms and according to its own aesthetic standards. To deduce such standards and principles from the music is indeed much more difficult and laborious than is the application of ready-made schemes. That it helps in this task is one of the immensely "practical" values of musicology.

9. *Music and Musicology*

The relation of music to musicology has often been discussed and sometimes in a rather abusive manner. Much has been made of the distinction between the knowledge of music and knowledge *about* music. The first is supposedly the domain of the musician, the second that of the musicologist. Like all oversimplifications, this is only a half-truth; if the division between these two types of knowledge were carried to extremes, the end would be absurdity, for neither can exist in pure form, divorced from the other. The identification of musicology as knowledge about music has been summarized in the joke "Musicology deals with all aspects of music except music itself" or still more briefly as "words without song." It has also been said that a musicologist is a "*musicien manque*." Perhaps some musi-

cologists are, but perhaps some composers are frustrated musicologists.

Actually, the large area of knowledge with which the musicologist and the musician deal is common to both; it is always knowledge of and about music. It should be remembered that "knowing music" is not the same as memorizing music. There are virtuosos who have committed every note of a complex work to memory and can start playing it at any given point, yet have no idea of its formal and harmonic structure. In the deeper sense of the words they do not know what they are doing, even though they may give "unconsciously" a creditable performance. The correct order of the notes is meaningless if one does not understand the relationships between them that turn a series of pitches into the potential source of an aesthetic experience. The study and explanation of such relationships are within the province of musicology.

The fallacy of separating the knowledge of and about music can be shown by many examples. We may consider first an unusual passage in the Eroica: the introduction, in the development, of a new idea in the key of the Neapolitan minor. The significance of this passage in Beethoven's total output can be grasped only if one "knows" a great many other development sections in Beethoven's compositions. This knowledge will enable us to draw conclusions about Beethoven's usual development technique. If we want to appraise Beethoven's contribution to the development of classical music in general we shall need in turn an equally broad knowledge of the developmental techniques of Haydn and Mozart; only the comparison of these three would finally enable us to make a valid generalization about developmental technique in classical music. Thus the observation of a single striking feature in a symphony may lead us step by step to principles and problems that are the essential subject matter of musicological research.

The masses of Palestrina offer another example. Recent research has discovered the fact that a considerable number

of them are "parody masses": they are based on other compositions by Palestrina himself or by other composers. Now, if we study the music without knowing about parody masses and without examining the model composition, we may easily make the mistake of crediting Palestrina with music he borrowed from others. It is obviously impossible to evaluate a parody mass if one does not distinguish between original and borrowed material. Only on this basis can one discover how Palestrina improved upon his model. Indeed, these improvements reveal the true genius of the composer. In this case, who could make a sharp division between knowledge of music and knowledge about music?

Sometimes it is argued that all these considerations are irrelevant in the face of the one and only important question, whether or not the composition is beautiful or enjoyable. This position brushes aside all historical considerations and seemingly concentrates on the music itself. But the appearance is deceptive. This is not concentration on the music but on one's personal response to it. Any decision about beauty involves standards by which the composer should be judged, and these standards presuppose musical knowledge. If one misses the point of the parody mass one misses the point of its structure. If one lacks a principle by which to grasp structure, to raise the question of "beauty" is to become concerned with a matter for which one does not have the means for penetrating insight, however enthusiastically one may obtain a partial glimpse of the truth. There is always the danger that raising the question of "beauty" may give rise to a vague escape into the subjective and to a pretext for an anti-intellectual attitude.

The musics of different stylistic periods and of different cultures can only be judged by the standards they set themselves. A certain harmonic usage, a certain interval pattern, or the total absence of harmony constitute configurations of musical thought that can be understood only in their own terms. We must, in other words, grasp the principles by which any music is put together. The idea, recurrent through

the ages, that musical understanding can be left purely to intuition comes to us especially as one of the persistent survivals of romantic thought. Upon investigation, this "intuition" always turns out to be merely the criteria and rationalizations unconsciously taken over from a past generation. The widespread resistance to modern music is a case in point, but an equally striking example is the romanticized conception of Bach or Beethoven, which has survived in certain quarters to the present day.

10. Aims of Musicology

The ultimate goal of musicology, like that of any other scholarly discipline, is understanding. Through understanding, music becomes a more intense aesthetic experience with wider and richer associations, greater sensual pleasure, and deepened spiritual satisfaction. Aiming at understanding, musicology has in consequence no axe to grind. It is not interested in "defending" artistic manifestations of the past or the present. It tries to discover all the forms that music has taken and sees each one as a manifestation of the human mind. The musicologist seeks and gathers all types of musical knowledge, regardless of whether they can be of immediate use. An immense amount of this knowledge can be turned directly to practical purposes, but the utilitarian point of view is neither the sole nor necessarily the driving aim of the musicologist.

It would betray a very limited conception of musicology if it were thought of only as the willing handmaid of musical practice supplying fodder for the concert hall and replenishing the repertory of the performing artist. The discovery and revival of old music is a genuine and very important function of musicology, but it is not the only one. Should we refuse to be interested in Handel's operas because they have not yet found a permanent place in the repertory?

The practical aspects of musicology change with the times and what in one period may have seemed extremely far-

fetched may in another become commonplace. When the complete works of Bach were published by the Bachgesellschaft, its editors never dreamed that their edition was destined to revolutionize musical practice. The edition was intended primarily as a monument, and only secondarily for practical performance, yet without it Bach's works would not be as widely played as they are today. A good example is the amazing development of long-playing recordings-completely unforeseen by the experts-which has made available for the first time a large repertory of great music hitherto regarded as "obscure" and of limited interest. Indeed, the recording companies are now scanning musicological publications in search of things to record. All this goes to show that in musicology, as in theoretical physics, certain activities originally considered to be completely unrelated to direct application may suddenly be found extremely practical.

Like the scientist and the historian, the musicologist is bent on research, on the discovery and explanation of new material that will enlarge the fund of human knowledge and open up new vistas and new conceptions. He may point out that certain dynamics were not used in the Bach period, and in so doing he states a significant item of scholarly information. The question, however, of how the modern artist should apply these dynamics in his playing of Baroque music cannot be answered by scholarship alone. If the scholar tells the modern performer what to do, he becomes, in a sense, a practical musician himself and steps out of character. He is then not satisfied with the investigation of facts, but draws conclusions for musical practice that cannot be proved historically. Many a notable musicological work contains such judgments, but the good musicologist must be aware of the fine line of demarcation that separates the investigation from the interpretation of his material.

The charge has been made that to the historian any and all events are equally important and that similarly the music historian must impartially consider both good and bad music. Now, the mass of music assiduously collected by the

music historians is only the raw material of music history. Works of uneven value exist in the history of art as well as in the history of music. The musicologist must be able to strike a balance between the historical and the artistic importance of a composition, and these by no means always coincide.

Through emphasis and selection, the musicologist consciously or unconsciously makes aesthetic judgments that reflect his own time and temperament. The evaluation of musical standards varies with each generation or each period. Informed attitudes towards the music of famous composers are not constants but variables. The masterworks of the past do not change, yet they mean something new to each generation. It has rightly been said that histories must be rewritten every thirty years, and it should be added that periodic re-evaluation is needed even more urgently in the case of musical styles.

There is a curious and noteworthy affinity between methods of composition in modern and medieval music. Although it may sound paradoxical it is nevertheless true that by a subtle process of give-and-take an insight into the technique of Machaut will facilitate an understanding of Hindemith's music and vice versa. It would be folly to take Machaut as a "modernist" as some enthusiasts have done. The similarities must be recognized, but they are found in a different context and have a different meaning. Least of all do they prove anything for or against the validity of modern style.

How strongly the ideas of a period may influence musicological evaluations may be seen in editions of Purcell's music. Purcell's characteristic dissonances sounded "wrong" to Victorian editors and were consequently expunged from his music as "mistakes." To us today not only do they sound right but they account for much of the charm of Purcell's music.

It is a widely held and persistent misconception that musicology is preoccupied with old music and is essentially a

pursuit followed by antiquarians. To the antiquarian the music of the past is good or interesting not because of its inherent quality but because it is old. Naive reverence for old works merely because they are not new and sentimental admiration of age for its own sake are signs of a lack of historical perspective. Artistic manifestations are not interesting curiosities salvaged for the present. Good and bad music have existed at all times, and the musicologist is interested in defining the difference between the two in each period. If he seems preoccupied with old music, as indeed he often is, it is merely because there is, after all, so much more of it. In principle, however, there is no difference in musicological significance between research work in modern and that in medieval music.

11. *The Study of Musical Styles*

If we examine the vast literature about music, we find, to the displeasure of many of us, that by far the largest part consists of biographies. The strange emphasis on biographical writing reflects very clearly the historical age of which musicology itself is a child and, more especially, the hero worship characteristic of the nineteenth century. Even more disturbing is the fact that the life of a composer has frequently received more thorough treatment than his musical works which, after all, are what make him deserving of a biography in the first place. There are, of course, good and valid reasons why biographies of musicians should be written, even if their music may not be worth while. Such works can indeed be fascinating psychological, historical, or sociological documents, though they are written from a point of view that is not strictly musicological, but from one that combines musicology with other disciplines. Certain biographies—such as Thayer's *Beethoven* or Newman's *Wagner*, to name only a pair of famous examples—are in effect painstaking historical studies that make no actual contact with the essence of music. Invaluable as these books are for the establishment of

dates and other facts *about* music, so far as the masterworks themselves are concerned the biographers might just as well have been tone-deaf.

The overemphasis on biography has led to a large body of anecdotal literature which, though it has found great favor with radio commentators, is neither musical nor musicological literature and can only be designated as "musical science fiction." In recent years a shift of emphasis has taken place. Musicologists have begun to concentrate more and more on the study of musical styles. Indeed, style criticism must be recognized as the core of modern musicology.

Style must not be confused with mannerism or with a cliché by which a composer may be recognized immediately. It embraces all those factors that in their distinct configuration produce the unity and coherence of the music. Concentration on musical style means concentration on the music itself, but at the same time the stylistic approach is more comprehensive because it tries to formulate the musical principles that have activated styles in musical history. These principles never lie on the surface, but must be extracted by analysis. The configurations called musical styles transcend any single composition. Inasmuch as they are the generalizations of principles, they are abstractions, but necessary abstractions which permit us to see the unity of any one composition in the same way as the abstraction "oak" helps us in the process of recognition when we are confronted by a particular specimen.

The history of music must be seen not as a large portrait gallery of individual composers, but as a history of musical styles, and the latter in turn must be seen as a history of ideas. The ideas that underlie musical styles can be shown only in a concrete stylistic analysis which makes clear how musical elements are fused to the larger units that are elements in the world of ideas and how they achieve their specific effects. The point of this analysis-and one most difficult to understand-is that the same stylistic criteria may have different functions in different styles in spite of external

similarity. The fact that change of context will induce a change of function calls for a contextual interpretation of music-which is but another name for stylistic criticism.

Contextual interpretation provides the only way to an understanding of the different modes of composition. The comprehension of former styles sharpens the senses for the modern styles, with regard to which a convincing and comprehensive theory is still lacking. By the same token stylistic investigations of modern music will help us understand the music of unfamiliar, non-Western culture.

A study of the evolution of musical styles provides the main factor round which the history of music can be organized. Their rise and fall determine the large periods of music history and establish the chronology of stylistic periods, such as the medieval, Renaissance, Baroque. This chronology constitutes one of the aspects of music history. There are other aspects which give depth and width to the linear chronological development. They are the styles of various cultures and nations, the personal styles of composers, the styles of certain functions (dance music), media (choral music), and forms (the fugue), and even the styles of particular works. All of these show the stamp of their respective period style, but at the same time their specific elements can be extracted and treated separately. The description of the origin and development of styles, their interrelation, their transfer from one medium to another, is the central task of musicology. Only the stylistic method will permit a correlation of music history with the history of ideas and the general cultural history of mankind, if such correlation is to be more than a loose comparison or an abstract parallelism.

12. *Musicology, a Graduate Study*

It will be gathered from the foregoing remarks that musicology as a specialized study must be taken up in the graduate school. The preparatory study in the undergraduate school should have awakened an awareness of music as a hu-

manistic discipline and should not be used for one-sided specialization. The prospective student of musicology will need all of the available help his general education offers in languages, history, and other cultural fields. Time and again has it been observed that students holding the degree of Bachelor of Music are not adequately prepared for the graduate study of musicology. They lack languages, general history, and also the broad orientation in music and music history that a liberal arts college properly equipped for the purpose would normally offer. Lacking essential preliminary training, the student enters advanced studies with deficiencies that must be made up at an inordinate cost of time and at the price of personal disappointment and frustration.

A general education in music can merely lay the foundation of work which at the graduate level must be intensified and deepened. Above all a much more thorough knowledge of musical literature of all periods is mandatory. Only if this requirement is fulfilled is it possible to proceed to the main point of graduate study: the application of scholarly methods to the music of any period. By means of lecture courses and seminar work the student is trained in the technique of a stylistic analysis whose goal is synthesis. By means of research problems that gradually increase in scope, the student is led step by step to the point where he can make observations himself, examine and critically evaluate what has been written about music, and arrive at conclusions of his own.

The first stage of this process ends with a master's thesis, which should demonstrate that the student has learned to apply musicological method. Even if the thesis does not contain new results, it should exhibit mastery; for it is an exercise in method and not restricted, as is frequently thought, to music history. The method may be applied to any aspect of theory, music education, or performance. Masters' theses on practices of performance, however, are comparatively rare, because they call for special skill in the application of musicological method.

It is a common mistake to assume that the graduate work just described concerns only and exclusively future musicologists. Anybody active in one of the four areas of music instruction should be able to recognize the musical principles that connect them. Properly understood, the M.A. thesis is the touchstone of this ability. This is not to say that every teacher of music should necessarily hold the M.A. degree, although this would be desirable, but it does mean that those who have not acquired a comparable background are not qualified to teach music as a liberal art or even in a professional capacity, however proficient they may be in a purely technical sense. Many professionals are intuitively and vaguely aware of larger musical principles but cannot "verbalize" about them. In other words, they cannot formulate and use them as conceptual aids in their instruction. Lack of articulateness is always the sign of a poor teacher.

Advanced study in musicology proper begins only after the first stage has been completed. It consists of the studies leading to the Ph.D. and is in every respect comparable to programs in the other humanistic disciplines. It requires a thorough knowledge of representative examples covering the whole of musical literature, a thorough knowledge of the various research methods employed, of a large body of scholarly writings on music regardless of language, and of bibliography. Above all, it requires the ability to carry on independent work. All this should be tested in a qualifying examination, which should encompass the knowledge just specified and, in addition, should attempt to measure creative capacities. After this second stage has been reached, the student is ready to concentrate on a field of his own, which will be the subject of his Ph.D. thesis.

It is the stated purpose of the thesis to make a "contribution to knowledge," though it must be admitted that many fall short of this goal. Too often there is the temptation to confuse a quantitative addition with a contribution to knowledge. A misguided Ph.D. candidate may set himself the task of finding out how many minor thirds appear in

Beethoven's symphonies. With a little industry the answer can easily be found. Since so far nobody has been foolish enough to count them, this would be an "addition to knowledge," but certainly not a significant contribution.

The selection of a proper thesis topic requires care and judgment. It must be remembered that the thesis is an apprentice piece, which automatically precludes large topics requiring the comprehensive knowledge of the seasoned scholar. This is why treatises on the philosophical or sociological background of musical periods, fascinating as they are, are not suitable subjects. A problem more limited in scope, restricted either to a well defined period or a technical criterion, will prove the ability of the candidate much more efficiently. It gives him the chance to develop a limited problem within a larger musical context. Without such correlation the findings will lack significance.

It is easy to ridicule the titles of certain theses. The topic itself is no more an indication of quality or the lack of it than the paper on which the thesis is written. Only the method and the manner of treatment will disclose the value of the work, however obscure its topic. It is a widespread misconception that musicological theses must deal with abstruse subjects and obscure composers. If this were true one would be forced to maintain the evident absurdity that Beethoven would have to be ruled out as a subject in favor of his forerunners or lesser contemporaries, such as Stamitz and Hummel. It has been possible for this myth to arise only because it is relatively easy to deal with the lesser men who provide the background and milieu of the great composers. There is a dearth of up-to-date special studies on the masterworks precisely because they call for deeper insight and more mature judgment than can normally be expected of young musicologists who are just about to earn their spurs.

Nothing is easier than to amass new musical facts in a vacuum, as it were, and to become an "authority" in an obscure field within a comparatively short time by writing the

"definitive" treatise on, say, "The concerto for double bass in the nineteenth century." Many amateurs know more about small and obscure points than any living musicologist, but they know them as isolated minutiae, without consequence and method, and they cannot derive from them any significant generalization.

It has been frequently, and often scornfully, remarked that musicological method includes much ballast knowledge which bears no relation to its subject. This charge is true, but it is true of any scholarly endeavor in any field. The discovery of a new symphony by Haydn or of a manuscript with medieval music is in itself a piece of nonmusical detective work, dusty library investigation, or just sheer explorer's luck. It has a thrill of its own, but it is certainly not a musical thrill, however important the discovery may be for musical practice. Those who profess to be concerned only with music should stop to think that the endlessly repeated scales and finger exercises of a performer constitute an equally heavy burden of purely mechanical labor that is certainly not musical.

While every musicological dissertation is oriented toward music, it should not exhaust itself in purely technical considerations, but should bring to bear the aids of scholarly method from the other humanistic disciplines. Of these a thorough reading knowledge of languages and familiarity with general bibliography are only the most elementary. More important are the critical evaluation of one's own premises, the weighing of evidence, and the ability to distinguish between fact and interpretation. Musicology differs from most other humanistic disciplines in that its subject is nondiscursive and nonverbal, and presents the constant challenge of how to "translate" music into words. He who has never felt and struggled with this problem does not know what musicology is.

13. *Analogy to the Study of Languages*

There exists a remarkable analogy between the study of music and musicology, on the one hand, and the study of languages, on the other. It is well to insist on the term "analogy" because language and music exist as two entirely different media, although they may be happily joined together in artistic form, for example in opera, oratorio, and the art song. Music has been called an "international language:" or "language of the heart," but these are metaphorical phrases that must not obscure the essential differences in media. Music is a language only in so far as it is a symbolic system that must be understood according to its own "grammar."

In music instruction the area of theory corresponds to the teaching of the grammar of a language, even to the point of applying identical terms. In both one is dealing with the raw material: the "vocabulary," the grammatical "rules," and the "composition of phrases and periods." Normally, composition in language can make no more claim to being an original piece of creative writing than composition in music. Both are advanced exercises and, if pursued long enough, will lead to real fluency and eventually even to "originality." Instruction in foreign languages usually stops at this point, though there may be classes in nominally creative writing in Departments of English. Courses in composition are much more common in music instruction, especially on the graduate level, and presuppose a certain degree of creative talent. The analogy between music and the languages ceases here because the musical medium permits genuine creativity at a much earlier age than language or other media (Mozart!).

From the point of view of their history, music and language are not taught "grammatically," but serve as means toward a larger goal, the understanding of the "literature." This would obviously be impossible without some knowledge of the grammar. Conversely, the works of art can be

and are being used as material for learning the rules. However, the emphasis lies definitely on the study of the literature. There are survey courses of stylistic trends, studies of selected masterworks, courses on one great personality, on one stylistic period, and on one particular form. Carried to the graduate level, the study is continued with increasing scholarly rigor and culminates in the same degrees. It is on this level that broad fundamentals of the field itself are studied. Subjects such as the relation between grammar and special problems of linguistics, the history of language, the history of literature as a history of ideas, and the comparative study of literature, correspond in the realm of music to the special problems of musicology: the theory and history of musical theory, the laws of style formation, and "comparative" musicology or the study of non-Western music.

On this highest level the problems and methods developed over a long period in the various branches of philology are in principle very similar to those of musicology. For example, the problem of establishing a reliable "text" in a critical edition calls for a kind of scholarship and raises questions of procedure and comparative method that are virtually the same in spite of the different natures of the media. Editorial decisions will ultimately be determined by considerations of style and form. Neither philology nor musicology should exhaust itself in the study of the laws of grammar and syntax. Both disciplines are directed toward the same end: a better understanding of the literature, the works of art themselves, which give the medium its cultural value and significance.

In the area of performance no direct analogy exists. This again is due to the difference in media, since a language can be read while music must be performed in order to be accessible. It is true that one can acquire a "reading knowledge" of music, but the ability to read a score and really hear it inwardly is the highest phase of a trained musical imagination, whereas reading knowledge is the lowest phase of knowing a language. Performance can perhaps offer a parallel to the actual speaking of a foreign language, which is not

usually emphasized in our language instruction since it would involve the same amount of "practice hours" as playing an instrument.

It will be seen from the foregoing observations that music stands as one among other humanistic disciplines and follows logically the same pattern of instruction if it is conceived as a liberal art. If conceived professionally, it can no more claim a place at an institution of higher learning than does a Berlitz school.

14. *The Pressure for Degrees*

It follows from the definition of musicology as the graduate study of a humanistic discipline that the proper degrees for it are the M.A. and the Ph.D. The M.A. should not be considered and, as a rule, cannot be a research degree. It embodies only the minimum familiarity with musicological method that any educated teacher in the musical field should possess in some form or other. The Ph.D., on the other hand, is a research degree and is intended for those who specialize in musicological studies.

In the recent past the pressure for higher degrees in music has become increasingly strong as a result of the mixing of curricula and the wide acceptance of the department-store conception in music instruction. In their desire for easy academic prestige the Music Schools have embarked on a vigorous course of "upgrading" and have devised higher "academic" degrees in their "departments" of theory, composition, music education, and sometimes even performance. Musical theory is, of course, a perfectly legitimate subject for an honest research degree, but the specially designed doctoral degrees in "departments of theory" have lowered the requirements and replaced what they lack in humanistic discipline by professional industry. The degrees in other "departments" are even further removed from academic standards.

The question whether an advanced degree should be given

in composition has been hotly discussed, but mostly on a mistaken premise. The issue is not whether the advanced degree in composition should be called Ph.D. or Doctor of Musical Arts. The real issue is whether the university pattern can be transposed to a professional school of music without cheapening the standards on each side. The advanced degree of professional schools are not, and are rarely claimed to be, comparable with their academic counterparts. A sampling of twenty dissertations from professional schools will prove this point better than any argument.

Universities that have succumbed to the glamor of professional schools find themselves in an impossible situation. They want academic personnel, but they need music teachers for their professional courses. The seriousness of the situation can be illuminated in a flash by a letter this writer received from a college president asking for a teacher of violin, "preferably with a Ph.D."

We have thus a vicious circle: academic institutions insisting on a Ph.D. for professionals and professional institutions insisting on a pseudo-academic degree because "there is a demand for it." Actually, the demand is artificially created by perpetuating the confusion regarding the place of music. This confusion has become a matter of vested interests with those institutions that are willing to satisfy the "demand" with cheap merchandise.

This writer has had all too frequent occasion to observe the desperate plight of music teachers who are caught in the squeeze. Perfectly competent professionals are suddenly faced with a demand by their administration that they acquire the doctorate if they want to be promoted. If they are advanced in years, they have neither the background nor the inclination to do scholarly work, yet they are forced to seek an advanced degree in order to protect their livelihood. Usually they lack the time to make up the deficiencies before they can start scholarly work. It is pathetic to watch the few who have the talent and who are prepared to make the effort at great financial sacrifice. The choices in directing

their programs are (1) to make them see that the demand is an unfair and vicious form of academic blackmail; (2) to send them to an institution which has lower standards; or (3) to lower one's own standards. The last choice has proved to be good business for some, but the better institutions have had the courage to resist the pressure groups at the risk of reducing the enrollment. Here again, the real issue is not whether standards should be lowered or maintained, but how to remove the cause of the academic blackmail.

The results of such pressures are bound to be felt sooner or later in the nation's musical life. They can be seen already in certain state requirements for music credentials designed not for the advancement of music, but for the benefit of those music educators who take pride in always operating at the lowest common denominator. An education that does not consider the quality of the music it teaches is education against music, not for music. The pressure for specious degrees works to the detriment of scholarship and against the integrity of professional standards. It certainly should make us ponder that the majority of the outstanding personalities in our musical life—and here we speak of composers, performers, and musicologists—have built their professional careers on a liberal arts education.

15. *European and American Plans of Instruction*

The training of musicologists at American universities does not exactly correspond to that offered at European institutions, except perhaps at institutions in England. In Europe musicology belongs to the "Faculty of Philosophy" and comprises virtually no courses in "practical" music. Since university study in Europe starts at what corresponds to our graduate level, there exists no formalized curriculum in music comparable to our undergraduate instruction. On the one hand, therefore, the preparatory training is more flexible; but, on the other hand, the grave danger exists that deficiencies in the basic musical education are discovered too

late. When entering the university the European student of musicology is expected to have received his practical training at a conservatory or with a private music teacher concurrently with his general education, but largely as an extra-curricular activity. He may also continue his practical studies while active at the university. In general, the European student concentrates on his special field later than the American student. This has the advantage that he is usually better prepared in the prerequisites such as languages, general history, and philosophy, but the disadvantage is that his knowledge of musical literature and his facility in theory may, be inadequate. As a result musicology has sometimes lost touch with music and has become a pursuit centering upon itself. A number of musicological dissertations give evidence of this danger by their tendency toward irrelevant abstractions.

The American system, on the other hand, suffers sometimes from the dangers, inherent in premature specialization, that manifest themselves in overdetailed descriptions that never reach general conclusions. The reluctance to proceed from details to broader principles is caused also by the fact that undergraduate students and sometimes even graduate students are spoon-fed too long.

From the social standpoint the American system has undoubtedly the advantage over that of Europe, where only a small segment of the population can afford university study. Since scholarships are almost nonexistent there and since, obviously, the most talented are not necessarily found among the privileged few, the principle of selection is not only socially undesirable but also inefficient. It is nevertheless a fact that both systems have produced excellent as well as poor results. This goes to show that any advantage is bought at the price of some disadvantage. Whatever the system, the shortcomings of the student must be recognized and corrected in time by the teacher. Even if it were possible to work out a perfect system there would always remain decisive human factors: the student's initiative and the teacher's ability to stimulate.

16. *Musical Scholarship and "Science"*

The scholarly study of music requires the same methods as any other humanistic study, but the musical medium calls for certain specific adaptations. Its main tool is the historical method. Even if the subject studied be contemporary music, it must be treated in a historical context. Being a humanistic discipline, musicology is qualitative research and can never abandon qualitative judgments in favor of quantitative data. Yet under the influence of the natural sciences a school of thought has developed in the humanities which rejects considerations of quality as unscientific and subjective. It insists on the "scientific approach" and will accept only statements that can be verified "objectively" by measurement and other quantitative methods developed in the natural sciences. It goes without saying that marginal areas of musicology such as acoustics and tone reproduction rightly apply the methods of natural science, being part of it. But acoustics is the science of meaningless sound. Aside from language, only in music do we deal with a symbolic system of meaningful sounds. Some of our musical scientists are unable to make this distinction and, moreover, confuse the reproduction of music with music itself. Small wonder then that a handbook of musical engineering, published in 1952, contains the following statement: "From an engineering standpoint the past history of music possesses very little of interest or value."

Quantitative methods are necessary also in the investigation of oriental and other tone systems, and in the investigation of tone quality which can neither be described in words nor indicated by musical notation. In these fields measurements are significant, but no amount of quantitative analysis can tell us why a tonal system was developed in one culture and not in another; nor can any amount of acoustical research explain the important position of the minor triad in our tone system.

The "objective" and measurable facts of music need cor-

relation and interpretation. Music is a product of art, a man-made object and not an object of nature. Both natural and artistic objects can be submitted to scientific and quantitative methods of investigation, but the method of dealing with the object or of presenting the findings must be clearly distinguished from the nature of the object itself. Efforts to substitute measurements of quantity for qualitative judgments confuse research method with the investigated object and in so doing falsify its essence. In certain musicological dissertations a misguided reverence for scientific methods has brought forth a flood of statistical surveys, interval counts, frequency charts of chord progressions, compiled with great industry and even ingenuity. Statistical methods can be of value in the description of technical criteria, which are one aspect of stylistic criticism. But if stylistic criticism is reduced to statistical observations without consideration of context and of the configuration of elements, one never arrives at musical style, which is a qualitative entity. If the charts were no more than a concise presentation of the raw material, they would be useful; but if no attempt is made at integration the result is a mass of unrelated facts presented in a form that speciously apes the precision of scientific method. This is not musical scholarship but pseudo-musicology.

17. *Musicology and the Other Humanistic Disciplines*

Musicology is a relative newcomer at institutions of higher learning, and in consequence the representatives of other disciplines have so far not fully utilized the results of musicological studies. Formerly the faculty members in music were regarded mainly as representatives of a pleasant extra-curricular activity. Now that scholarship in music has been established as a respected discipline in its own right, the musicologist has been received in the community of scholars. His presence on the campus has brought distinctive advantages to the teaching of the humanities. The musicologist

is obviously the person to advise students in all matters relating to music and music history, and to discuss with his colleagues common interdisciplinary problems. There are few aspects of musicology that do not, in one way or another, also have a bearing on nonmusical matters. The close analogy between the study of music and that of languages and literatures has already been shown. There are large areas in the history of literature that cannot possibly be discussed adequately without bringing in music. Consider the songs of the troubadours, trouvères, and *Minnesänger*, in fact the entire field of medieval song in any language. Whenever music and words appear together, and they do all over the world, they become the subject of musicological as well as literary study. In the past such studies have been carried out side by side with little or no cross-fertilization, but more and more it has come to be recognized that topics like the art song, the Italian madrigal, the French chanson, the opera, the oratorio, and sacred music in general cannot be treated intelligently from the musical or literary standpoint alone.

The historian is interested in the history of music as part of general history. But he should not lose sight of the documentary importance of compositions for political and historical occasions, for dignitaries of state and church, songs of protest and censure, and music for propaganda, which are directly linked with political history. Church history and more especially the history of liturgy are obviously incomplete without a consideration of music.

It has already been said that musical biographies may combine a great many disciplines ranging from psychology to economics. Music can, for example, be regarded not as an art, but as a business and an industry. Indeed, it offers an interesting history in labor relations; the results of such studies are important for social and cultural history, but care must be taken not to confuse the economic with the musicological approach.

The interrelations between historical styles in music and in the fine arts have been recognized and studied more in-

tensively in the past than any other interdisciplinary relations, but much still remains to be done. This is true also of musical aesthetics and cognate questions that call for the correlation of musical and philosophical ideas. That music forms an integral part of the history of culture is a truism, yet it will be found that some of the leading books on this subject pass over music with a few inconsequential remarks, if indeed they mention it at all. The crucial position of music in the field of anthropology will be discussed in a special section.

Each of the fields mentioned has become so specialized that no nonmusical scholar can be expected also to master the musical side of his field. The situation calls for a joint effort and close co-operation between the musicologist and scholars in other disciplines. As regards university organization this means much closer interdepartmental relations than presently exist. Joint publications of recent date by specialists have shown how fruitful such co-operation can be, but unfortunately they have so far been the exception rather than the rule.

The position of acoustics, physiology, psychology (including the psychology of learning and pedagogy) is not quite the same, because these are independent fields in the natural or social sciences, rather than the humanities. According to an old and by now outdated classification these fields are said to belong to "systematic musicology"; actually, they are fields auxiliary to musicology proper, although their findings—for example, a new theory of hearing—may be of the utmost importance for musicology. The quantitative methods and results of the auxiliary fields find their corrective in the historical conclusions of musicology. For example, acoustics may define dissonance in absolute and quantitative terms, while musicology will demonstrate that the same interval has been treated as a dissonance in one style and as a consonance in another, regardless of its acoustical definition. The raw materials of music, its nature and the way it affects man, are the main subjects of the auxiliary fields. Their in-

vestigations cannot be ignored by musicology, but the results, whatever they may be, are subsidiary to the artistic use of the raw material.

18. *The Study of Non-Western Music*

The traditional humanistic disciplines have shown in the past a determined and almost self-conscious limitation to the patterns of European thought from antiquity to the present day. The high cultures of the Orient and the lower and primitive cultures of the rest of the world have not been fully integrated into the general conception of man. With the recent shift of interest towards Asian problems the shortcomings and limitations of the traditional view have become especially clear, for example, when it was discovered during the second World War that there was an acute shortage of persons with a mastery of the languages of the Pacific area. The modern conception of the humanities is no longer confined to an interest in Western European civilizations but promotes the study of all cultures, high or low, as the best means for an understanding of human behavior.

Although a young discipline, musicology has shared the traditional limitations of the humanities-but to a lesser degree. From the beginning it has included the study of Oriental and primitive music or, in brief, non-Western music. This special branch is known by the somewhat clumsy names, "comparative musicology" and "ethnomusicology." No matter what its name, the study of non-Western music is actually a combination of musicology and anthropology and requires the closest co-operation between the two. The study also includes the musical folklore of Western nations. This somewhat illogical division is a survival of the traditional preoccupation of musicology with art music and of a correspondingly narrow definition of folk music. There have been signs recently that these categories are now in process of being revised.

Relatively few scholars have so far seen the need of entering the difficult and seemingly remote field of anthropological musicology, although the second World War suddenly brought into focus its immense practical importance. The methods of anthropological musicology differ from those of other branches in that they deal essentially with living cultures. Their music defies notation and lacks the kind of historical documents to which we are accustomed. As a rule, we are unable to discover much about the history of this music and must consider ourselves fortunate if we can piece together as much as a comprehensive picture of its present practice. Our methods are therefore essentially descriptive. This means that a historical study of the styles of world music is at present an unattained goal.

Non-Western music presents a great number of difficult problems that differ radically from those normally encountered in musicology. The basic musical concepts in Oriental music have almost nothing in common with those of the West, and as a result Westerners cannot directly understand the music of the East and Orientals cannot directly understand that of the West. The anthropological branch of musicology is attempting to collect the various musics of the world and deduce from them new concepts on which to base a proper evaluation. A comparison of the Western and the non-Western concepts will ultimately give musicology a truly world-wide inclusiveness.

We are as yet very far from this ideal. The gathering of non-Western music has only just begun, and we have as yet but a sampling of the musics of the world. They can be recorded only by means of phonograph, tape, and sound film, because they cannot be written down in our limited notation. The situation is aggravated by the paradoxical fact that phonograph and radio are destroying the native musical cultures more rapidly than the same means can record them.

19. *Tools and Aids*

The study of musicology cannot be pursued successfully without a minimum supply of the proper tools and aids. The most important of these is a good library, which should contain a comprehensive collection of the literature of music (of all periods), including the scholarly editions, and an equally comprehensive collection of the literature about music. These form the basis for any serious work in musicology, since they enable the student of the subject to gain a knowledge of musical styles. He must acquire a good "reading knowledge" of music, and for this purpose a large collection of recordings may prove a highly desirable aid, although it is not absolutely essential. However, recordings are indispensable in the study of performance practice, the tone qualities of old instruments, folk music, and non-Western music.

The collections of books and scores just mentioned represent the core of any library holdings, but they are not original research material. Manuscript scores, autographs, early prints of music, and early books on music and music theory constitute main sources for original research, and to these should be added the scores of modern music and recordings of non-Western and folk music. Certain American libraries have accumulated a vast amount of these materials, but the holdings of the average university library are usually insufficient. In the past, the musicologist has always had to travel extensively in order to collect his research material. Modern methods of reproduction such as microfilm and microprint have gone far toward eliminating this necessity. The progress made possible by microfilm has been tremendous. In fact it can be said that musicology in America began in earnest with this technological advance. It should be recognized, on the other hand, that microfilm does not completely remove the need for research travel and for the col-

lection of new material on the spot. Scholarship cannot be carried on by remote control.

In special cases the needed collections of instruments may be available in the local museums of art or the museum of anthropology. Similarly, paintings or other representations may be studied for what they tell us about the musical practice of their time. Work in non-Western music requires the proper machines for recording and measuring intervals or for the analysis of the overtone structure. It is here that the help of a laboratory in electronics and acoustics will prove most fruitful.

The main musicological aids, however, will be found in the library and will include modern bibliographies, periodicals, and indices, which the high specialization in every field has made indispensable.

It should be remembered that even the best organization of library aids and the most complete research collection do not guarantee worthwhile results in scholarship. The student must be taught how to work with these tools and how to use them imaginatively. At this point the question of personnel becomes paramount: only a musicologist with ideas will be able to make the student see new musicological problems and teach him how to solve them.

20. *Prospects of Musicology*

Whatever may be said about musicology, there is no longer any need for justification or apology. Its rightful place at institutions of higher learning is assured. Its value is recognized by its sister disciplines and indirectly also by those institutions that feel compelled to offer degrees in pseudo-musicology. Imitation is still the sincerest form of compliment.

The introduction of musicological studies into the university must be planned with care and circumspection. It requires a well-balanced set of undergraduate courses leading

up to graduate study. The latter ought to be contemplated only if the proper library facilities and personnel are available. Our best universities have proceeded in accordance with these points and have set an example to lesser institutions. It may proudly be stated that the young generation of American musicologists so far produced will stand comparison with that of any other nation.

The vast areas of work that still lie ahead in musicology can only be indicated here in their barest outlines. It is easy to prophesy that projects calling for interdisciplinary co-operation will receive more and more attention. The time has come when the musicologist needs his colleagues in other disciplines just as much as they need him. This co-operation will give the single disciplines new and wider dimensions, the import of which can hardly be overestimated.

The work of musicology proper can be divided roughly into six categories:

- I. The discovery, collection, editing, and recording of new and previously unknown music. This is an ever present and never finished task that accompanies any historical investigation.
- II. The writing of general histories covering the entire history of music or of the history of single periods and countries. Such histories should follow strictly the methods of stylistic criticism.
- III. The writing of specialized histories of form and generic types of composition, such as the concerto, the symphony, the string quartet, the mass, the motet; and studies of particular styles and procedures, such as polyphony, homophony, and the fugue.
- IV. Studies of special aspects, discussed in a systematic manner but approached from the historical point of view, such as the history of performance, musical instruments, orchestration, and notation; the history of harmony, counterpoint, music theory, music education, as well as partial problems of these larger topics.

V. Biographies emphasizing the stylistic development of the composer. Also archival studies which use the tools of the historian pure and simple. These include the local history of cities and regions, which sometimes yield remarkable results. Early American music furnishes a good and by no means fully exploited field of investigation.

VI. Monographs and stylistic studies of single works or groups of works by individual composers or groups of composers. The works of masters like Bach, Mozart, and Beethoven have received such attention, but a great deal still remains to be done.

It goes without saying that such studies will gradually shape and determine the public and professional attitude toward music and lead to a clearer and more profound insight into music altogether. The purely emotional and sentimental approach of those who teach and preach music as an entertainment will then slowly give way to a more enlightened and serious conception, such as has long been adopted without question in literature and the fine arts.

Many reasons could be cited why music and musicology are not just cultural ornaments without practical use. It has taken a war to teach us that if we wish to understand man's mind and emotions, a knowledge of his material culture is not enough. Music reveals to us man's inner life; its scholarly study is therefore of immediate practical use. Yet the utilitarian justification of musicology must not be overstressed. Immediate uses change quickly with the times and their demands may be ephemeral. The goal of the humanities, the understanding of man, although approached in each age in a different way, is timeless. The future of this ideal is also the future of musicology.

21. Summary

Musicology, the scholarly study of music, has developed in the United States in consequence of the general recogni-

tion of music in the college. Music instruction in the college is part of the general education in the humanities. Its purpose is not professional.

The traditional division of music instruction into four areas is basically sound, provided that the instruction is offered in a humanistic spirit. Specialization, be it performance or musicology, must rest on the foundation of a broad humanistic education. The Music School, externally patterned after the four-year scheme of the college, mixes professional and humanistic aims. The lack of a clearly formulated policy leads to a lowering of both professional and academic standards.

The study of musicology must be taken up in the graduate school. Undergraduate courses in music, if properly taught, cannot help being introductory courses to musicology.

Knowledge of and about music cannot be separated. The goal of musicology is to understand and to intensify the aesthetic experience. Attitudes toward music are not historical constants, and the musicologist, too, is a child of his time.

The study of musical styles is the most important part of the broad subject-matter of musicology. Concentration on style means concentration on the music itself. The musical principles that have activated the styles in music history can be extracted only by historical analysis.

The advanced study of musicology is comparable with the study of any other humanistic discipline. The analogy to the study of languages (philology) is especially close. The musicologist has been received in the community of scholars in the humanities, and his presence on the campus helps to advance studies of interdisciplinary problems.

The knowledge of man's material culture is not enough if we want to understand his mind and emotions. The study of non-Western music gives musicology a world-wide scope. It is an indispensable part of the understanding of human behavior.