

1. Introduction

'Musicology' is a coinage that is recent enough – the *OED* dates it to 1919, even though the *Musical Quarterly* commenced publication with a famous leader 'On Behalf of Musicology' in 1915 – so that there still exist pockets of somewhat surly purists who take exception to its use. It early suffered a modification or contraction of meaning. Adapted from the older French term *musicologie*, itself an analogue to the nineteenth-century German *Musikwissenschaft*, the word was originally understood (as *Musikwissenschaft* still is) to cover thinking about, research into, and knowledge of all possible aspects of music. Musicology ranged from the history of Western music to the taxonomy of 'primitive' music, as it was then called, from acoustics to aesthetics, and from harmony and counterpoint to piano pedagogy. Subtle and elaborate categorizations of knowledge were proposed, starting with the classic formulations of Hugo Riemann and Guido Adler in the nineteenth century and continued by not a few German scholars down to the present day. The last person to work seriously with 'systematic musicology' in English – it was the fixation of a long and great career – was Charles Seeger, the guiding spirit of modern American ethnomusicology. After reprinting several avowedly preliminary formulations of a comprehensive classification of music and music study in his collected essays, published at the age of ninety, Seeger completed two more extensive redactions of it before his death a few years later.

But in academic practice, and in broad general usage, musicology has come to have a much more constricted meaning. It has come to mean the study of the history of Western music in the high-art tradition. The academic musicologist teaches

courses in the music of the Renaissance, in the symphony, in Bach, Beethoven, and Bartók. The popular musicologist writes programme notes for chamber-music concerts and intermission features for opera videocasts. Furthermore, in the popular mind – and in the minds of many academics – musicology is restricted not only in the subject matter it covers but also in its approach to that subject matter. (I say ‘restricted’ rather than ‘constricted’ here, for this approach is not the result of any paring down of an earlier concept.) Musicology is perceived as dealing essentially with the factual, the documentary, the verifiable, the analysable, the positivistic. Musicologists are respected for the facts they know about music. They are not admired for their insight into music as aesthetic experience.

Which is the subject of this book – musicology in the ideal, comprehensive, original definition, or musicology in the restricted, more mundane, current one? The broad or the narrow? The answer lies somewhere in between. Few people today could claim to write with much authority about the broad range of musical knowledge as mapped out by Adler or Seeger. Even those who could would need an outsized book to deal with so large a subject – and in any case, I am distinctly not one of those few. Still, a glance at the table of contents of this book may suggest to the reader that my view of the history of Western art music is less narrow than it might be. In what ways, I shall try to explain in a moment. It will be necessary first to say a word about other directly relevant disciplines of music study: music theory, analysis, and ethnomusicology.

Everybody understands what musicology is, at least in a general way. Music theory is much less widely understood, even by musicians, and to non-musicians it is usually a closed book. The latter can hardly be blamed, for music theory is invariably technical in nature, sometimes forbiddingly so. The former entertain a number of different estimates as to the relation of theory on the one hand and its ambivalent adjunct, analysis, on the other.

Theory, says *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ‘is now understood as principally the study of the structure of music’. Another way of putting it – hardly more

informative – is that music theory is the investigation of what makes music ‘work’. Thus the range of its subject matter extends from the formation of scales and chords to procedures for the distribution of pitches in time – such as counterpoint and twelve-tone or serial operations – to principles of musical form and even semiology. Choosing our words with great care, we might say theory deals with those aspects of music that might be thought analogous to vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and rhetoric in the field of language. And musical analysis as a technical procedure might be thought analogous to parsing, linguistic reduction, and *explication du texte*. While theory clearly is an indispensable part of the study of any one of the world’s music systems, musicians who call themselves theorists nearly always confine themselves to Western art music, past and present. It is characteristic, too, that even when they deal with past music, they decline to deal with it in historical terms.

Ethnomusicology is popularly understood to mean the study of non-Western music – or ‘musics’, as the ethnomusicologists themselves prefer to put it. Indeed, they have their own all-inclusive definition of ethnomusicology, Alan P. Merriam’s famous phrase ‘the study of music in culture’. They see the whole world of music – Western art music, Western folk and popular music, non-Western musics both simple and complex – as their dominion; it is no accident that Seeger the systematic musicologist was also a father of modern ethnomusicology. Still, what has in fact occupied ethnomusicologists most intensely are the highly developed art musics of Indonesia, Japan, and India and the less developed musics of the American Indians and subsaharan Africans. These are studied to yield accurate technical descriptions on the one hand, and information about the musics’ roles in societies on the other. There are no generally accepted names for students of Western popular musics such as jazz, rock, or reggae, or for students of European folk music (a field that now flourishes particularly in Eastern Europe). One has the impression that the ethnomusicologists would be glad to swallow them up.

The musicologist likes to think of himself as a historian, like the art historian or the literary scholar, and aligns himself with

the goals, values, and style of traditional humanistic scholarship. That is why although he is a relative latecomer to the academy he (and even she) has had a relatively easy time there. Typically musicologists write or aspire to write essays and books in ordinary academic English, with the result that their work can be read outside the profession more easily than can that of theorists or ethnomusicologists. The ethnomusicologists' alignment is with anthropology; they are likely also to have special sympathies with some nation, 'world', or class other than that of their own origins. Seldom are their articles and reports free of social-scientific apparatus, if not jargon. Music theorists are the hardest to generalize about. Some of them lean in the direction of philosophy, and some write papers in a self-generated language as highly specialized as that of symbolic logic. But the more fundamental alignment of music theory is with musical composition: for if theorists have an intellectual interest in the structure of music, composers have this same interest from their own strictly practical viewpoint.

And indeed, while people have presumably been intrigued by theory for as long as music has existed on any level of sophistication – in all literate cultures, treatises on music theory predate by many centuries essays in music history or criticism – theory has acquired a special urgency in this century on account of the movement in the arts known as modernism. There will be a good deal to say about modernism in this book; one way or another, it remains a determining issue in the ideology of many musicians – and in particular, of many whose views we shall have to consider. In music, modernism falls into two broad phases. The first phase was accomplished just before the First World War, with works such as Debussy's *Jeux*, Stravinsky's *Le Sacre du printemps*, and Schoenberg's *Pierrot lunaire*. The second was launched directly after the Second World War, with the compositions of Boulez, Stockhausen, and Cage.

Unlike great changes in art of the past, modernism has not resulted in a new consensus; that negative fact is practically a part of its programme. We no longer agree on how new music is to 'work'. Hence composers continue actively to seek new ways

of making it do so. Modern theory is sometimes not (or not only) descriptive, then, but rather (or also) prescriptive. Much of the power and prestige of theory derives from its alignment, at least until very recently, with the actual sources of creativity on the contemporary musical scene.

So it might appear as though the three disciplines I have sketched above divide up the subject matter of music fairly equably among them. Musicologists deal with Western art music before around 1900, theorists with the same after 1900, and ethnomusicologists with non-Western musics and Western music outside the elite tradition – folk and popular music. Generalization on this level, even in the conventionally safe preserve of a book's Introduction, makes the head spin, yet this is probably a fair enough description of what happens as far as day-to-day work and year-to-year publication are concerned.

Musicology, theory, and ethnomusicology should not be defined in terms of their subject matter, however, but rather in terms of their philosophies and ideologies. Even without going into detail at this point, we can probably see that when they are defined in this way, the disciplines overlap appreciably in the musical territory they cover. It may be suspected, furthermore, that it is often where two or even all three systems can be said to compete for the intellectual control of territory that we will find the most promising fields of study.

And in the areas of overlap all is not equable. Ethnomusicologists, as has already been remarked, are disposed to see as their province the entire universe of music, encompassing the more limited domains of musicologists and theorists. While they have not plunged into work on Western art music to show exactly what they mean, some of them have repeatedly called for an 'ethnomusicological approach' to this music. It is a message that musicologists repeatedly claim they are taking to heart, and one that they do indeed, in some cases, take substance from for basic orientations of their work. Theorists, so far from concentrating exclusively on the composers' immediate concern, the music of modernism, have also developed powerful doctrine about the so-called standard repertory of music. By proposing

analytical models for the canonic masterpieces of Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Brahms, and the other familiar masters, they come up with quite a different view of musical repertoires than do the musicologists, who treat the same works within a much wider empirical context. Particularly with music of the nineteenth century, as we shall see, a confrontation and accommodation between the two viewpoints is offering an avenue of fresh understanding.

History, anthropology, the analysis of structure . . . it will be noticed that nothing has been said so far about another thoroughly traditional method of considering the arts. Criticism – the study of the meaning and value of art works – does not figure in the explicit programmes of musicology or theory. (For the moment the reader is asked to take this on faith; the point will be substantiated – and qualified – later.) Ethnomusicology encompasses the meaning and value of music along with everything else about it, but what is usually considered is the meaning of a musical genre to its culture and the value of a musical activity to its society. This is rather different from the sort of thing we mean by Shakespeare criticism or the body of criticism that has grown up around *Paradise Lost* or *Notes Toward a Supreme Fiction*. In music-academic circles, the term ‘criticism’ is little used. It is, in fact, positively distrusted.

Part of the problem is the vexing common usage of the term ‘criticism’ in musical parlance to mean the reviewing of concerts for daily or weekly papers – that and nothing more. Journalistic criticism has a very bad odour among the profession. The folklore of journalism is rich in rascally tales of music critics who switched over one fine day from the sports pages to revel in a life of ignorance and spite. People tend to forget that within living memory composers and musicologists as reputable as Virgil Thomson and Jack A. Westrup practised daily journalism for a time, and that someone as profoundly knowledgeable and civil (or, rather, humane) as Andrew Porter has devoted himself to it for decades.¹ But whether practised badly or well, and it is usually practised badly, criticism conceived of in journalistic

terms always places the writer under severe limits of space and level of technical discourse. To mention only one simple index of this: music reviews are never illustrated by examples in music notation, in the way that poetry reviews cite lines of verse, and art reviews regularly employ admittedly rough-and-ready reproductions of some of the works exhibited. This makes it almost impossible for the critic to do one very simple and necessary thing. He cannot refer to a detail.

What I would call serious music criticism – academic music criticism, if you prefer – does not exist as a discipline on a par with musicology and music theory on the one hand, or literary and art criticism on the other. We do not have musical Arnolds or Eliots, Blackmurs or Kermodes, Ruskins or Schapiros. In the circumstances it is idle to complain or lament that critical thought in music lags conceptually far behind that in the other arts. In fact, nearly all musical thinkers travel at a respectful distance behind the latest chariots (or bandwagons) of intellectual life in general, as we shall see many times in the following pages. Semiotics, hermeneutics, and phenomenology are being drawn upon only by some of the boldest of musical studies today. Post-structuralism, deconstruction, and serious feminism have yet to make their debuts in musicology or music theory.

There is, of course, musical analysis – though most people prefer not to call that criticism. As applied to music, the term ‘analysis’ has come to mean the detailed ‘internalist’ explication of the structure of particular compositions. (And a highly technical process this explication turns out to be, with its fine print and its doctored musical examples, its tables, reductive graphs, and occasional mathematical excursions.) Analysis, as I have already said, is closely associated with music theory and often subsumed under it, as if analysis were merely theory’s demonstrative adjunct. And if so – if the primary activity is theory – one cannot complain that what the analysts are doing is too narrow. A theoretical demonstration may legitimately be as abstract as the demonstrator needs in order to make his point.

But questions arise when one tries to look at things the other way around, and subsume theory under analysis as its enabling support structure. (There are ample historical grounds for this way of looking at things, as will be explained below, in Chapter 3.) In this view, the primary activity becomes analysis; and when analysis becomes a primary way of approaching the work of art, it has to be seen as a type of formalistic criticism. At this point it can also be legitimately complained about in terms that go beyond its own self-imposed frame of reference. Why should analysts concentrate solely on the internal structure of the individual work of art as an autonomous entity, and take no account of such considerable matters as history, communication, affect, texts and programmes, the existence of other works of art, and so much else?

Qua criticism, musical analysis is limited and limiting; yet it is also capable of more rigorous and powerful determinations in its own sphere than are available to formalistic criticism in any of the other arts. That is why the serious critic cannot help being both fascinated and exasperated by analysis. The potential of analysis is formidable, if it can only be taken out of the hothouse of theory and brought out into the real world.

In my own work I have sometimes attempted to do this, but more often I am to be found on the junction between criticism and musicology, between musicology conceived more broadly than in purely positivistic terms, and criticism conceived more broadly than in purely formalistic ones. Among the primary 'facts' about pieces and repertoires of music (past and present) are their aesthetic qualities (past and present). There is a widely held conviction that musicologists are, if not actually failed musicians, then at any rate persons of sharply limited musical sensibility – persons who know a lot of facts about music and very little about 'the music itself'. That could be true of certain musicologists. But with the majority of them, in my experience, it is not so much a matter of inherent unmusicality as of a deliberate policy of separating off their musical insights and passions from their scholarly work. I believe this is a great

mistake; musicologists should exert themselves towards fusion, not separation. When the study of music history loses touch with the aesthetic core of music, which is the subject matter of criticism, it can only too easily degenerate into a shallow exercise. At the same time, I also believe that the most solid basis for criticism is history, rather than music theory or ethnomusicology.

Earlier it was suggested that the view of musicology in this book is somewhat broader than it might have been had its author accepted the conventional current view of his subject. Such breadth follows from the set of beliefs about history and criticism just mentioned, rather than from the actual range of music that occupies me, and that will be dealt with in the following chapters. For better or for worse, I am not very much interested in non-Western music or in the popular music of the West (for worse, in that this must betray a real limitation of mind and sensibility; for better, perhaps, in that it may lend a certain intensity to what I do within these limitations). But I *am* interested in the art music of the Western tradition, interested and engaged, and to this music I would bring as many critical tools as possible. In practice, this entails a good deal of experimentation with analysis, and a good deal of impatience with the viewpoint conventionally regarded as 'historical' in the dry sense. Another way of putting it might be to say that my conception of history is more comprehensive than that of more conventional musicologists.

We began with two familiar or at least standard definitions of musicology, one broad, one narrow. They correspond, of course, to two views of the subject which determine the work of actual scholars; and for me the broad view is too broad and the narrow view too narrow. The one is suspect on account of its schematic quality and a certain chilliness of academic ambition that goes with it, the other on account of its undeniable tendency to shy away from 'the music itself'. What I uphold and try to practise is a kind of musicology oriented towards criticism, a kind of criticism oriented towards history. More of this in Chapter 4.

The way we think about music – as professionals or as amateurs; as critics, historians, theorists, whatever – is important at least partly because of the way it impinges on music that is composed, performed, and listened to. Ideas can influence music: though it is just as glaringly obvious that the flow also runs in the other direction. Ideas about music come into being as a response to music that is already there. Since this book is an account of ideas and ideologies of music as I have apprehended them since the Second World War, in the United States and Britain, it will be well to begin by recalling the main outline of musical developments in that period.

As in many areas of thought and artistic expression – perhaps in all – the end of the war marked the beginning of a period of major change, in which virtually every aspect of music was transformed. Almost all the transformation took place in the first fifteen or so postwar years, furthermore; thereafter things have been relatively static, perhaps even disappointingly so. But it would be hard to think of another period lasting less than a generation in which so much happened to so many branches of the art of music as in 1945–60.

What I have called the second phase of modernism in music erupted with remarkable speed after 1945. In terms of historical process, incidentally, this presents a sharp contrast with the situation after the First World War, where it was the immediate prewar generation that witnessed just such another major development, the development of modernism in its first phase. By 1950, young Europe's discovery of Schoenberg and Webern, Debussy and Messiaen was already an old story; Darmstadt and Donaueschingen were established forces and the Paris Conservatoire the unlikely site of Messiaen's revolutionary analysis classes. The earliest studios for electronically generated music were in the advanced stages of construction. And the theorizing was well under way. Messiaen and Eimert had published full-scale treatises, and smaller but more fervid writings by Boulez and Stockhausen were beginning to appear. *Die Reihe* started

publication in 1955, by which time the first important compositions of Boulez and Stockhausen, Barraqué, Xenakis, Pousseur, Ligeti, Berio, Maderna, and Nono had all been heard and were beginning to make their impact.

Die Reihe is one of those periodical titles (like that flower of Victorian Wagnerism called *The Meister*) that tells it all. European avant-garde music was a celebration of Schoenberg and especially Webern's idea of the twelve-tone row. The principle of serialism was extended from pitch to other musical 'parameters' such as duration and dynamics. *Die Reihe* must be one of very few German journals on any subject that have ever been translated issue by issue within a few years of publication for dissemination in English-speaking countries. Still, not many composers from those countries joined in directly with the continental avant garde in the earliest days. From Britain, where modernist composition had never established itself in the 1930s, there was no one to join. The Americans were content to continue working at home. A number of native composers had been writing twelve-tone music for some time – and of course Schoenberg himself was right here, teaching, along with many more musicians associated with the Schoenberg school than were living at that time in any other country. Milton Babbitt conceived of and composed the first piece of music with durations serialized as well as pitches in 1947, actually a little ahead of Messiaen's independent effort along similar lines.

Babbitt's rigorous mathematical style of music theory left no room for the variously metaphysical, confessional, and Marxist strains that were coming out of Darmstadt. His treatise of 1946 was not and never has been published, but this in no way impeded his influence as a teacher. With Roger Sessions, he was the inspiration for a group of young composers and theorists at Princeton which would later be associated with *Perspectives of New Music*, an American answer to *Die Reihe*.

Another strain of prewar American music was gaining definition and force in this period. The rediscovery of Ives, usually dated approximately from the time of his death in 1954, coincided with a surge of interest in Cage, in indeterminacy,

happenings, minimalism, and (again) writings in the form of lectures, non-lectures, squibs, interviews, and 'silences'. This too was 'theory' of a sort – and a much more accessible sort than the other, it must be admitted. Also much more media-wise. The meteoric rise of interest in serial and chance music was accompanied by an eclipse, at least in prestige, of more conservative music. It seemed symbolic that the main Eastern establishment figures in their fifties, Roger Sessions and Aaron Copland, both turned to serialism at this time. This was as nothing, however, compared to the sensation produced by the similar turn by Stravinsky, in his seventies, on the West Coast.

Partly as a result of the eclipse of conservative contemporary music, the polarization of musical life between the old and the new seemed to grow even more intense under the second phase of modernism than under the first. As the decades passed, music-lovers found themselves listening at concerts and on the newly marketed long-playing records to the same old music, over and over again. The best-loved Puccini operas and Mahler symphonies were now more than fifty years old. Advanced twentieth-century music seemed no nearer to acceptance. The left accused symphony orchestras, opera companies, and other standard concert institutions of turning themselves into museums, museums without modern wings which people could walk through (for when contemporary pieces were played, people walked out). Critics of this persuasion were further disquieted by the vigorous revival of even older music, such as that of Vivaldi and Telemann, to say nothing of the twelfth-century *Play of Daniel* which was so stylishly presented by the New York Pro Musica Antiqua in 1958. The right persisted with attacks on the avant garde. The polemic of Henry Pleasants's *The Agony of Modern Music* of 1955 was to echo down through the decades to Leonard Bernstein's *The Infinite Variety of Music* of 1966, Samuel Lipman's *Music after Modernism* of 1979, and (presumably) beyond.

In Britain conservative music was not eclipsed, chance music never had much of a chance, and serialism did not make a serious impact until somewhat later. A younger generation of

composers needed to grow up, such as the group who were students at the Royal Manchester College in the mid-1950s, strongest among them Peter Maxwell Davies. Well before this, however, something else was happening under the aegis of a composer who had once wanted to study with Alban Berg but who now turned sharply away from the avant garde. Benjamin Britten's work is best understood as an emphatic continuation of the revival of British music that began in late Victorian times – the 'English musical Renaissance', if this term may be extended to generations past those of Parry and Vaughan Williams. Britten's triumphant establishment of English opera starting with *Peter Grimes* in 1945, his 'realizations' of Purcell and English folksongs, his celebration of an East Anglian rural-cum-marine idyll at Aldeburgh, even his provision for generational continuity through music written for children – all this can be seen as a single impetus. Not everyone liked Britten's music, but by 1960 he was already becoming that highly improbable phenomenon for the second half of the twentieth century – a 'classical' composer with whom a substantial part of a nation could identify.

It is true that this all looks a lot clearer today in retrospect, and that more conservative and less perceptive critics were quite capable of missing important things that were taking place in musical composition of the 1950s. (I was among them.) This was hardly the case as regards popular music. The precipitous decline of the big bands was widely observed, while much attention was paid to survivors such as Stan Kenton and the indestructible Ellington. The resurgence of jazz for small ensembles was predicated on radical new styles, the 'bop revolution' of the 1940s soon refracting into the dazzling kaleidoscope of modern jazz. The fusion of jazz with 'classical' music, an ideal since the time of Gershwin and the early Copland, never took place. Or, at least, it took place on the terms of jazz musicians such as Ellington and Ornette Coleman, not on the terms of classically trained musicians such as Mátyás Seiber and Gunther Schuller.

Shaken by its own modernist movement, jazz even produced its own antimodernist reaction in a faceless new Dixieland tradi-

tion. As modern jazz grew more esoteric and less popular, other kinds of popular music developed from sources humbler than those of jazz to meet the needs of the mass audience and those who purveyed to it. First rhythm and blues, then rock and roll, and finally rock were swept forcefully into everyone's consciousness. The rather astounding rock explosion in Britain (to some observers, though not to all, the final decisive confirmation of that English musical Renaissance) came a little later, once again. But the Beatles and many other groups in Britain were already playing in the 1950s, though the gold records had not yet begun to be issued. A fertile ground for all kinds of jazz, blues, and country music had been prepared by the American presence in Europe during and after the war. As Charles Hamm has pointed out, it was only in the wake of America's decisive political entry into the world scene that American popular music finally became an undisputed world language.²¹

Obligatory, in discussions of postwar music, is mention of the impact of electronic technology for recording and generating music. Though the electronic studio equipment of the 1950s seems almost unbelievably clumsy by today's standards, it produced the first and still seminal monuments of electronic music. The Beatles were soon to try their hand at a little electronic composition – and as for performance, the whole rock phenomenon is certainly unthinkable without electric guitars, Moogs, and those terrifying amplification systems which made Woodstocks possible. In a quite different area, new vistas were opened up for ethnomusicology. Field work, which had relied on sound recording since the days of Edison, was revolutionized by the battery-powered tape recorder, while all the musics of the world were disseminated in the West by long-playing records. A little later the Beatles were playing sitars, too, and Benjamin Britten was writing *Curlew River* on a Japanese model.

In all this welter of audio-technological advance, nothing was more important than the simple fact of the long-playing – and low-priced – record. People have been fascinated, even horrified, by the power of recording technology and marketry to establish whole genres of popular music, let alone the careers of individual

performers and groups. The postwar concert repertory has also been decisively guided by records: consider the new popularity of Haydn and Mahler, of opera of all kinds, and of Baroque and other early music. Consider also not exactly the popularity but at least the availability of the corpus of modernist and other important music from the first half of the twentieth century, and even from the second.

But the crucial thing, I believe, was that now listeners could and did obtain great masses of music of all kinds and were able to *browse* through it on recordings, in something like the way they were used to browsing through literature of all kinds in books. Previously only professional musicians had been able to move around in music with such (actually less) flexibility by reading scores. The range and sheer amount of music known to non-musicians and musicians alike went up exponentially; musical composition, musical performance, and musical consumption were all affected by the electronic revolution of the 1950s, but consumption was affected most. No wonder the audience for music increased (and with the record audience, also the audience for live music at concerts). No wonder the young Colin Davis at postwar Oxford could remark that the *cachet* formerly reserved for poetry now seemed to be accorded to opera.

The new radical music created a demand for and received its new radical theory. 'Demand' is too strong a word, perhaps, but the great mass of music newly made available on records might be said to have called up its new criticism, too. A need was felt for modes of understanding, approach, or at least accommodation to increasingly sophisticated types of modern jazz and popular music, Indian ragas and Japanese koto performances, the bewildering array of medieval, Renaissance, and Baroque music of the West and – last but not least (and not the least bewildering) – music of the twentieth-century avant garde. Criticism in the broadest sense, taken to include everything from scholarship to journalism, proliferated in dissertations, monographs, journals, newspapers, and in that newest locale for the musical feuilleton, the LP record sleeve.

That the most coherent body of thought to develop should centre around Western music of the past was not a requirement, only the unavoidable consequence of academic history. Musicology – the history of Western art music – had thrived in the universities of German-speaking countries for more than fifty years before the war, and habits of mind formed at those times and in those places have been with us ever since. There have been legitimate grumblings about the slow acceptance into the academy of ethnomusicology, music theory, and criticism, but in fact by 1960 some important first steps had been taken, at least in ethnomusicology and theory. Before the war ethnomusicology had only a marginal place in universities here and abroad, and music theory only a marginal place in conservatories. Serious criticism existed at best – and it was not a very good best – in fugitive issues of little magazines.

Musicology before the war was not restricted to Germany, of course. It was practised everywhere, though everywhere less intensely and in a less organized way. The tradition in Britain was small, largely amateur, and distinguished. In the United States things were similar but rather less impressive – until the Hitler years, when the influx of refugees from Europe transformed music along with so many other aspects of American artistic and intellectual life. Musicology became institutionalized at major universities, and most of the powerful professors of the postwar period, with the exceptions of Oliver Strunk at Princeton and Gustave Reese at New York University, were members of the European diaspora. To mention only the most influential, Willi Apel was at Harvard and later Indiana, Manfred F. Bukofzer at Berkeley, Hans T. David at Michigan, Otto Gombosi at Chicago and later Harvard, Paul Henry Lang at Columbia, Curt Sachs at NYU, and Leo Schrade at Yale. From this time on, musicology has been expanding in the American academic setting at an expanding rate.

It was a fortunate time to enter the field. What was unfortunate was that the work of some of the most effective and best-placed of these teachers was cut off so soon. Bukofzer and

Gombosi died as young men in 1955, and in 1958 Schrade returned to Europe. This left Princeton, in particular, where Strunk had been joined by Arthur Mendel, in a favourable position; under Mendel, who was equally effective as an administrator and as a teacher (and indeed as a performer of early music), Princeton became the main music-intellectual centre in America. This was also because of the serious work fostered there in music theory, allied to composition, in which the commanding figures were Sessions and Babbitt, as has already been mentioned. The other strong theory programme established at the time, under the influence of Schrade at Yale, was associated less with composition than with music history.

And it was perhaps predictable that ethnomusicology should have received no comparable impetus at those particular institutions. Indiana University and Wesleyan University in Connecticut were outposts of ethnomusicology in those days, but it seems fitting that the most emphatic programme should have been developed in the West, at the University of California at Los Angeles. The force behind this development, which coalesced in 1961 with the establishment of a highly effective Institute of Ethnomusicology, was a young composer who had studied with the great Dutch ethnomusicologist Jaap Kunst, Mantle Hood. Its *éminence grise* was Charles Seeger, who had also started out life as a composer, who had sparked a music department at the university as long ago as 1912 (at Berkeley), and who had given the first courses on ethnomusicology ever offered in America, at the New School for Social Research in New York in the 1930s.

Similar developments took place in Britain but, once again, rather later. A recent survey of musical scholarship in Britain remarks on how slowly institutional support seems to be taking hold, and on how stubbornly ingrained patterns of amateurism continued in this area.³ Yet the immediate postwar years did see some decisive advances. Although the serious study of theory and analysis was possible only in private, with refugee scholars in the Schoenberg orbit such as Erwin Stein and Hans Keller, heady stuff was published in new or newly invigorated journals

such as *Music Survey*, *The Score*, *Tempo*, and the *Music Review*. The scholarly publication series *Musica Britannica*, by getting launched on the same wave as the 1950 Festival of Britain, did receive institutional support, from the Arts Council; this series, devoted to the publication of musical monuments from Britain's past, serves or served as a major focus for musicological work. A different sort of focus, also important, was provided by the indirect support of the BBC. On the Third Programme musicologists and historically minded performers joined forces to broadcast an unbelievable amount of early music. If English musicology is characterized by high-level popularization and a concern for the actual sound of early music, and American musicology by seminars, dissertations, and other insignia of academia, we can see the difference also in certain primary institutions supporting them.

But there was also, in Britain, growth of academic support. The clutch of new universities founded in the 1950s contributed to the institutionalization not only of musicology but also of theory; York specialized in avant-garde music, Southampton and Sussex in theory. At the older foundations there was the astonishing fluke of three senior musicologists appointed to chairs in the single year 1947 – this in a country which up to that time had had only one real musicologist-professor, Edward J. Dent at prewar Cambridge. (All university appointments in Britain are flukes, or so it sometimes seems to outsiders.) Jack A. Westrup went to Oxford, Anthony Lewis to Birmingham, and Gerald Abraham to Liverpool. Also in that same year a younger man was appointed lecturer at Cambridge who was to have as great or even a greater impact. Thurston Dart immediately proved to be an almost explosively dynamic teacher, and in the 1960s he was to establish a music department at King's College in the University of London on radical terms – radical not only as regards musicology. Ethnomusicology and avant-garde music were on the syllabus, as well as the historical performance of music, which was always the focus of Dart's musicology. In 1982 King's actually established a professorship, for Arnold Whittall, in Musical Theory and Analysis.

The rapid development of musical scholarship in the postwar period has to be charted principally in terms of influential scholars and enabling institutions, as I have tried to do very briefly above. Institutions of various other kinds also deserve to be mentioned: the learned societies with their journals, committees, and annual meetings; fellowship programmes – especially, perhaps, that of the Fulbright Commission; and publishers such as W. W. Norton in New York who specialized *inter alia* in music textbooks and 'official' scholarly books on music. And perhaps I might also put in a word for the students of the postwar generation, since I was one of them: a generation which in both England and America appears to have produced as many bright – well, anyway, interesting – young musicians who were attracted to musical scholarship as to musical composition. This may well be considered to be a rather surprising turn of events; and doubtless in strictly logistical terms it would also have to be counted as a decisive one. It probably had a good deal to do with the new availability of music of all kinds on long-playing records. People desire or decide to become musicologists, composers, or ethnomusicologists because they have heard music that excited them – old music, contemporary music, or music of non-Western cultures. And whether students go into scholarship or composition is sometimes determined less by their supposed intellectual or creative proclivities, I think, than by their attitudes towards modernism.

When they go into scholarship, they publish too much. This is a state of affairs music shares with all other branches of academic life today; it has been analysed and deplored on many occasions, and I would have nothing really new to add to what others have incisively said about it.⁴ But I do think it necessary, before concluding this sketch of postwar developments in music, and before embarking on a more detailed analysis of the course of postwar musicology, to underline this condition. The situation may not, in fact, be at its worst in music, but there is no blinking at the fact that a great deal of so-called intellectual

work is done on a low level. No editor of a journal, and no reader of manuscripts for university presses, has been spared the shock of seeing a piece of work he has firmly rejected pop up like a cork in someone else's magazine or monograph series. We are all a part of the problem. Half of the academic community writes when it has nothing to say, it seems, while the other half conspires to get that writing published.⁵

Perhaps, then, the above account of the rapid development of postwar scholarship in music is altogether too rosy. One would like to think that the great expansion of activity entailed a corresponding expansion of good work; but it would be impossible to say confidently that this second expansion has been proportional to the first. It would in any case be a dispiriting task, as well as a very dull one, to try to survey the field comprehensively and impartially. No, the coverage in the following chapters will be nothing if not selective. The reader has already been alerted to the criteria governing the selection. We shall examine certain lines of thought in musicology and in related disciplines, lines that illuminate the coming together of those disciplines and the growing orientation of musicology towards criticism.

2. Musicology and Positivism: the Postwar Years

What is the impetus behind musicology? Why do we study the history of music? This was a question posed by Arthur Mendel at the beginning of his well-known paper 'Evidence and Explanation', which became a sort of musicological credo for many in the 1960s.* His answer was really an evasion:

Our primary reason for studying history . . . is, I hope, the same as the primary reason why the best minds study anything: because we have a passion for understanding things, for being puzzled and solving our puzzles; because we are curious and will not be satisfied until our curiosity rests. 'Man, who desires to know everything, desires to know himself' (p. 4).

This dictum of R. G. Collingwood's, or something like it, is often invoked in order to supply an ideal impetus for musicology as a kind of abstract investigation, a pure working of the mind among the multiple mysteries of music's past and present. It is invoked especially by those who without understanding science very well would like to attach the term 'scientific' to thought about music.

Mendel knew better. The puzzles to which he had turned his presumably free-floating curiosity during the essential span of his career as a musicologist were puzzles about Bach, the com-

* For notes marked with an asterisk (rather than an arabic number), the reader should refer directly to the list of Main Works Cited, page 243. When the titles of articles or books are already present in the text, as here, the list will provide full bibliographical information. When, as sometimes happens in the course of a discussion of an author's works, articles and books are referred to in the text (and asterisked) without being actually named, the full titles can be found in the list under the name of the author.

This book has been concerned with ideas and ideologies of music as I have apprehended them, mainly in the United States and Britain, since the Second World War. It would be silly to conclude it on a note of prediction. A coda is no place for presentiments. I draw attention to the above trends as hopes, not as predictions: as hopes for motion.

Notes

1. Introduction

1. See Andrew Porter, *A Musical Season* (New York: Viking, 1974); *Music of Three Seasons: 1974–1977* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1978); *Music of Three More Seasons: 1977–1980* (New York: Knopf, 1981).
2. Charles Hamm, 'Popular Music: North America to 1940', vol. 15 of *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London: Macmillan, 1980), p. 110.
3. David Fallows, Arnold Whittall, and John Blacking, 'Musicology in Great Britain since 1945', *Acta Musicologica* 52 (January–June 1980), pp. 38–68. Updated in vol. 55 (July–December 1983), pp. 244–53.
4. For example, by J. H. Hexter, in *Doing History* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1971), pp. 136–8.
5. In the half-dozen or so years around 1980, there was something like a quantum leap in the number of new English-language scholarly journals, yearbooks, monograph series, and the like in music. The following list makes no claim to completeness: *American Music*, *California Studies in 19th-Century Music*, *Composers of the Twentieth Century*, *Early Music History*, *Journal of Musicology*, *Music Analysis*, *Music Perception*, *Music Theory Spectrum*, *Musica Asiatica*, *19th-Century Music*, *Popular Music*, *Studies in Musical Genesis and Structure*, *Studies in the History of Music*, *Studies in Musicology* (dissertations: 83 volumes since 1978, including both English and American series), *Studies in Russian Music*, *Studies in Theory and Criticism of Music*. This list does not include facsimile series or opera guides.

2. Musicology and Positivism: the Postwar Years

1. Mendel, 'Evidence and Explanation', p. 4.
2. See Joseph Kerman, 'A Few Canonic Variations', *Critical Inquiry*