Musicology, §III: National traditions of musicology

III. National traditions of musicology

Just as there are recognizable national styles in musical composition, so too are there patterns in scholarship that owe their character to the presence of national traditions, ideas and institutions peculiar to a given country or language group. The objectives of scholarship are international, but it is instructive to follow the various native strands and note how they fuse into the total pattern. The present discussion nevertheless can only make passing reference to the principal events and individuals within the major countries.

1. France.

If modern musicology is a product of the Enlightenment, then France is the logical place to begin a discussion of national schools. French learning was emulated throughout Europe as the source and centre of rationalism. The rationalistic spirit revealed itself first of all in the work of the lexicographers, in the dictionaries of Sébastien de Brossard and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, culminating in the great Encyclopédie of Diderot and D’Alembert, and beyond that in the musical volumes of the Encyclopédie méthodique (1791–1818) edited by Framery, Ginguené and Momigny. French learning was also disseminated in the writings of a group of aestheticians (notably the Abbé Dubos and Batteux) all preoccupied in some degree with the classic concept of art as ‘imitation of nature’. Much of their argument was channelled into the prevailing controversy over the merits of French as against Italian opera. Chabanon, whose thinking took account of instrumental music, was the first to make a clean break with this aesthetic.

France had less to offer in writings on music history. After the efforts of Pierre Bonnet-Bourdelot early in the century there was only one work of any significance – J.-B. de La Borde’s four-volume Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne (1780), a provocative but uneven work important chiefly for the attention it draws to the early French chanson. In 1756 a Benedictine monk, Philippe-Joseph Caffiaux, had produced a systematic history of music from pre-history to contemporary times in seven volumes, but it was never
published (MS in \textit{F-Pn}). Finally, the theoretical works of Rameau were fundamental to French musical learning in the 18th century; they provided a focal point for the discussion of a host of crucial problems confronting composers and scholars alike.

After the disruptive events of the French Revolution a new generation of music scholars came to the fore. Prominent among them was Alexandre Choron (1771–1834), a man of broad knowledge and high didactic aims who was director of the Opéra in 1816 and for a brief period was involved in efforts to establish the Paris Conservatoire as the ‘Ecole Royale de Chant et de Déclamation’. His lifelong objective was to revitalize the training of musicians in France and to raise the level of musical understanding of the public in general. He was well versed in the German and classical writings on music, but Italy remained for him the prime source of musical excellence, as demonstrated in his best-known work, \textit{Principes de composition des écoles d’Italie} (1808, in three volumes; 2/1816, in six). As a teacher, writer and administrator, Choron exerted a profound influence on his contemporaries.

A more direct precursor of modern historical methods was François-Louis Perne (1772–1832), whose research centred on the music of the Middle Ages and antiquity. He was among the first to transcribe the music of Machaut and the Chastelain de Couci, and he made a rather misguided effort to restore the musical notation of ancient Greece to modern practice. A model of erudition of another kind was presented by Guillaume André Villoteau (1759–1839), who was chosen to accompany Bonaparte’s army to Egypt as a member of a scientific commission to study the culture of that country. His monographs treating of Egyptian music, musical instruments and iconography are pioneer works of ethnomusicology.

The central position in French musicology in the first half of the 19th century was occupied by François-Joseph Fétis (1784–1871), whose range of musical activity was extraordinarily comprehensive, embracing history, theory, music education, composition and the sociology of music. Prodigious in energy and prolific in output, Fétis dominated the music scholarship of his generation; he is best known today for his \textit{Biographie universelle des musiciens}, published in eight volumes between 1833 and 1844. The journal \textit{Revue musicale}, which he founded in 1827, served as a medium for the expression of his views as a critic and historian until it merged with Schlesinger’s \textit{Gazette...
musicale in 1835. In 1833 Fétis left Paris to become director of the Brussels Conservatory. His series of historical concerts with commentary, given in Paris from 1832 and in Brussels from 1839, awakened public interest in the music of the past. With Raphael Kiesewetter he was one of the first to stress the importance of the Netherlands school in the history of early European music. In a competition set by the Dutch government for the best essay on the subject ‘The Contribution of the Netherlands to the History of Music in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries’, Fétis’s text was rated a close second and was published along with Kiesewetter’s prizewinning work.

In the shadow of Fétis’s vigorous personality, a distinguished group of French music scholars was active in the first half of the 19th century, including Adrien de La Fage (1805–62), a pupil of Choron and friend of Baini (Palestrina’s biographer) in Rome. La Fage’s interests ranged from plainchant and the music of the Near East to music bibliography and source studies in general. He collaborated with Choron on the latter’s *Nouveau manuel complet de musique vocale et instrumentale* (1838–9) and wrote his own *Histoire générale de la musique et de la danse* (1844) emphasizing ancient and oriental practices. His best-known book was published posthumously under the title *Essais de dipthérographie musicale* (1864), a collection of notes and commentary related to early printed and manuscript sources, many of them deriving from Baini’s library. Several of these French scholars were archivists or librarians associated with one or more of the Parisian collections undergoing rapid expansion at that time. One such was Auguste Bottée de Toulmon (1797–1850), a lawyer by training who served as librarian of the Conservatoire from 1831 to 1848; he produced a number of important monographs, on the medieval chanson, medieval musical instruments, and the life of Guido of Arezzo.

An interest shared by many of these early 19th-century French musicologists was the improvement of church music performance through the reconstruction of organs and restoration of the authentic corpus of the chant. A leader in this movement was Joseph Louis d’Ortigue (1802–66), best known for his *Dictionnaire liturgique, historique et théorique de plain-chant et de musique d’église* (1854, in collaboration with Théodore Nisard). Others concerned with chant reform include La Fage, Jean-Louis-Félix Danjou (1812–66), who with Stéphan Morelot (1820–99) edited the *Revue de la musique religieuse, populaire, et classique* from 1845 to 1849, Alexandre Vincent (1797–1868)
and Félix Clément (1822–88). In its critical approach to chant sources the work of these men foreshadowed that of the monks of Solesmes later in the century. Another important figure, Aristide Farrenc, compiled jointly with his wife, the pianist and composer Jeanne-Louise Farrenc, a 23-volume set of early keyboard music, *Le Trésor des Pianistes* (1861–72). A selection of early vocal music was edited by the Prince de la Moskowa (son of Marshal Ney) in his 11-volume *Recueil des morceaux de musique ancienne* (1843). Charles Bordes (1863–1909) was responsible for an *Anthologie des maîtres religieux du XVe au XVIIe siècle* and Henry Expert (1863–1952) produced several well-edited sets of Renaissance French music. Of great significance still is the work of Edmond de Coussemaker (1805–76), a Franco-Belgian lawyer who came to medieval studies through reading Féétis’s *Revue musicale*. Best known among his editions is *Scriptorum de musica medii aevi nova series* (1864–76), an anthology of medieval writings on music modelled on a similar collection produced by Martin Gerbert nearly 100 years earlier, the *Scriptores ecclesiastici de musica sacra* (1784).

All of these scholars, with the exception of Féétis, were amateurs in the best sense; they were largely self-taught in music, and pursued careers as doctors, lawyers and public officials. The French were slow in giving institutional support to research in music: it was not until 1872 that chairs in music history were established at the Conservatoire and at the University of Strasbourg (then part of Germany). By the second half of the 19th century, however, French musicology began to take on a professional character: a new generation of scholars had emerged, some, notably the medievalist Pierre Aubry (1874–1910) and Jules Ecorcheville (1872–1915), harshly critical of Féétis’s dogmatism and frequent inaccuracies. A major effort to establish France as the centre of musical learning was made by Albert Lavignac (1846–1916) and Lionel de La Laurencie (1861–1933) who joined forces to edit the great *Encyclopédie de la musique et dictionnaire du Conservatoire* (1913–31). La Laurencie himself produced the definitive study *L’école française de violon de Lully à Viotti* (1922–4). Romain Rolland (1866–1944) was one of the many contributors to the *Encyclopédie*. Marie Bobillier (1858–1918), who published under the name Michel Brenet, was a prolific writer on early French music. Henry Prunières (1886–1942) founded a new *Revue musicale* in 1920.
It was Rolland who occupied the first chair in music history at the Sorbonne (University of Paris), beginning in 1903. He was succeeded in 1912 by André Pirro, one of the giants of modern French musicology. In addition to his basic research in the music of the late Baroque (J.S. Bach, Schütz and Buxtehude) and the 15th century, Pirro claimed a long line of distinguished pupils including Yvonne Rokseth, Jeanne Marix, Geneviève Thibault, Jacques Chailley, Armand Machabey, Elisabeth Lebeau, Nanie Bridgman, Vladimir Fédorov, Paul Henry Lang and Dragan Plamenac. Pirro retired in 1937, and his successor, Paul-Marie Masson, was not appointed until 1943. Masson was succeeded by Chailley in 1952. In 1961 a third chair of musicology was created at the University of Poitiers, and Solange Corbin was appointed to it.

Outside the universities the Ecole des Hautes Etudes Sociales, where Pierry Aubry and Henry Expert taught, offered courses in musicology intermittently from 1902. In 1929 André Schaeffner founded the Department of Organology at the Musée de l’Homme in Paris (it was renamed the Department of Ethnomusicology in 1954); this was the point of departure for ethnomusicological research in France. During the 1950s musicologists also gained access to the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CRNS), which organized conferences devoted principally to the Renaissance (focussing on instrumental music, particularly for the lute, and the relationship between poetry and music) and to the interaction of music and drama. Jean Jacquot, the organizer of these ‘colloques’, also edited a vast series of transcriptions of lute music, the Corpus des luthistes. From 1961 to 1973 Geneviève Thibault (Countess of Chambure) was director of the Musée Instrumental du Conservatoire de Paris, the precursor of the Musée de la Musique in the Cité de la Musique. Thibault, who amassed a large collection of instruments and scores, trained many researchers in the fields of organology and musical iconography. Among the other senior scholars of this period was Marc Pincherle, a specialist in the history of the violin in the Baroque and Classical periods.

The most important institution for musicological research in France was founded during the German occupation (although the idea had been put forward during the Popular Front period). The music department of the Bibliothèque Nationale, created in 1942, united under one administration the three major French music libraries: the music division of the Bibliothèque Nationale (now the Bibliothèque Nationale de France), the Bibliothèque du
Conservatoire and the Bibliothèque de l’Opéra. From the 1950s this department became the centre of musicology in France; among the distinguished scholars who have been associated with it are Nanie Bridgman, Vladimir Féдоров and François Lesure, the last serving as head of the department from 1970 to 1988, when he was succeeded by Catherine Massip. Since 1965 the department has been the headquarters of the Société Française de Musicologie (see below). It housed the central secretariat of RISM from 1953 to 1967, and at present accommodates the French teams of RISM and RILM.

As a result of major reforms introduced in 1969, music finally became fully accepted into French universities (see Universities, §III, 1). Eight universities, as well as the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Études and the Ecole des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, are authorized to award doctoral degrees in music and/or musicology. In 1999 some 30 musicologists also worked at the CNRS, most of them belonging to one of five teams: the Institut de Recherche sur le Patrimoine Musical en France, Études d’Ethnomusicologie, Atelier d’Études sur la Musique Française des XVIIe et XVIIIe Siècles (the research team of the Centre de Musique Baroque de Versailles), Ricercar (a team working within the Centre d’Études Supérieures de la Renaissance at the University of Tours) and the Centre d’Information et de Documentation-Recherche Musicale (associated with IRCAM, the Institut de Recherche et Coordination Acoustique/Musique).

The Société française de Musicologie (SFM) continues to play a crucial part in the musicological life of France. In 1917, when the Société Internationale de Musique closed abruptly as a result of World War I, the SFM was founded by a small group of French musicologists headed by La Laurencie. It publishes a journal (generally twice a year), entitled since 1922 Revue de musicologie, as well as scholarly studies and critical editions; the latter activity virtually ceased in the 1970s but has been revived since the early 90s. The society’s traditional ‘communications’ or discussion meetings have been replaced since the 1970s by conferences held every two or three years, sometimes organized by the SFM alone, and sometimes in association with foreign societies. Originally a small academic society run by a few outstanding personalities who often had no connection with the life of French institutions, the SFM has slowly been transformed into an association uniting all French musicological research. In 1999 it had about 500 members.
Although France still lags behind Germany, the USA and other countries in musicology, some 40 musicological theses are now submitted annually and the number of important publications has greatly increased, including translations of foreign works (France used to be extremely backward in this respect). Essential research tools have been provided (notably the systematic inventory within the framework of RISM of the musical material of the French provinces) and French musicologists have contributed to the great international reference works (MGG1 and 2, The New Grove).

Jean Gribenski

2. Italy.
Before World War I the state of musicology in Italy presented a contrast between the extraordinary richness of the country's archives and the failure of its scholars to make the best use of them. The reasons for this may be sought in the failure of universities to offer courses or degrees in historical music studies, in the lack of funds available for research, in the haphazard organization of certain libraries (a situation not entirely remedied today), and perhaps also in the sheer quantity of material available. One result of all this was that scholars worked, often in isolation, on whatever came nearest to hand, and it was only after the 1960s that a broader sphere of interest and a more sophisticated methodology raised the status and productivity of Italian musicology to international levels.

At the same time Italy's early contributions should not be overlooked. In the area of music theory Burney met numerous learned musicians, collectors, theorists and historians during his Italian tour (1770), and even before this Antonio Calegari, his pupil F.A. Vallotti, and Tartini at Padua were looking for a theoretical basis for music founded on mathematical principles. Vallotti's ideas were systematically expounded in treatises by L.A. Sabbatini published in Venice about the end of the century. Sabbatini had been a pupil at Bologna of Padre Martini, a central figure in the Italian musical Enlightenment, whose reputation as a historian and theorist was unsurpassed. His three-volume *Storia della musica* (1757–81), though incomplete, badly proportioned and marred by archaic methodology, was of wide influence; and his two-volume *Saggio fondamentale pratico di
contrapunto (1774–5) was an admired textbook on the contrapuntal practice of the old and new styles.

Martini's interest in the past as a lesson for the present was noteworthy, and his voluminous correspondence and library (now in I-Bc) represent in the first place a source of information about musical activity in the broadest sense. His methods were modelled on those of Muratori, the founder of modern Italian historiography, in nearby Modena.

In the area of music biography, G.O. Pitoni (1657–1743) compiled his Notizie dei maestri di cappella, containing copious information on some 1500 musicians active in Rome and elsewhere between 1000 and about 1700. Although it was never published, Giuseppe Baini drew on it for his study of Palestrina (1828) and for his projected Storia della cappella pontificia. The former is a starting-point for the 19th-century cult of Palestrina and the a cappella style, and it was soon followed by a seven-volume edition of Palestrina's works edited by Pietro Alfieri.

Extremely valuable (if not invariably accurate) documentary work on ‘local’ music history was carried out by scholars such as Francesco Caffi on the music at S Marco, Venice, Gaetano Gaspari on that of S Petronio, Bologna, and Francesco Florimo, whose account of the Neapolitan conservatories appeared in four volumes (1880–83). This 19th-century interest in local music history, often motivated by a scholar's pride in the place where he was born or brought up, continued in the 20th century (usually on a more scientific basis), for example by Francesco Vatielli at Bologna, Raffaele Casimiri at Rome and Ulisse Prota-Giurleo at Naples.

The more comprehensive outlook of 19th-century scholars led also to the formation of collections and publications of music: for example, Fortunato Santini (1778–1861) assembled at Rome a remarkable library of some 4500 manuscripts, 1100 prints and transcriptions, which ultimately found its way to Münster (now in D-MÜs). The interests of Abramo Basevi (1818–85) extended to contemporary German music as well as older Italian music, as did those of Alberto Mazzucato at the Milan Conservatory. Mazzucato's ideas on music history were systematically presented in the writings of his pupil Amintore Galli. An attempt to cover early Italian music comprehensively was made by Luigi Torchi in his L'Arte Musicale in Italia, projected in 34 volumes, of which only seven reached publication. At about the same time Oscar Chilesotti brought out a nine-
volume set of early French and Italian music, mostly for lute and guitar, under the title Biblioteca di Rarità Musicali.

An influential figure in the early part of the 20th century was Fausto Torrefranca, whose writings were motivated by nationalism (Le origini italiane del romanticismo musicale, 1930) and by the ‘neo-idealistic’ philosophy and historiographic methods of Benedetto Croce (La vita musicale dello spirito, 1910). Following in the same trend was Andrea Della Corte, co-author with Guido Pannain of the first large-scale Italian history of music in 1936. Gaetano Cesari was the first Italian scholar to profit from a thorough musicological training, which he received in Munich from Sandberger and Kroyer. In 1931 he founded the historical series Istituzioni e Monumenti dell'Arte Musicale Italiana, on which Giacomo Benvenuti, another Sandberger pupil, also worked. Benvenuti inaugurated another important series, I Classici Musicali Italiani, in 1941. The Istituto Italiano per la Storia della Musica, founded in 1938, published Casimiri's edition of Palestrina and works by other Renaissance and Baroque composers. More recently Italian musicology has benefited from the outstanding scholarship of Nino Pirrotta (especially on Italian subjects of the Ars Nova and early Baroque) and Alberto Basso (his writings on Bach, and on freemasonry and music, and his editorial acumen).

A central figure in musical activity and organization during the first half of the 20th century was Guido Maria Gatti, author of several books, editor with Andrea Della Corte of what was long the standard Italian musical dictionary, editor with Basso of the dictionary and encyclopedia La musica, and music editor of two other encyclopedias. In the second half of the century Basso was the editor of several major works: Opera, a series of music guides (1973–5); with Guglielmo Barblan, the three-volume Storia dell'opera (1977); the five-volume Storia del Teatro Regio di Torino (1976–88); and the 13-volume Dizionario enciclopedico universale della musica e dei musicisti (1983–90). In 1920 Gatti founded the periodical Il pianoforte, which in 1928 became the Rassegna musicale; publication ceased in 1962, but a series of Quaderni followed. The most authoritative Italian music periodical from 1894 until it ceased publication in 1955 was the Rivista musicale italiana, published by the Bocca brothers of Turin; others include Ricordi's Gazzetta musicale di Milano (1842–1966, with several changes of title), and
Note d'archivio, a mine of documentary information on early Italian music and musicians which Raffaele Casimiri edited from 1924 until his death in 1943.

In an effort to place Italian musicology on a sounder footing the Associazione dei Musicologi Italiani was founded at Ferrara in 1908 by Guido Gasperini. An important result was the publication between 1909 and 1941 of a series of catalogues of Italian libraries and archives. The project remained unfinished and the results were uneven, but many of the catalogues were of outstanding quality, notably those of the Biblioteca Estense in Modena and the libraries of the conservatories in Naples and Bologna. The association's activities ceased after Gasperini's death in 1942.

Since World War II enormous strides have been made in Italian musicology as a consequence of increased contact with scholars of other countries, resulting in the heightened appreciation of Italy's own rich heritage and the establishment of university courses in musicology-related subjects, beginning in Turin in 1925. The first chair in musicology was created in Florence in 1941, the second in Rome in 1957. At the end of the 20th century, music history was being taught at some 30 universities; few, however, offered a wide range of courses in musicology. Fully fledged departments of music existed only at the universities of Pavia at Cremona (Scuola di Paleografia e di Filologia Musicale, founded in 1952), Bologna (Dipartimento Arti Musica Spettacolo, 1970), Macerata at Fermo (Scuola Diretta Fini Speciali in Musicologia e Pedagogia Musicale, 1989) and Cosenza (Discipline delle Arti, della Musica e dello Spettacolo, 1990). A few universities also offer courses in ethnomusicology (usually limited to the traditional music of Italy). Journals and series of publications associated with universities include Esercizi: musica e spettacolo (from 1991), Studi musicali toscani (from 1993), Il saggiatore musicale (from 1994) and Studi e testi musicali (from 1992). In 1987 a large-scale, multi-volume history of Italian opera, Storia dell'opera italiana, was begun, under the editorship of Lorenzo Bianconi and Giorgio Pestelli.

In 1964 the Società italiana di musicologia was founded (with Barblan as president). In 2000 it had about 800 members. The society publishes a biannual journal, the Rivista italiana di musicologia, as well as conference proceedings, catalogues, editions of music and books on music history. When outside funding for RISM was discontinued, the cataloguing of music sources directed by Elvidio Surian for the society was interrupted.
Private associations were formed to carry on the enormous task, and they now exist in almost all regions of the country. Through their efforts many catalogues of private and public collections have been published. The reference centre for these activities is the Ufficio Ricerca Fondi Musicali in Milan, established by Claudio Sartori in 1964. However, Italy still lacks a coordinated national computer system, which would make all such information generally accessible.

The Società Italiana del Flauto Dolce, founded in 1969, was influential in the teaching of the recorder in schools and, especially through its early music summer schools, encouraged interest in pre-19th-century instruments and literature. In 1992 the society became the Fondazione Italiana per la Musica Antica; it publishes the annual journal Recercare.

The Istituto di Studi Verdiani at Parma, the Accademia Tartiniana at Padua, the Fondazione Rossini at Pesaro, the Fondazione Gaetano Donizetti at Bergamo, the Fondazione Locatelli at Cremona, the Fondazione Salieri at Legnago and the Istituto Liszt at Bologna are all engaged in scholarly research into those composers whose names they bear. The Fondazione Cini at Venice has assembled an important collection, in photographic reproduction, of Venetian musical sources, as well as organizing conferences on Venetian opera. Courses and conferences are also arranged each year at Siena by the Accademia Chigiana; the proceedings are published in Chigiana. Two other important research journals are the Nuova rivista musicale italiana, published by Italian Radio, and Analecta musicologica, published by the Istituto Storico Germanico in Rome.

Carolyn Gianturco


Musicology in Britain has grown out of certain particularly strong and long-lived traditions: the collecting and study of musical instruments, the science of acoustics, the performing of early music (with the allied practices of textual criticism and editing) and to some extent also the collecting and editing of folksong. The development of music history as a scholarly discipline came, in a sense, rather later, although it has roots extending back to the 17th century. Its pre-Victorian manifestations were very much part of the amateur tradition of music study that has always been an element of British
musicology. In those earlier times, all music other than contemporary music was termed ‘ancient music’ and thought of as the domain of the ‘antiquary’.

Roger North (1653–1734) stands at the beginning of the English Enlightenment and was a man in whom the spirit of the Enlightenment was clearly visible. Furthermore, he represents an abiding tradition in British musical scholarship in placing emphasis on music not as a subject for speculation but as a living art to be enjoyed and understood in performance. North, a member of a distinguished family, was trained for a career in law but retired in 1688 to devote himself to music and gardening. He regarded himself as an amateur musician. He cultivated music in its widest dimensions, was fascinated by the ideas that move men to create it, and filled notebooks with observations related to theory and musical composition, history, aesthetics and performing practice. These views were consolidated in a series of treatises of which *The Musickall Grammarian* and *Memoires of Musick* were the most important. He continually redrafted and revised his writings but never brought them to publication. North, though not a profound music historian or speculative theorist, had vision and a lively curiosity, and was free from pedantry.

A more traditionally orientated musician was J.C. Pepusch (1667–1752). His fame rests chiefly on his association with John Gay as musical arranger of *The Beggar’s Opera* (1728), but his contemporaries knew him as a student of ancient music and theory. The crowning achievements of English music historiography in the 18th century were the general histories of Charles Burney and John Hawkins. Hawkins’s *General History of the Science and Practice of Music* appeared complete in five volumes in 1776. The first volume of Burney’s *General History of Music from the Earliest Ages to the Present* was issued in the same year, but the author did not finish his work until 1789. The magnitude of these accomplishments is astonishing considering that Hawkins and Burney worked independently and without significant antecedents.

The two main preoccupations of 19th-century music historians were church music and the Elizabethan ‘Golden Age’ of English music. The critical study of church music arose at about the time that the monks of Solesmes were beginning their work in France on plainchant; it was associated in part with the Oxford Movement for liturgical reform, and later with the so-called English Renaissance at the end of the century. Two scholars represent the study of church music at the turn of the century: Walter Howard Frere
(1863–1938), Bishop of Truro, and Edmund H. Fellowes (1870–1951), a minor canon of St George’s Chapel, Windsor. Frere was concerned with the study of medieval plainchant, but he also did much to establish the forms of liturgy in late medieval England, particularly the Use of Sarum, and produced editions of the main Sarum liturgical books. His work was continued by Dom Anselm Hughes (1889–1974). Fellowes produced his standard history of English Cathedral Music from Edward VI to Edward VII (1942) and biographies of Byrd (1923, superseded by a second in 1936) and Gibbons (1925), as well as studies of the English madrigal and its composers and many editions of 16th- and 17th-century sacred and secular music (see below).

The first important 20th-century history of music in English was The Oxford History of Music (1901–5), written from very different standpoints by H.E. Wooldridge, Hubert Parry, J.A. Fuller Maitland, Henry Hadow, Edward Dannreuther and H.C. Colles, with an introductory volume by Percy Buck. Parry in particular, in his volume on the 17th century, took a Darwinian evolutionary approach to music history which he had already applied in The Art of Music (1893, enlarged as The Evolution of the Art of Music, International Scientific Series, lxxx, 1896), and which has characterized much English historical writing since. The successor to OHM, The New Oxford History of Music (1954–86), was under the direction of Egon Wellesz and Jack Westrup – two great Oxford historians, the latter one of the most influential minds in English music historiography – and Gerald Abraham, noted particularly for his work on Russian and east European music. Another scholar of profound influence, in England and internationally, was Edward J. Dent (1876–1957), professor at Cambridge, whose main field of research was Italian Baroque opera, and who did much to bring little-known music of the past and present to a wider audience.

British historical writing prides itself on its strong critical tradition, cultivating descriptive and evaluative prose. An interest in musical aesthetics goes back to the 18th century, with a group of writers concerned chiefly with the relationship between music and poetry. Its principal member was Charles Avison, a composer-critic whose Essay on Musical Expression appeared in 1752. A few years later John Brown published his Dissertation on the Union and Power, the Progressions, Separations, and Corruptions of Poetry and Music (1763), which was followed by Daniel Webb’s Observations on the
Correspondence between Poetry and Music (1769) and James Beattie’s Essays on Poetry and Music (1776).

Occasional reviews of music and musical performances began to appear during the second half of the 18th century in monthly journals such as the Gentleman’s Magazine and European Magazine, but it was not until the early 19th century, with such publications as The Harmonicon (1823–33) and the Musical World (1836–91) that independent music journalism was firmly established. The Musical Times, which has been in continuous publication since 1844, combines unusually wide coverage of musical events with well-informed criticism and articles of general and scholarly interest. The Musical Antiquary (1909–13) was short-lived but set a new standard in the presentation of musical scholarship, while both the title and the contents of Music & Letters (founded 1920) are representative of the best traditions in English musicology. Newspaper music journalism has always been of a high standard, elegant and well informed. Among the most famous critics in the late 19th and early 20th centuries were George Bernard Shaw, Ernest Newman and Neville Cardus, and these were followed by Martin Cooper, William Mann, Jeremy Noble, Andrew Porter, Stanley Sadie, Paul Griffiths and others in the principal newspapers and weekly and monthly magazines.

The tradition of collecting musical instruments is a very old one, and Britain houses several fine collections which furnish primary material for research. These include the Russell Collection of keyboard instruments in Edinburgh, the Bate Collection of wind instruments in Oxford, the Cobbe Collection of keyboard instruments in Surrey, and the collections at the Ashmolean, Oxford, and the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Horniman Museum and the Royal College of Music, London. Francis Galpin (1858–1945), working at the same time as Hornbostel and Sachs, was one of the first to write in a scholarly way about instruments in his Old English Instruments of Music (1910). He investigated not only European instruments but also those of the Near East, and his private collection numbered more than 500 instruments. The Galpin Society, founded in 1946, publishes an annual journal which is indispensable to anyone interested in early instruments, with articles by such scholars as Philip Bate, Anthony Baines and Peter Williams (who also edits the important Organ Year Book, founded 1970). The quarterly
Early Music, which started publication in 1973, devotes many of its pages to articles on instruments.

The twin traditions of performing and editing early music go back to the 18th century. Pepusch was one of the founders of the Academy of Ancient Music in the 1720s, the first of a British series of associations devoted to the performance of early music. Others were the Apollo Society (1731), the Madrigal Society (1741) and the Noblemen’s and Gentlemen’s Catch Club (1761). The repertory of these singing societies was drawn from English and Italian partsongs of an earlier period together with contemporary catches and glees.

The members of the Dolmetsch family were the most influential figures in the early 20th century in bringing about performances of Renaissance and Baroque music on authentic instruments such as lutes, viols, recorders and crumhorns. Arnold Dolmetsch (1858–1940) pioneered the accurate restoration of old instruments and the making of reproductions; he also researched and edited early instrumental music, and instituted festivals of early music. The Viola da Gamba Society (founded 1956) and the Lute Society (1948) continue to encourage authentic performance, and produce their own journals as forums for the discussion of performing practice, instruments and sources. This activity resulted in the setting up from the 1950s onwards of many instrument makers who based their designs on original instruments, as well as of a number of professional groups whose players were thoroughly versed in early performing practice and whose singers were trained in vocal production and ornamentation appropriate to specific musical styles.

These developments led to a sharp rise in the performance of early music in the 1950s by groups under directors who were also scholars and university teachers, among them Thurston Dart, Denis Stevens, Gilbert Reaney and, later, Raymond Leppard. With their work generously fuelled by the BBC and record companies (notably L’Oiseau-Lyre), they paved the way for younger musicians who mostly held no university position but were active publishing scholars and enthusiastically subscribed to the ideals of their predecessors: among them were David Munrow, Christopher Hogwood, Michael Morrow, Andrew Parrott and many others.
The performance of 17th- and 18th-century opera, particularly the operas of Monteverdi, Purcell and Handel under Westrup at Oxford University from the 1920s onwards and under Anthony Lewis at Birmingham University in the 1940s to 1960s, was an important venture. Lewis, on the staff of the BBC from 1935 and in charge of music on the Third Programme in the mid-1940s, brought such music to a still wider public. The spirit of all these operatic ventures derived from the work and teaching of Dent, who saw performance as the ultimate goal of scholarship.

The histories by Burney and Hawkins were remarkable for their extensive examples of early music, and the English were among the first to edit early music on a large scale. A collection, *Cathedral Music*, was projected by John Alcock and Maurice Greene and completed by William Boyce between 1760 and 1778. The edition, representing a continuous tradition from Tye and Tallis to Purcell and Croft, was further revised and expanded in 1790 by Samuel Arnold. It was Arnold who made the first collected edition of the works of a major composer, namely Handel. The set was issued in 180 instalments between 1787 and 1797 and, for its time, was a creditable undertaking, but unfortunately Arnold, for all his enthusiasm, was not equipped to fulfil his promise that the work would be ‘correct, uniform, and complete’. The many collections of catches and glees that appeared at intervals throughout the century displayed great antiquarian interest. One of the most conspicuous examples of this kind was Thomas Warren’s *Collection of ... Catches, Canons, and Glees* (c1775–), which contained 652 pieces, many of them transcribed from 16th-century sources. Another edition devoted to the music of the past was William Crotch’s *Specimens of Various Styles of Music* (1807–8), one of the first historical anthologies of music designed for teaching purposes. Crotch’s selection is unusual in the amount of folk or national music that it contains, of both Eastern and Western origin. John Stafford Smith published a similar anthology in 1812 under the title *Musica Antiqua: a Selection of Music of this and other Countries from the Commencement of the 12th to the Beginning of the 18th Century*.

The British Musical Antiquarian Society published music of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, and also of Purcell, between 1840 and 1847 (three decades before Eitner began his *Publikationen*). The Purcell Society, founded in 1876, embarked on its edition of Purcell’s music in 1878, in collaboration with the publishing firm of Novello; it
was eventually completed with volume xxxiii in 1965, but has continued with the active publication of revised and updated versions of the earlier volumes – another tradition that can be found throughout British musicology.

In 1898 John Stainer published his collection of medieval music, *Dufay and his Contemporaries*. The earliest English counterparts of the great German and Austrian Denkmäler editions, which began in 1892, were the publications of the Plainsong and Mediaeval Music Society (founded 1888), which date from 1891 onwards, Edmund Fellowes’s 36-volume English Madrigal School (1913–24) and 32-volume English School of Lutenist Song-Writers (1920–32), and the jointly edited Tudor Church Music (1922–9). Fellowes also produced a collected edition of the works of Byrd (1937–50). Thurston Dart later revised much of Fellowes’s work, as well as engaging in several important projects of his own. His editorial methods, which combined exact scholarship with sympathetic awareness of the needs of performers, were widely imitated. He was associated with the most important series of British scholarly editions to appear since World War II, Musica Britannica, launched in 1951 by the Royal Musical Association, with Anthony Lewis as general editor and Stainer & Bell as publishers.

As early as 1851 a learned society had been founded in London ‘for the cultivation of the art and science of music’. This was the Musical Institute of London, presided over by John Hullah. It was dissolved two years later, but in 1874 the Musical Association (since 1944 the Royal Musical Association) was founded by John Stainer and William Pole ‘for the investigation and discussion of subjects connected with the art and science of music’. The ‘science’ referred to was acoustics, a study strongly cultivated in Britain from the mid-19th century to the mid-20th by such scholars as Pole himself (a civil engineer by profession), Alexander Ellis, James Jeans and Alexander Wood; its major practical manifestation was the scientifically designed Royal Festival Hall, built in 1951. Since its formation the RMA has extended its activities, and its published *Proceedings* (continued from 1987 as the *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*), together with a *Research Chronicle* and a series of *RMA Monographs*, now constitute a major contribution to English musicology.

From its earliest times British musicology has placed great emphasis on research into folksong and popular music. The tradition extends from Bishop Percy’s *Reliques* (1765)
and Edward Jones’s *Musical and Poetical Relicks of the Welsh Bards* (1784) to the 20th century. Joseph Ritson (1752–1803) introduced critical methods in place of the casual amateurism of Percy, and the Anglican clergyman John Broadwood was one of the first to collect (in 1843) songs directly from the lips of living singers. His methods were followed by his niece, Lucy Broadwood, and by another clergyman, Sabine Baring-Gould. Two of the leading 19th-century students of British popular song were Edward F. Rimbault (1816–76) and William Chappell (1809–88). Rimbault was a versatile if not very precise scholar who played an active part in the formation of both the Musical Antiquarian and the Percy Societies. William Chappell is best remembered for his *Popular Music of the Olden Time* (1845–9), a work of enduring value. Towards the end of the century Frank Kidson, Cecil Sharp and Ralph Vaughan Williams were collecting and editing folksongs – still part of a living tradition. Kidson was a founder-member of the Folk Song Society in 1898; Sharp and Vaughan Williams later became members. In 1932 the society joined with the English Folk Dance Society (founded 1911) to form the English folk dance and song society. Later studies in English folk music have owed much to the research and activities of Maud Karpeles, A.L. Lloyd and Frank Howes, editor of the *Folk Song Journal* and its successor the *Journal of the English Folk Dance and Song Society* from 1927 to 1945.

Many later British scholars adopted a more anthropological approach to the study of Britain’s folk music, and much research has been undertaken into the folk music of non-European countries, notably by Hugh Tracey, A.M. Jones and John Blacking on African music, Laurence Picken on Chinese music and Turkish folk instruments, and an important group of scholars at the School of Oriental and African Studies, London University, working on Indian music in particular.

In 1740 the young James Grassineau, encouraged by Pepusch, published *A Musical Dictionary*. This turned out to be something more than the mere translation of Brossard’s *Dictionaire* that had been planned, and was in fact the first substantial work of its kind in the English language. Busby’s *Complete Dictionary* (1786), Burney’s articles for Rees’s *New Cyclopaedia* (1802–20), Busby’s *Musical Biography* (1814) and Sainsbury’s *Dictionary of Musicians* (1824) are among the more important lexicographical works between Grassineau’s and the first edition of Grove’s *Dictionary of Music and
Musicians. This was completed in 1890 and, in its subsequent revisions, has remained the most comprehensive and authoritative English-language work of its kind. Percy Scholes’s *Oxford Companion to Music* (1938) showed a more idiosyncratic approach to lexicography, but contained much information not readily accessible elsewhere, and Eric Blom’s *Everyman’s Dictionary of Music* (1946) was more useful and reliable than its small size might suggest. Both these works subsequently appeared in several new editions.

The role of the universities in the advancement of British musicology was not a prominent one before World War II, although the influence of isolated scholars such as Donald Tovey at Edinburgh and Dent at Cambridge was profound on those students who came into contact with them. Oxford and Cambridge have continued to play a leading role, partly because of their rich archival resources, but also because of the example and teaching reforms of Jack Westrup at Oxford and Thurston Dart at Cambridge. Dart was also for a time professor at King’s College, London University, and his influence was felt by a whole generation of British scholars.

Since the appointment (however brief) of overseas scholars such as Joseph Kerman, Howard Mayer Brown, Pierluigi Petrobelli, Thomas Walker and Reinhard Strohm to positions in British universities in the early 1970s, and the preparation of the 1980 *New Grove* with a much wider international contribution (authorial and editorial) and scope than any hitherto, musicology in Britain became far more strongly aware of currents elsewhere. The growth of British universities that began in the 1960s and continued well into the 90s has provided employment for enormously more musicologists; and a change in the method of national funding in the late 1980s, for the first time explicitly connected to research output, has led to a growth in both quantity and diversity in British musicology.

Vincent Duckles

4. Germany and Austria.

(i) 19th century.

Modern musicology owes much of its formation and development to the contributions of German and Austrian scholars, regarded internationally as leaders in the field from the
19th century to the mid-20th. Several standard historical works of the 17th century were the works of Germans: Sethus Calvisius's *De origine et progressu musices* (1600), Praetorius's *Syntagma musicum* (1614–18) and W.C. Printz's *Historische Beschreibung der Edelen Sing- und Kling-Kunst* (1690). Martin Gerbert wrote the first scholarly history of sacred music, *De cantu et musica sacra*, in 1767, and compiled an anthology of medieval treatises, *Scriptores ecclesiastici de musica sacra*, in 1784. Pioneer works in lexicography included J.G. Walther's *Musikalisches Lexicon* (1732) and Johann Mattheson's *Grundlage einer Ehren-Pforte* (1740). E.L. Gerber revised Walther's work and proceeded to compile the largest biographical lexicon up to that time, *Historisch-biographisches Lexikon der Tonkünstler* (1790–92), and the four-volume *Neues historisch-biographisches Lexikon der Tonkünstler* (1812–14).

J.N. Forkel is considered one of the founders of modern musicology; his *Allgemeine Litteratur der Musik* (1792) was the most comprehensive bibliography of music books to that time. He also wrote a history of music (*Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik*, 1788–1801) and the first Bach biography (*Über J.S. Bachs Leben, Kunst und Kunstwerke*, 1802). German writers trained in classical philology thereafter set the standards for biographical music research (Otto Jahn's *W.A. Mozart*, 1856–9; Philipp Spitta's *J.S. Bach*, 1873–80; Friedrich Chrysander's *Händel*, 1875–82; and Hermann Abert's revision of Jahn's *Mozart*, 1919–21). In Vienna, R.G. Kiesewetter, a civil servant in the Austrian War Ministry, wrote an outline of music history (*Geschichte der europäisch-abendländischen Musik*, 1834) alongside studies ranging from secular song of the Middle Ages and early monody to Arab music, tuning and temperament, and medieval instruments. Anton Schmid, head of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, was a specialist in the history of music printing and wrote the first critical biography of Gluck (1845). C.F. Pohl wrote a scholarly biography of Haydn (1875–82). Kiesewetter's nephew A.W. Ambros produced a five-volume history of music to 1600 (*Geschichte der Musik*, 1862–82) which set standards for subsequent research. These works, as well as Carl von Winterfeld's *Der evangelische Kirchengesang* (1843–7), contributed greatly to musicology's increasing focus on early music.

Until the late 19th century musicology was still practised largely outside the academy. The University of Vienna was the first to recognize it as scholarly discipline with the
appointment of the music critic Eduard Hanslick as professor of music history and aesthetics in 1861 and his promotion to full professor (Ordinarius) in 1870. German universities were slower to acknowledge the field, even though Germany ultimately surpassed all others in the strength of its musicology curricula. Forkel and D.G. Türk had been appointed university music directors in 1779 in Göttingen and Halle respectively, but the first Ordinarius positions in musicology at those universities came as late as 1918 in Halle (Abert) and 1920 in Göttingen (Friedrich Ludwig). Carl Breidenstein was the first musician to occupy a professorship in music (Bonn, 1826), but that university did not appoint an Ordinarius in musicology until 1915 (Ludwig Schiedermair). The first German position comparable to Hanslick's was that of Gustav Jacobsthal (Strasbourg, 1897), and two more chairs were established in the next 12 years (Hermann Kretzschmar in Berlin, 1904; Adolf Sandberger in Munich, 1909). Even Hugo Riemann never attained the rank of Ordinarius, despite his incomparable productivity and his mastery in music theory, history, aesthetics, acoustics, keyboard instruction, performing practice, editing and lexicography (his highly regarded Musik Lexikon appeared in its 12th edition between 1959 and 1975).

As the 20th century approached, German and Austrian scholars set standards for creating catalogues and indexes for research purposes and critical editions of musical works. Vast amounts of newly discovered source materials were made accessible through Robert Eitner's ten-volume Biographisch-bibliographisches Quellen-Lexikon (1900–04), Eitner, Lagerberg, Pohl and Haberl's Bibliographie der Musik-Sammelwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts (1877), Ludwig's Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili (1910), Emil Vogel's Bibliothek der gedruckten weltlichen Vocalmusik Italiens (1892) and Johannes Zahn's six-volume Die Melodien der deutschen evangelischen Kirchenlieder (1889–93). Thematic catalogues of the works of major composers first appeared with Köchel's catalogue of Mozart's works in 1862 and Nottebohm's Beethoven catalogue in 1868. Collaborative critical editions of the works of a single composer (Gesamtausgaben) started with the establishment of the Bach-Gesellschaft in 1850, followed by editions of the works of Handel (1858), Palestrina (1862), Mozart (1876), Schubert (1883), Beethoven (1884) and Lassus (1894). The most ambitious editorial projects were the government-sponsored scholarly editions of early
music from German-speaking regions, the ‘monuments’ (Denkmäler) series, the largest of which date to the last decade of the 19th century (Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich began in 1888, Denkmäler deutscher Tonkunst in 1889 and Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Bayern in 1900). Germans and Austrians were also the prime motivators in organizing the discipline. The first journal dedicated to serious music scholarship was a joint German-Austrian venture, *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, edited by Chrysander, Spitta and Guido Adler (professor in Prague, later Hanslick's successor) from 1885 to 1894. Oskar Fleischer spearheaded the founding of the International Music Society and its scholarly journal, *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, in 1904. The organization disbanded at the outbreak of World War I, but Adler successfully revived it as the International Musicological Society in 1927, with its journal *Acta musicologica*.

(ii) The early 20th century.

In the first decades of the 20th century, German-Austrian musicology emerged as a highly diversified area of scholarly inquiry, with intellectual traditions converging from philology, art history, hermeneutics and Dilthey's influential philosophy of *Geisteswissenschaften* (‘humanities’). The history of style, already established in other humanities disciplines, was adapted to musicology by Adler and further developed by Riemann into a synthetic approach incorporating music analysis, history and aesthetics. Kretzschmar, stressing the importance of cooperation between musicology and music practice, looked at music history by separate genres in the series he edited entitled *Kleine Handbücher der Musikgeschichte nach Gattungen* (1905–22). Specialization became more common in such areas as medieval and Renaissance music (Heinrich Besseler), notation (Johannes Wolf), Gregorian chant and history of the mass (Jacobsthal and Peter Wagner), Classical and Romantic music (Abert) and performing practice (Arnold Schering). German musicologists also continued to explore innovatory ways of presenting music history in such formats as anthologies of old music (Schering's *Geschichte der Musik in Beispielen*, 1931) and in iconography (Georg Kinsky's *Geschichte der Musik in Bildern*, 1929). Adler enlisted colleagues to contribute to a collaborative music history, the *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte* (1924), which served as
a model for Ernst Bücken's *Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft* (1927–31) and a later series of the same title edited successively by Carl Dahlhaus and Hermann Danuser (1980–95). As scholars in the humanities began to perceive the impact of science and technology on contemporary society, musicologists were also encouraged to open their minds to applications from natural sciences and social sciences. Research in systematic and comparative musicology laid its foundations in the first three decades of the 20th century at centres in Berlin (under the guidance of Carl Stumpf, Erich von Hornbostel and Curt Sachs) and Vienna (under Richard Wallaschek and Robert Lach). Working in the Psychology Institute at Berlin University, Stumpf built up a large archive of sound recordings from around the world and brought in collaborators from diverse fields, such as Hornbostel (with a doctorate in chemistry), Otto Abraham (a physician), Max Wertheimer (an authority in Gestalt psychology), and the musicologists Sachs, Georg Schünemann, Marius Schneider and Wolf. A recorded sound archive was established in Vienna in 1889, and Wallaschek, appointed to the University of Vienna in 1897, wrote extensively on the music of various cultures, aesthetics and psychology. Lach, appointed to the faculty in 1920, contributed to a variety of methodological issues, transcribed and analysed recordings, and shared an interest in oriental music with his colleague Egon Wellesz, best known as an expert in Byzantine music. Younger members of the Vienna school included Siegfried Nadel, Albert Wellek and Walter Graf.

At the outbreak of World War I, the International Music Society was disbanded, and travel restrictions and limited research funding compelled German scholars to stay at home. This led musicologists to pay closer attention to Germany's own musical traditions. H.J. Moser's three-volume *Geschichte der deutschen Musik* (1920–24) was the first comprehensive survey devoted exclusively to German music. During this period a profusion of studies focussed on the music of specific locales in Germany, societies dedicated to the performance and research of regional music were established, and plans were laid for local Denkmäler editions. The study of German folksong, until that point the exclusive domain of German philologists interested only in the texts, received more attention from musicologists. The Deutsches Volksliedarchiv in Freiburg, founded in 1914 by John Meier, collected and organized vast numbers of folksongs in text form, without their melodies. A serious study of melody came with the establishment of the
Archiv Deutscher Volkslieder in Berlin in 1917, under the direction of Max Friedländer. It became a major centre for cataloguing folktunes and, under Hans Mersmann's direction, expanded its collection to include the music of contemporary amateur movements.

The end of World War I marked an organizational turning-point for German musicology with the establishment of the Deutsche Musikgesellschaft (with its scholarly journal, the Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft) and the Institut für Musikwissenschaftliche Forschung zu Bückeburg. Serving the dual aims of renewing severed ties with scholars from former enemy nations and promoting work on German music, these institutions helped win academic recognition for musicology and asserted Germany's leading role in musicological research. In the years up to World War II, full professorships in musicology were established in Halle, Breslau, Göttingen, Leipzig, Heidelberg, Kiel, Freiburg, Cologne, Frankfurt and Königsberg.

(iii) The Nazi period.

After Hitler's rise to power in 1933 there was unprecedented government involvement in musicology (see Nazism). Discriminatory laws forced many musicologists to emigrate; most were of Jewish descent or, in the case of Leo Schrade, had a Jewish spouse, and many went on to enrich musicological scholarship abroad. The departure of Sachs and Hornbostel (the only Jewish musicologists holding faculty positions), along with several of their students, left a vacuum in systematic musicology and forced the dissolution of the Gesellschaft für Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft (founded in 1930 as the Gesellschaft zur Erforschung der Musik des Orients) and its journal, the Zeitschrift für vergleichende Musikwissenschaft. The Jews and spouses of Jews who stayed behind suffered greatly. Kinsky's private library was seized and he was sentenced to hard labour; released in 1944 with a serious illness, he died in 1951 in severely reduced financial circumstances. Willibald Gurlitt was dismissed from the University of Freiburg because of his Jewish wife, was banned from public speaking, publishing and academic work, and endured Gestapo surveillance and discrimination against his children.

Despite the immeasurable loss of personnel, German musicology reaped significant tangible benefits from Nazi government sponsorship. Most notable was the Nazi education ministry's resurrection of the virtually defunct Bückeburg-Institut and its move
to Berlin. Now called the Staatliches Institut für Deutsche Musikforschung, it incorporated the Berlin folksong archive, the instrument collection of the Hochschule für Musik and the Deutsche Musikgesellschaft's scholarly journal, Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft (renamed Archiv für Musikwissenschaft). It established a second journal, Deutsche Musikkultur, for musicological articles directed towards a general readership, as well as publishing two bibliographies. All existing Denkmäler projects fell under the institute's control and subscribed to uniform editorial principles; supervised successively by Besseler and Friedrich Blume, they were published as the series Das Erbe Deutscher Musik. The institute also laid the groundwork for the most ambitious musicological reference work of the postwar period, Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, with Blume as general editor.

The Nazi propaganda ministry sponsored publications and employed musicologists as consultants for musical activities. The ‘scientific’ branch of Himmler's SS published musicological monographs and articles, funded archival research projects in ancient and medieval music, and organized field research for the collection of folksongs from ethnic Germans and their ‘racial kin’. The Rosenberg Bureau, formed by the Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg, enlisted musicologists to evaluate scholarly writings for their ideological content, to compile a music lexicon, to contribute to a comprehensive directory of Jews in music and to assess the value of musical treasures plundered during the war.

With the annexation of Austria into ‘Greater Germany’ in 1938, Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich was immediately incorporated into Das Erbe Deutscher Musik, and Austria's folksong archives became part of the Staatliches Institut. Of the few remaining leading musicologists of Jewish descent, Wellesz and O.E. Deutsch left for England, and Karl Geiringer, dismissed as curator of the Gesellschaft für Musikfreunde, went to the USA. Wilhelm Fischer was suspended from his position in Innsbruck and was compelled to do forced labour until the end of the war. Vienna lost ground in comparative musicology as Lach retired and Erich Schenk was appointed in his place. The Nazi Education Minister also authorized a new musicology position in Graz and appointed Herbert Birtner. The Nazi propaganda ministry underwrote the Bruckner Gesamtausgabe,
formerly funded by the Schuschnigg government, and Hitler commissioned a new Mozart Gesamtausgabe.

Under the Nazis unprecedented advances were made in German folk-music research and its applications for everyday use (in the work of Kurt Huber, Marius Schneider, Walter Wiora, Fritz Bose, Mersmann, Werner Danckert, Joseph Müller-Blattau, Gotthold Frotscher, Wilhelm Ehmann and Siegfried Goslich), and there was steadily increasing interest in German music, its history and its distinguishing characteristics (pursued by Moser, Bücken, Müller-Blattau, Gurlitt, Hans Engel and many more). A revival of music biographies, previously shunned by musicologists as ‘positivist’, generated the series Die Grossen Meister der Musik (edited by Bücken, 1932–9) and Unsterbliche Tonkunst (edited by Herbert Gerigk, 1936–42, and published by the Rosenberg Bureau); both displayed a decided emphasis on German composers. A short-lived preoccupation with racial science attracted much attention, particularly when the first musicological conference in the Third Reich in 1938 adopted ‘Music and Race’ as its theme and featured a keynote speech by Blume on its methodological ramifications. For the most part, however, German musicology failed to make any significant progress in either accepting or rejecting the ideologically charged theories proposed by race theorists and amateur musicologists such as Richard Eichenauer, and generally avoided inquiries into the ‘Jewish Question’.

(iv) After 1945.

German musicology suffered during World War II not only from the loss of valuable personnel and widespread damage to libraries and publishing houses, but also from its 12-year isolation from the international scholarly community. After the war scholars in both Germany and Austria directed their energies towards renewing international ties and reviving the publishing industry. Blume founded the Gesellschaft für musikforschung in 1946 and served as its first president, advocating the resuscitation of large-scale ventures established during the Third Reich with state and private funding. The Gesellschaft drew members from around the world, many of whom contributed to the revival of Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart in 1949. In addition to its own journal Die Musikforschung (established in 1948) and Gurlitt's privately funded Archiv für Musikwissenschaft (1952), two international journals, Acta musicologica and Fontes artis musicae, were based in
Germany. The establishment of the Répertoire International des Sources Musicales was a German initiative, planned by Hans Albrecht and Blume, supported by international funds, and published by Bärenreiter and Henle. In Austria, numerous international societies dedicated to individual composers arose after the war and made significant contributions to research and the publication of editions. The Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum produced the *Mozart-Jahrbuch* from 1951, the Haydn Society advanced the continuation of a Haydn-Gesamtausgabe under the editorial direction of J.P. Larsen, and the Bruckner Gesamtausgabe resumed under Leopold Nowak. A Johann Joseph Fux-Gesellschaft was established in 1955 and proceeded to publish Fux's complete works, and an International Chopin Society was founded in Vienna in 1952 and began publication of the *Chopin-Jahrbuch* in 1956, edited by Franz Zagiba. Other societies include the Franz-Schmidt-Gemeinde, the International Liszt-Center, the Internationale Hugo-Wolf-Gesellschaft, the Johann-Strauss-Gesellschaft and the Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Schubert-Forschung.

Many musicologists in the western zones of occupation were allowed to continue their careers as before, but the musicology establishment disassociated itself from the Nazi past, most notably by publicly ostracizing Moser for his overtly nationalistic writings. The Soviet zone, on the other hand, strove to evict all former Nazis between 1945 and 1948, and encouraged those driven out of Nazi Germany as Communists and Jews (such as the musicologists Georg Knepler, E.H. Meyer, Nathan Notowicz and Harry Goldschmidt) to return to help build the new German Democratic Republic. Interest in sustaining publishing activities begun before the war, especially in the face of competition from the USA, led to Besseler's appointment in Jena and then in Leipzig, despite the active role he played in the Third Reich. Valued for his skills as an organizer and editor, Besseler succeeded in collaborating with Leipzig's famous music publishing houses. The *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters* was revived in 1956 as the *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft*, the Neue Bach-Ausgabe began in 1954, and the series Musikgeschichte in Bildern began in 1961.

Much early postwar scholarship continued to concentrate on German and Austrian music, with a strong emphasis on critical source studies. New and revised thematic catalogues for the works of Bach, Beethoven and Haydn were published, along with new complete
critical editions of the works of Bach, Mozart, Schütz, Handel, Telemann, Gluck, Spohr and Reger. The first task in Austria after the war was to regain control over Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich; this was achieved with the re-establishment of the Gesellschaft zur Herausgabe von DTÖ and the resumption of editorial work, supervised successively by Schenk and Othmar Wessely. Although the study of folk music ceased to be as well organized as before the war, research flourished under Felix Hoerburger in Regensburg, where the materials from the Berlin archive had been stored during the war, and at the Freiburg archive, where Walter Salmen and Wiora worked and where the Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung resumed publication. These and other researchers (Doris and Erich Stockmann, Ernst Klusen, Müller-Blattau and Wolfgang Suppan) investigated German folk music, while others (Bose, Hans Hickmann, Marius Schneider and Graf) turned their attention to non-European traditions as well. Graf revived the Vienna school of comparative musicology, and the Austrian education ministry established the Österreichisches Volksliedwerk and supported the publication of its yearbook.

Academic musicology experienced another spurt of growth in the postwar era as new chairs were established at the universities in Mainz, Marburg, Münster, Jena, Tübingen, Hamburg, Saarbrücken, Würzburg and West Berlin. Gurlitt returned to the Freiburg department, which continued to grow and diversify under him and his successor, H.H. Eggebrecht. Medieval and Renaissance concentrations continued in Göttingen in the work of Heinrich Husmann and Ursula Günther, and in Cologne (Fellerer and Heinrich Hüschen), and spread to Frankfurt (Ludwig Finscher and Helmut Hucke), Regensburg and Erlangen (both under Bruno Stäblein), and Berlin (Rudolf Stephan and Dahlhaus). In Austria, departments outside Vienna gained prominence. The department in Graz was directed successively by Hellmut Federhofer, Wessely and Rudolf Flotzinger. Wilhelm Fischer directed the department in Innsbuck until 1956, followed by Hans Zingerle and then Salmen, who emphasized folk-music research, music of the Classical period and musical iconography. A new musicology department came into being in Salzburg in 1966, focussing on the research and editorial production of music of local significance.

The division of Germany into two separate states resulted in the distribution of important source materials between the two countries, compelling East and West German musicologists to collaborate in a number of ventures, such as the Neue Bach-Ausgabe.
and the Hallische Händel-Ausgabe, both of which were published simultaneously by East and West German houses. Yet different philosophies and methodologies developed in the East and West, and in 1968 East Germans withdrew from the Gesellschaft für Musikforschung. East German musicology promoted a sociological approach, a Marxist interpretation of music history (see Marxism), work in music education, the study of folk music and the music of the workers movement, collaboration with other eastern Bloc countries, and a closer relationship between scholarship and music-making. Musicologists were affiliated with the Verband Deutscher Komponisten und Musikwissenschaftler, which produced the journal Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft, begun in 1959, as well as the more practically orientated Musik und Gesellschaft, begun in 1951. Until the 1970s, subject areas denigrated by communist ideology as ‘formalist’ and bourgeois, such as atonal music and jazz, could not be researched. Restrictions on travel abroad compelled East German musicologists to concentrate on available resources; thus the archives located in East Germany facilitated extensive work on Bach, Handel, Telemann, Schumann, Reger and Vivaldi. With access to foreign literature seriously limited, and scholars and students restricted in their choice of subject matter and its interpretation or even excluded from studying musicology because of their own and their families' political or educational background, a number of musicologists attempted to flee to the West. The study of musicology, available at six universities (Berlin, Jena, Halle, Rostock, Greifswald and Leipzig), had shrunk significantly by the late 1980s.

In the meantime, musicology in the West had been developing new strengths in areas of music research suppressed by the communists. West Berlin became an important centre for the study of the Second Viennese School by virtue of both its musical life and the concentration of engaged musicologists (Stephan, Dahlhaus, Reinhold Brinkmann and Elmar Budde). Other scholars pursued research in jazz and rock music and in systematic musicology at the universities and at the Staatliches Institut. In the wake of the student rebellions in the late 1960s, university reforms allowed students greater input into their curricula, and a new generation of scholars started to question the positivist approaches and emphasis on objectivity that had been nurtured in German musicology since World War II. Musicology in the 1980s yielded critical assessments of Germany's recent past, musicology's relationship to musical practices, new theoretical approaches to the
interpretation of music history and an upsurge of interest in the music of the 19th century. Germany's reunification resulted in further reflection on the course of the discipline, a restructuring of musicological institutions and the reshuffling of personnel.

Pamela M. Potter

5. Other west European countries.
The smaller countries of western Europe have naturally leant heavily on their larger neighbours in the development of musicological studies, and in particular many of them have leant on Germany. Their own traditions have been relatively late in developing and have not always been distinctive – depending, to some extent, on the musical past of the country concerned. A typical case is that of Switzerland, at the junction of three larger cultures. Scholars in that country have worked extensively on the history of Swiss music (notably the Protestant psalm), and have been avid in the production of dictionaries and periodicals; but apart from a continuing interest in medieval and Renaissance studies it would be hard to discover any national pattern in the work of such distinguished scholars of different generations as Peter Wagner, Jacques Handschin, Kurt von Fischer and Martin Staehelin. The activities of the Schola Cantorum Basiliensis, with which August Wenzinger and Wulf Arlt have worked, show an interest in the practical application of musicological knowledge.

Studies of performing practice, and of instruments, have been prominent in the Low Countries, typified by the instrument collecting of D.F. Scheurleer (1855–1927) and more recently by the conservation work of J.H. van der Meer, the performances of Gustav Leonhardt, the publications of Frits Knuf, and the historical instrument designs of Flentrop. The (since 1995: Koninklijke) Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, founded in 1868, is the oldest musicological society in the world. Albert Smijers became the first reader in musicology in a Dutch university (Utrecht, 1928), shortly after beginning his complete edition of Josquin. Partly through his influence, Dutch musicology has always been primary in research on the music of Josquin (with the New Josquin Edition in progress since 1987) and Obrecht (three editions, the second incomplete, the third, the New Obrecht Edition, ed. Chris Maas, 1983–99), even though neither composer was Dutch. Other interests were represented by
scholars as diverse in their interests as Joseph Smits van Waesberghe, a chant scholar, and Frits Noske, whose work on song and opera covered the 17th to 19th centuries and whose interest in socio-musicology represented a significant new trend. The convergence of historical, sociological and ethnomusicological traditions (inherited primarily through Jaap Kunst, organologist and scholar of Indonesian music) typifies much Dutch musicology since the 1970s.

In Belgium the study of musicology made an impressive start with the famous competition of 1829 to write an essay on the importance of Low Countries music just before the establishment of Belgium as an independent country in 1830: the contribution by François-Joseph Fétis perhaps paved the way for his appointment as the first director of the Brussels Conservatory in 1833. His massive output of scholarly and educational writings over the next decades – not least his *Biographie universelle des musiciens* (1835–44) – helped to establish Belgian musicology as a serious topic. His pupil Edmond Vander Straeten similarly published an enormous quantity of archival research, particularly in his eight-volume *La musique aux Pays-Bas avant le XIXe siècle* (1867–88). Musicological studies were introduced at universities in 1931, partly through Ernest Closson’s initiative. A specially influential figure was Charles Van den Borren, who at Brussels and Liège taught Suzanne Clercx-Lejeune, Albert Vander Linden and Robert Wangermée; his son-in-law was Safford Cape, with whom he founded the Pro Musica Antiqua ensemble.

Very different traditions have influenced Spanish musicology, with such scholar-priests as Higini Anglès, José María Llorens Cisteró and José López-Caló prominent in the uncovering of their country’s heritage of ecclesiastical music. But important work was early accomplished by M.H. Eslava y Elizondo (1807–78) in his ten-volume *Lira Sacro-Hispana* and F.A. Barbieri (1823–94) in his edition of the early 16th-century *Cancionero Musical de Palacio*. The true father of modern Spanish musicology, however, was Felipe Pedrell (1841–1922), a composer, teacher, writer and music editor. He is best known for his editions of sacred music by early Spanish composers, *Hispania Schola Musica Sacra* (1894–8), and keyboard music by Cabezón, and especially for the complete edition of the works of Victoria. Iberian musicology received a decisive new impetus from the 1992 Madrid congress of the International Musicological Society, as well as from the rise of a
new generation of scholars who were not priests and had been trained in the universities of Germany and elsewhere.

Scandinavian scholars, though much occupied with their national musical past, have tended to look to the German-speaking countries, particularly Switzerland, for their training. Tobias Norlind (1879–1947), the senior Swedish figure, studied at Leipzig and Munich; his pupil Carl-Allan Moberg (1896–1978), considered the founder of Swedish musicology, studied in Vienna and Fribourg; and Moberg’s successor, Ingmar Bengtsson, studied in Basle. Moberg’s research embraced early Swedish music and Swedish folksong. In 1947 Moberg was appointed to the first chair at the University of Uppsala (where musicology had been taught since 1927); chairs were later established at Göteborg and Lund. Other signal initiatives in Sweden have been the institute for acoustics (under Johan Sundberg) and the Corpus Troporum (under Ritva Jacobsson), both at the University of Stockholm. In Denmark musicology has been longer established: Angul Hamerik (1848–1931) was awarded the earliest doctorate in music (1892) and obtained the first lectureship in musicology at Copenhagen (1896); he was a teacher of Erik Abrahamsen (in 1926 the first Danish professor of musicology) and the great Palestrina scholar Knud Jeppesen (the first professor at Århus, 1946). Jens Peter Larsen’s work on the Classical era, and the involvement of several Danish scholars in Byzantine studies, have helped give the country’s musicology a special character as well as an international standing. In Norway the first musicological chair was established in 1956 at Oslo, for Olav Gurvin (1893–1974), who had studied in Heidelberg and Berlin; he and Ole Sandvik (1875–1976) had given the first regular university lectures in music in 1937–9. Folk music studies form the bulk of these men’s work; the investigation of the national musical past, including the Protestant church music tradition, has always occupied an important place in Scandinavia. There are now institutes of musicology at the universities of Oslo, Trondheim and Bergen. The founder of Finnish musicology was Ilmari Krohn (1867–1960), who studied at Leipzig and Weimar, and founded the Finnish musicological society in 1916; his chief work was on theory, church music and Finnish folk music. Musicology is now also taught at the universities of Turku, Jyväskylä, Tampere and Oulu. Alongside many journals and the recently begun critical edition of
Sibelius, the strength of Finnish musicology can be seen from the six-volume *Suuri musiikkittietosanakirja* (Keuruu, 1989–92).

Vincent Duckles (with David Fallows)

6. Russia.

Scholarly investigation of Russian music history began in the 18th century, notably after the rule of Peter the Great (1689–1725), when sustained contacts with western European countries were established. The first significant publications in Russia were by foreigners, for example Leonhard Euler's *Tentamen novae theoriae musicae* (1739) and a lecture by G.W. Krafft (1701–54) on consonance (delivered in Latin in 1742 and published in Russian in 1744). Both were well-known mathematicians. Jacob von Stählin was the first to publish information about music in Russia; his ‘Nachrichten von der Musik in Russland’ appeared in Haigold's *Beylagen zum neuveränderten Russland*, ii (Riga and Leipzig, 1770). The first music periodical established in Russia was published by a German: Johann Daniel Gerstenberg's *Magasin musical de St. Pétersbourg* (1794). Towards the end of the 18th century the Russians began investigating their musical legacy by collecting folksongs (Vasily Trutovsky) and studying the rich domain of church music. The first to assemble data on Russian chant was Yevfimy Bolkhovitinov (1767–1837), better known as Metropolitan Yevgeny of Kiev, whose 1797 lecture on the subject was published two years later.

Some early 19th-century Russian writers preferred to study European music. Count Grigory Orlov (1777–1826), for example, published his *Essai sur l'histoire de la musique en Italie* (1822), and Aleksandr Ulūbīshev and Wilhelm von Lenz their writings on Mozart and Beethoven. Aleksandr F. Khristianovich (1835–74) collected folksongs in Algeria in 1861 and published them in Cologne in 1863 under the title *Esquisse historique de la musique arabe aux temps anciens avec dessins d'instruments et quarante mélodies notées et harmonisées par Alexandre Christianowitsch.*

Prince Vladimir Odoyevsky, though an amateur, played an important role in the study of Russian music and may be viewed as one of the founders of musicology in Russia. Despite some earlier work, it was in the 1860s that the scholarly investigation of Russian
Apart from an article by Aleksey Veselovsky in *Russkii vestnik* (July 1866, pp. 97–163), the first significant attempt at a history of Russian music in the Russian language was Vladimir Mikhnevich's *Istoricheskiye etudy russkoy zhizni: ocherk istorii muziki v Rossii v kulturno-obshchestvennom otnoshenii* (‘Historical studies of Russian life: essay on the history of music in Russia in relationship to culture and society’, 1879). In the next four decades, leading to the establishment of the Soviet Union in 1917, a number of writers specialized in aspects of Russian music history. Probably the most significant were Vsevolod Cheshikhin (1865–1934), a historian of Russian opera, and Nikolay Findeyzen, founder and editor of the important periodical *Russkaya muzikal'naya gazeta* (1893–1918) and of the annual *Muzikal'naya starina* (‘Musical past’; 1903–11). Findeyzen's lifework, *Ocherki po istorii muziki v Rossii s drevnyekh vremyon do kontsa XVIII v.* (‘Essays on the history of music in Russia from the earliest times to the end of the 18th century’; 1928–9), is still the most comprehensive survey of Russian music. The high level of analytical and historical musicology attained in the pre-revolutionary period is also exemplified in articles by a variety of writers on the 19th century and on contemporary music in the periodical *Muzikal'niy sovremennik* (‘The musical contemporary’; 1915–17), edited by Andrey Rimsky-Korsakov, biographer of his father and a first-rate scholar. However, this and all other pre-revolutionary music periodicals were suspended after the 1917 revolution.

There were significant developments between the wars. Perhaps most far-reaching and internationally recognized was the publication of original scores of Musorgsky's works under the editorship of Pavel Lamm, starting in 1928. This gave a strong impetus to systematic, critical study of sources. Even more significant were attempts to re-examine the basic postulates of music as an art, its components and its impact on the listener. These problems were studied from a theoretical point of view with a strong tendency to formulation in Marxist terms and, from the 1930s, in accordance with the officially promulgated concepts of *Socialist realism*. Among the leaders of these studies were Boris Asaf'ev (who also wrote under the pseudonym Igor Glebov), a scholar of great erudition who formulated the concept of *intonatsiya* dealing with the creation of audio-imagery by
association with familiar melodic patterns, and Boleslav Yavorsky, the creator of a concept of harmonic rhythm in his theory of ‘auditory gravitation’. Important in the historical field was Tamara Livanova, whose works, especially her classic book *Ocherki i materiali po istorii russkoy muzïkal'noy kulturi* (‘Essays and documents on the history of Russian musical culture’, 1938), are among the most scholarly in Russian musicology, as are also Boris Yarustovsky's on dramaturgy. A number of scholars have tried to write comprehensive histories of world music, notably Roman Gruber.

In the years immediately following World War II, Russian musicology continued to focus on aspects of Russian music and on the artistic development of non-Russian ethnic groups in the USSR. In the 1950s and 60s the number of scholars increased dramatically, and the scope of their research expanded beyond the narrow confines of Russian music. Books, periodicals and yearbooks appeared in unprecedented quantities. Music bibliography (which had its roots in pre-revolutionary Russia) kept most scholars informed about trends outside the USSR, although most foreign publications were unavailable. Retrospective bibliographies were compiled for periods hitherto inadequately covered, for example in Livanova's *Muzïkal'naya bibliografiya russkoy periodicheskoy pechati XIX v.* (‘Musical bibliography of the Russian periodical press in the 19th century’; 1974). Lexicography also became highly developed: Boris Shteynpress, Izrail' Yampol'sky and Grigory Bernandt (1905–86) were prominent in this area. Yury Keldish, author of a history of Russian music and an account of music in 18th-century Russia, was chief editor of a collective work on the music of all the peoples of the USSR, *Istoriya muzïki narodov USSR* (begun in 1970); he was also the editor of the largest Russian music encyclopedia, *Muzïkal'naya entsiklopediya* (1973–82), as well as chief editor of the first Russian equivalent of the Denkmäler series, *Pamyatniki Russkoy Muzïki*. In 1983 Keldish initiated a multi-volume history of Russian music.

Another publication of great significance was Semyon Ginzburg's anthology of Russian art music up to Glinka, *Istoriya russkoy muzïki v notnïkh obraztsakh* (‘History of Russian music in music examples’, 1940–52). Biographical studies of Russian composers and analytical discussions of their works have proliferated, and, after a period of neglect, scholarly studies of Russian church music and its history were resumed by Maxim V. Brazhnikov, Nikolay D. Uspensky and many younger scholars. Vladimir Protopopov has
studied both Western and Russian polyphony, while Abram Gozenpud is the most erudite investigator of the traditions of Russian opera. Notable theorists of music include Viktor Tsuckermann (1902–88), Lev Mazel’ and Yury Kholopov. The participation of Russian musicologists at international conferences, which after many years of ideological control started to increase in the 1960s, continues in an obvious attempt to keep pace with scholarship in western Europe and North America.

With the break-up of the USSR at the end of 1991, Russia emerged somewhat diminished in size yet still the culturally dominant member of a loose family of nations. All periodicals with the word ‘Soviet’ in their titles were discontinued; thus the ‘official’ monthly magazine Sovietskaya muzyka was replaced by the quarterly Muzykal’naya akademiya. Muzikal’naya zhizn’ (‘Musical life’) survives as a monthly chronicle of musical events, albeit somewhat reduced in scope, while a number of other periodicals fight for survival under uncertain economic conditions. The publishing of books, which in the former USSR was subsidized by the state, now depends on the market economy and foreign subsidies. Similar financial difficulties have since 1992 forced the scholarly research institutes, which in the Soviet era largely controlled the content of publications, to reduce their personnel, programmes and field expeditions.

Miloš Velimirović

7. Eastern Europe.
In the past musicology in Eastern Europe was preoccupied with the history of church music and opera, with local music history, and increasingly with folk music. More recently Marxist ideology fostered the systematic and social study of music, and it is in this part of the world that the Sociology of music first became an independent discipline with rigorous standards.

Before 1989 most European countries followed the Soviet model in establishing scholarly institutions as state-funded research institutes within an Academy of Sciences. Since the disintegration of that system, the worsening financial situation has resulted in a reduced number of publications, which are now dependent on commerical sponsorship.

The first important musicological publication on Polish music was the biographical dictionary Les musiciens polonais et slaves anciens et modernes (1857) by the pianist and
amateur scholar Wojciech Sowiński. In the same year Józef Sikorski founded a significant periodical, *Ruch muzyczny*, but it lasted only five years. An anthology of the rich legacy of church music, *Monumenta Musices Sacrae in Polonia* (1885–96), was initiated by Józef Surzyński. Many 19th-century scholars focussed on Chopin, including Maurycy Karasowski, who also wrote the first history of opera in Poland (*Rys historyczny opery polskiej*, 1859). The first full-scale history of Polish music seems to have been that by Aleksander Poliński, *Dzieje muzyki polskiej* (1907). No fewer than eight Poles obtained doctorates in musicology at German universities in the first decade of the 20th century. In 1911 the first chair in musicology was established in Poland, in Kraków. By World War I a group of scholars was already producing significant and lasting work. Among the next generation of scholars were Hieronim Feicht, Jósef Chomiński and Zofia Lissa, a leading thinker in musical aesthetics and historiography and one of the most influential musicologists in eastern Europe. The two main centres of publication for music scholarship are Warsaw and Kraków, to which must be added Bydgoszcz, where triennial conferences for scholars of eastern European music have been held since 1966 under the title Musica Antiqua Europae Orientalis. Among the most distinguished scholars of the last few decades are Stefan Jarociński, Zygmunt M. Szweykowski, Mirosław Perz, Irena Poniatowska and Zofia Chechlińska.

Romania had a forerunner of musicology in the humanist Dimitrie Cantemir, who wrote a description of Romanian music (1716), studied Turkish music and devised a notational system for recording it. Before the 20th century there were individual attempts at collecting church music, notably by Anton Pann; Eusebius Mandyczewski, the great scholar and editor active in Vienna, was of Romanian origin. Modern scholarship began only after World War I with the ethnomusicological studies of Constantin Brăiloiu and the musicological work of George Breazul and Ioan D. Petrescu, who studied church music and its relationship to Byzantine music. Distinguished scholars of recent years include Gheorghe Ciobanu, Viorel Cosma (the very erudite lexicographer), Octavian Cosma, and Romeo Ghircoiasiu.

In Bulgaria, except for some studies in folk music, scholarly activities did not really begin until the work of Ivan Kamburov and Stojan Brashovanov, author of the first history of Bulgarian music (1946). Since 1945 there has been a much greater emphasis on
scholarly work, supported by the Institute of Musicology founded in 1948 as part of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Until the early 1990s, the dominant figure in musicology was Venelin Krastev, who was responsible for the first comprehensive encyclopedia of Bulgarian music. Among younger scholars, Stefan Lazarov, Lada Brashovanova and Bozidar Karastojanov have concentrated on Bulgarian music of the last two centuries, and on the Byzantine roots of its ecclesiastical music.

The first systematic gathering of data about Czech musicians seems to be the *Allgemeines historisches Künstler-Lexikon* (1815) of Bohumír Dlabač. The beginnings of a more systematic study of the Czech and Slovak musical past appear in the works of Otakar Hostinský, who trained a generation of scholars, among the Dobroslav Orel, Otakar Zich and most notably Vladimir Helfert, a fine scholar particularly active after the creation of an independent Czechoslovakia in 1918. Otakar Šourek devoted himself to the study of Dvořák. The three most important centres of musicological studies are Prague, Brno and Bratislava. In Prague scholarly activities were long directed by Bohumír Štědroň, joint editor of the dictionary *Československý hudební slovník* (1963–5). The important centre in Brno was long directed by Jan Racek, who has not only written a comprehensive history of Czech music up to the beginning of the 19th century and been principal editor of the series *Musica Antiqua Bohemica*, but has also specialized particularly in Italian monody.

Since the separation of Slovakia from the Czech Republic, the Bratislava group (originally formed around Orel), which fostered publications like *Musica Slovaca*, has produced a number of significant writers. The finest anthology of Czech music before Smetana was prepared by Jaroslav Pohanka. Historical studies are supported by a profusion of periodicals and publications of high quality.

Hungarian musical scholarship before 1918 was closely tied to that of Austria. Liszt’s writings about Gypsy music aroused much interest in traditional folk music, on which Kodály and Bartók later contributed studies. The first Hungarian music periodical, *Zenészeti lapok* (‘Musical journals’), was founded in 1860 by Kornél Ábrányi, and Emil Harasztí did much to make Hungarian music known in other countries. Modern musicological studies came into their own after 1918, especially in the work of Bence Szabolcsi, pre-eminent as a student of the distant past as well as of more recent
developments in Hungarian music; Otto Gombosi, a medievalist of unusually broad erudition; and Dénes Bartha, well known for his work on Haydn as well as on Hungarian music. The Haydn and Bartók studies of László Somfai are in the forefront of research on those composers. Benjamin Rajeczky’s studies of Gregorian chant have led to the formation of a group of scholars headed by László Dobszay which, in cooperation with the Institut für Musikwissenschaft at Regensburg, is the nucleus for periodic gatherings of medievalists known as Cantus Planus.

In the former Yugoslavia the 19th-century beginnings of music historiography can be traced to those areas belonging to the Austrian empire before 1918. Perhaps the most significant figure was the ethnomusicologist Franjo Kuhač, who fancifully claimed Croatian origin for Haydn, Tartini and Liszt. In Slovenia Peter Radics published *Frau Musica in Krain* (1877), which marks the beginning of interest in the Slovenian musical past; the first true scholar, however, was Josef Mantuani, long active in Vienna. Dragan Plamenac was a scholar of international reputation whose interests centred on the music of the 14th to 16th centuries; his contributions to scholarship include an edition of Ockeghem’s works. The greatest progress in musicology since 1945 has been achieved in Slovenia; at the University of Ljubljana the first and so far the only chair of musicology was founded in 1962; it was occupied by Dragotin Cvetko until his death in 1993. Andrej Rijavec, Marija Koren and others continue to publish *Muzikološki zbornik*, the musicological annual started by Cvetko in 1966. In Croatia the teacher and author Josip Andreis trained a whole generation of fine scholars; and Ivo Supičić created an important centre for the sociology and aesthetics of music in Zagreb before moving to France. A number of scholars around Stanislav Tuksar have produced studies of distinctively Croatian musical traditions. In Serbia the beginnings of music historiography were made by the composer–scholars Miloje Milojević and Kosta Manojlović. Several studies on the history of Serbian music were produced by Stana Đurić-Klajn, editor of a number of journals. The most significant recent achievements in historical musicology have been Dimitrije Stefanović’s and Danica Petrović’s studies of ecclesiastical chant. Musicological studies are mainly centred on research institutes in Belgrade (founded in 1948), Zagreb (1967) and Ljubljana. Cooperative efforts, however, were dealt a severe blow by the break-up of Yugoslavia in 1991–2.
Musicology was slow to respond to Ralph Waldo Emerson's call for distinctive American contributions to humanistic disciplines in an address ‘The American Scholar’ (1837), for the field was at that time scarcely in existence in a formal sense in Europe. It began in the USA in the later 19th century with distinctive though necessarily isolated achievements by scholars who lacked the institutional bases that were later created by the development of the field as an intellectual enterprise. To its earliest phase belong such efforts as J.S. Dwight's *Journal of Music* (1852–81), which included material on music history, and the work of Lowell Mason, who combined the roles of music teacher, editor and collector of rare music. Intellectually more distinguished though geographically more isolated was the achievement of A.W. Thayer (1812–97), the great pioneer of serious Beethoven biography, who spent all his later life as US consul at Trieste.

The first important American-based scholar, in the true sense, was Oscar George Theodore Sonneck (1873–1928), who was born in the USA, trained in Germany and for 15 years was chief of the Music Division of the Library of Congress (1902–17). Sonneck was not only instrumental in building the great music collection of the Library of Congress; he was also the author of essays and studies on a variety of music-historical subjects and the compiler of a bibliography of early American music and of a richly annotated *Catalogue of Opera Librettos Printed before 1800* (1914). He was also the founder-editor of the *Musical Quarterly* (published first by G. Schirmer and later by Oxford University Press) which began publication in 1915 and long remained the most widely circulated American periodical containing serious writing on music.

Between the wars American musicology began to establish its roots in American institutions of higher learning and formed the professional ties that would make possible its growth as a scholarly discipline. As early as 1915 the *Musical Quarterly* had issued a programme for the field in an article by Waldo Selden Pratt entitled ‘On Behalf of Musicology’. Although the term ‘musicology’ at first rang strangely in American ears, the field by the early 1930s was beginning to acquire in academic circles the status
accorded to other branches of humanistic scholarship. A seminal figure in the establishment of musicology in the American university was Otto Kinkeldey (1878–1966). Like Sonneck, Kinkeldey was trained in Germany, where he was not only awarded the PhD but was also in 1910 named Royal Prussian Professor of Musicology at the University of Breslau. On returning to the USA in 1914 he became head of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, and in 1930 professor of musicology at Cornell University, the first such chair to be established in an American university.

Kinkeldey was the first president of the American musicological society, founded by a group of nine scholars and teachers on 3 June 1934 in New York. By the late 1990s the society, whose Journal has been issued regularly since 1950, had a national membership of more than 4500, making it the largest professional association in the USA devoted to music scholarship. In 1961 the society was host to the eighth congress of the International Musicological Society in New York, the first such congress held off European soil; in 1977 the twelfth congress met at Berkeley, California. Although members of the AMS are active in every field of study, the bulk of their efforts has been undeniably directed towards the Western historical tradition. In response to this orientation the Society for Ethnomusicology was founded in 1954; this society still serves as the primary professional organization in the field of musical ethnography and issues its own journal, Ethnomusicology. Despite this formal separation there have always been signs of mutual awareness of the common interests that can unite traditional musicological disciplines and their ethnomusicological counterparts. For example, the important set of essays entitled Musicology (1963), published in the series Humanistic Scholarship in America, was written by two scholars who were then principally distinguished for their work in music history, Frank Ll. Harrison (from Great Britain) and Claude V. Palisca, and by the ethnomusicologist Ki Mantle Hood. (After this book Harrison devoted himself to full-time teaching and research in the field of ethnomusicology.)

A third general orientation within American musicology was solidified with the founding of the Society for Music Theory in 1977. This society represents scholars primarily engaged in music analysis and speculative music theory. Still other, smaller societies share membership and sometimes meetings with these large umbrella groups: these
include the Sonneck Society, devoted to the study of American musics, and the Center for Black Music Research.

Since the first American PhD in musicology was awarded at Cornell University in 1932 (to J. Murray Barbour), the field has spread widely among universities. Music in any form was relatively late in entering American university curricula as a separate subject, but it has undergone enormous growth in the past century (see Universities, §III, 4). Today few universities or colleges in the USA can fail to offer, in addition to practical vocal and instrumental music-making, at least elementary courses devoted to music theory and to music history in one or more of its phases. Most offer much more, including courses in theory, analysis and related fields, a full range of courses in the history and literature of music, and courses in one area or more of non-Western musics, jazz and popular music.

The large number of PhDs awarded in musicology since 1945 is indicative of a growing population of American-trained scholars, but also indicates the creation of university positions on a larger scale than before, although conditions of economic retrenchment since the 1970s have reduced the earlier trend. In part, the significant role of American musicology in every field of study now being pursued in the discipline is attributable to its substantial number of practitioners, to the location of its research bases in universities, and to the research support available to American scholars through such private organizations as the Guggenheim Foundation, the American Council of Learned Societies and the federally supported National Endowment for the Humanities. Even more, it is attributable to the contributions of a score of eminent scholars who, in the generation after Kinkeldey, can be said to have created the field in its more modern forms in the USA. Among these seminal teacher-scholars were three of the founder-members of the AMS: Gustave Reese, Charles Seeger and Oliver Strunk. The first and last of these trained generations of scholars at, respectively, New York University and Princeton University. To their names must be added those of Paul Henry Lang, Glen Haydon, Donald J. Grout, Charles Warren Fox and Arthur Mendel.

During the Nazi regime a large number of significant figures in musical scholarship emigrated to the USA, including Willi Apel, Manfred Bukofzer, Hans David, Alfred Einstein, Karl Geiringer, Otto Gombosi, Paul Nettl, Erich Hertzmann, Edward Lowinsky,
Curt Sachs, Leo Schrade and Emanuel Winternitz. All these men taught at major institutions and had vital roles in the training of younger American scholars; all of them, furthermore, published their work in English and brought European backgrounds and modes of approach to the fields in which they specialized. With the recovery of Europe after World War II, the increasing internationalization of the discipline was felt in many ways: in the resumption of European travel and research by American scholars, in their contacts with foreign scholars and scholarly enterprises, and in the presence of other major foreign scholars in American teaching posts; among the latter was Nino Pirrotta, who taught at Princeton, Columbia, and then for many years at Harvard before returning to his native Italy. Such teachers as these laid the foundations for the postwar generation of American scholars, among them Barry S. Brook, Howard Mayer Brown, James Haar, Daniel Heartz, Joseph Kerman, Jan LaRue, Lewis Lockwood and Claude V. Palisca.

By the 1970s musicology in the USA had become a solidly established field of scholarship embracing a vast spectrum of interests. At distant ends of the arc these interests coalesced in the work of large groups of scholars sharing common approaches: at one end a group concerned with Western historical musicology in all its forms, fields and sub-disciplines (ranging from archival work and narrative history to performing practice, which manifested itself in, for example, the pioneer work of the New York Pro Musica and the authentic instrument designs of such men as Hubbard and Dowd); and at the other end, a group of ethnomusicologists more and more deeply involved in anthropological and ethnographic approaches. In addition to these more or less clearly definable segments of the active scholarly population, there was abundant evidence of the opening of the discipline to new or formerly less emphasized areas such as speculative and descriptive theory and analysis (notably Milton Babbitt, Allen Forte and Leonard Meger), contemporary music, folk and popular music, and the music history of the American continent (to which such scholars as Gilbert Chase, Robert Stevenson and H. Wiley Hitchcock contributed substantially).

Perhaps the greatest challenge facing American musicology in the 1970s was to make its impact felt outside the academy – on the world of performance, in conservatories, in concert life, and even in the commercialized music industries. By 1980 American musicology had barely breached the long-established barriers that divided the forces of
serious intellectual life from the vast media that produce and disseminate music and musical culture. Several results of this situation can be noted: the continued isolation of scholarship from practical musical life, the proliferation of much traditional misinformation, the generally low level of music criticism in the mass media, and the perpetuation of long-established and deeply entrenched attitudes about music, largely inherited from the 19th century. One important question facing many musicologists was whether scholarly knowledge of and about music might come to be more strongly felt in American society in the future than it had been in the past.

(ii) Since 1980.

Despite the willingness of American musicologists to embrace new approaches and subject matters that were in many cases unimaginable (or undesirable) for earlier generations of scholars, American musicology has failed significantly to enlarge its role outside the academy. The reasons are various. While contemporary American culture offers some niches for ‘public intellectuals’, there is little public place for the musical intelligentsia, and what space there is tends to be occupied by performers rather than scholars. (Crossover figures who pursue dual careers as both accomplished concert performers and serious scholars are rare.) Moreover, musical studies have been broadly implicated in recent ‘culture wars’ in the USA. As musicology has grown more pluralistic, its practitioners have increasingly adopted methods and theories deemed by observers to mark the academy as irrelevant, out of touch with ‘mainstream values’, unwelcoming of Western canonic traditions or simply incomprehensible. Paradoxically, such approaches have distanced music scholarship from a broad public at the very moment they have encouraged scholars to scrutinize the popular musics that form the backbone of modern mass musical culture.

At the same time, the growing diversity of musical scholarship in the 1980s and 90s served in the most general way to blur the discipline's longstanding focus on individual musical styles, genres, composers and works. In the process scholars asserted more and more clearly approaches to musicology that endeavour to understand music as acts of expression in a sociocultural context; these approaches were relatively undersung in the postwar period, even though they had been anticipated by musicologists from the time of Guido Adler. This diversification of emphasis has strengthened the ties of musicology to
other interpretative disciplines within the academy, notably anthropology (especially in its culturalist guises), sociology (again in culturalist versions such as those derived from Weber) and history (especially its non-positivist hermeneutic and philosophical modes). It has linked musicology with emergent fields of cultural studies and performance studies. It has led many musicologists to explore a broad range of cultural theory – including latter-day feminism, new conceptions of ethnicity and race, and poststructuralist views of language and subjectivity – that has been prominent in literature (and especially English) departments in the USA. Not least, it has underscored the affinities between European-orientated musicology and ethnomusicology, notwithstanding the lingering defensiveness with which these subdisciplines regard each other. In sum, these new emphases engage musicology more and more deeply in central agendas of today's humanistic academy.

Few if any of the approaches prominent in recent American musicology have broken with the empirically based reasoning and evidentiary standards that have characterized Western scholarly work at least since the Enlightenment. The criticism of Joseph Kerman (1985), for example, is fundamentally allied to the ‘positivistic’ researches he has at times disdained; his critical exegeses are based as profoundly on argument from musical and non-musical evidence as are positivistic histories and philology; and both of these approaches are likewise allied to the novel scholarly strategies that have emerged since the mid-1980s. Nevertheless, most of these newer approaches are committed in one fashion or another to understanding music-making as an act situated in a cultural or ideological context. Even when they circle back towards individual works, they question musical claims to autonomy, absoluteness or transcendence and treat handed-down evaluations and canons with suspicion. Indeed in many cases they challenge the basic conception of discrete, self-identical works that has tended to guide musicologists since the beginning of the discipline.

The turn away from objective historicism, in which the historian was seen as an inert observer of past objects and facts, has led in two directions. The first endeavours to describe an ‘effective’ history, a tradition in which the historical object and the historian stand in mediated relation to one another. This approach looks back through Collingwood at least to Nietzsche, but owes its recent elaboration especially to Hans-Georg Gadamer.
The formulation of Gadamer's ideas in music-historical terms preoccupied the German musicologist Carl Dahlhaus, who exerted a strong influence on American musicology from the 1980s. Leo Treitler heralded the effective-historical approach in the 1960s, and it is exemplified in his more recent writings on the reception history of Gregorian chant; in Richard Taruskin's studies of Russian music and the philosopher Lydia Goehr's examination of the Western musical canon; and in the work of historically sensitive music analysts such as Scott Burnham.

The second alternative to objectivist historiography is more explicitly political, endeavouring to reveal the structures of power that inform and shape acts of music-making (or even of music scholarship-making). Such ideology critique looks back on another influential German, Theodor Adorno; it emerges fully formed in his Versuch über Wagner, much of which dates from the 1930s. His brand of critique was ushered into American musicology especially by Rose Rosengard Subotnik, in essays written in the late 1970s and 1980s. Adorno's hermeneutics of suspicion in the face of prevailing relations of power may be sensed more or less clearly in much recent scholarship, especially that scrutinizing the formation of the Western canon (e.g. Bergeron and Bohlman, 1992) or emphasizing feminism, gender studies or queer studies (e.g. McClary, 1991; Solie, 1993; Brett, Thomas and Wood, 1994). It is felt also in popular music studies (e.g. Taylor, 1997), though this area remains somewhat underdeveloped in the USA in comparison with the UK and Canada, where it was nurtured by sophisticated traditions of Marxism and grew along with the cultural-studies orientation they spawned.

In its broadest implication, musicological ideology critique moves beyond the political, narrowly conceived, to assert the view that the self is largely constituted, in body and psyche alike, through the action of social forces and the corollary view that the play of these forces may be witnessed in music-making. As language may be considered to form a crucial element of such forces, it is not surprising that some recent American musicology has selfconsciously exploited post-Saussurean language theory (with its shift from ideas of reference to the view that meaning emerges from relations among words) and its outgrowths (for instance, in Lacan's psychology, Barthes's narrative theory, Derrida's grammatology or Foucault's archaeology). Scholars have brought these theories to bear in critical exegeses of individual works (e.g. Kramer, 1990; Abbate, 1991), as
well as describing broad discursive systems in which acts of music-making, traditions of performance or conceptions of music do not merely represent but actively constitute particular subjectivities (e.g. Floyd, 1995; Tomlinson, 1999).

While a focus on individual works, however theorized, has usually gravitated towards a text-centred view of musical study, a more general discursive approach can at times move away from scores towards performative views and a focus on aspects of musical traditions, even élite European ones, not conducive to inscription. This division represents a reformulation of the oral/written dichotomy that long differentiated musicology and ethnomusicology in the USA. As non-ethnographic musicology has given increasing attention to performative aspects basic to the traditions it scrutinizes, the divide between written and unwritten traditions has eroded. This development has been particularly clear in jazz studies, an area that long seemed intent on legitimizing its subject matter through construction of a canon of masterworks analogous to the European art-music canon, but which recently has taken large strides in the direction of performative analysis (e.g. Berliner, 1994; Monson, 1996). The development can be witnessed also in other areas, even ones as close to the heart of musicology's old objective historiography as Renaissance studies. Recent rethinking of issues such as modality and Tinctoris's shadowy *cantare super librum* has raised broad questions concerning the status of the work-concept around and after 1500 (e.g. Bent, 1983).

Perhaps the broadest division in recent American musical studies is between a scholarship that aims finally, through whatever congeries of new and conventional means, at exegesis of the musical work or act itself, and a scholarship that sees musical utterance not as its endpoint but as the inception of an investigation of trans-musical human concerns – a scholarship that aims, in other words, to exploit music in order to describe particular configurations of human culture and ideology. Such work allies itself with goals that until recently were more evident in ethnomusicology than historical musicology. As it proliferates it once again blurs boundaries between the two fields that were always questionable (as Frank Ll. Harrison asserted in 1963), if seldom questioned. Thus one scholarly trajectory leads back towards the musical act or work, but with a panoply of scholarly technique perhaps more varied and certainly more questioning of culture-transcending values than that of earlier decades. The other leads towards broader
considerations of human aspiration and limitation, armed with tools that aim to guard against the too-frequent universalisms of earlier scholarship. In the coming years the truest measure of the success of the diversification in subject matter and method of American musicology may well be its ability to sustain and interwine these two strategies.

Vincent Duckles/Gary Tomlinson

9. Latin America.

(i) Historical musicology.

In most Latin American countries musicology has been understood primarily as the history of music. With few exceptions, interest has centred on local art music activities, frequently related to concurrent western European trends. Several national music histories written in the early 20th century stressed the achievements of individual composers and the development of musical institutions; interpretative or critical analysis did not become part of musicological work until the 1960s. Latin American music historians, however, early on showed a special concern for integrating music within the social history of an era or a country. In addition, their nationalist ideology forced them to consider at least some aspects of folk and popular music (see below).

Lack of access to primary source material, both historical and musical, hindered the development of musicology in the region; only after World War II was it established as a research discipline in some areas of Latin America and the Caribbean. Journals such as the Revista brasileira de música (1934–44), the Revista musical chilena (from 1945) and the Revista de estudios musicales in Argentina (from 1949) published articles on Latin American topics. Systematic bibliographical compilations also began to appear in this period, notably Gilbert Chase's A Guide to Latin American Music (1945), the Bibliografía musical brasileira (1820–1950) by L.H. Corrêa de Azevedo, C. Person de Matos and M. de Moura Reis (1952), and the Organization of American States series Composers of the Americas (1955–72). The first important dictionary dealing with the whole of Latin America was Otto Mayer-Serra's Música y músicos de Latinoamérica. Major international dictionaries and encyclopedias have given serious attention to Latin
American music only since the 1970s. New national music dictionaries and periodicals have appeared since that time, but most are predominantly descriptive rather than critical. The central figure in Hispanic-American historical musicology concerned with music before 1900 is Robert Stevenson. Among the leading Latin American musicologists in the early postwar years were Carlos Vega in Argentina and Lauro Ayestarán in Uruguay. Francisco Curt Lange, editor of the six-volume *Boletín latinoamericano de música* (1935–46), supported his campaign of ‘Americanismo musical’ out of his Inter-American Institute of Musicology, established in Montevideo in 1945. Lange was one of the first South American scholars to study colonial music archives in Argentina and Brazil. These, together with archives in Mexico, Cuba, Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, Chile and Uruguay, have been extensively catalogued since the 1940s, and modern editions of colonial church music have also appeared. Until the 1970s, however, musicology was not an area of academic priority in many countries. A number of well-known scholars, such as Mário de Andrade, Renato Almeida, Alejo Carpentier and Vasco Mariz, were not trained as musicologists, and many composers turned to musicology as well. In the last quarter of the century the field received more attention in universities, which now provide systematic training, frequently leading to doctoral study in Europe or North America. The work of the younger generation of scholars has resulted in publications of source and thematic catalogues, editions, recordings and critical analyses of colonial and 19th-century music.

(ii) Ethnomusicology.

Corrêa de Azevedo observed that ethnomusicological research preceded historical musicology throughout Latin America. The first students of native American music were the numerous European travellers, missionaries and scientists who had varying degrees of contact with Indian and mestizo cultures during the colonial period. In the late 19th century cultural historians began to study local oral cultural phenomena, reacting primarily against the domination of European and European-related music in Latin America under the control of élite social classes. The first music histories of various Latin American countries, beginning in the 1920s, acknowledged traditional, folk and urban popular music. This awareness was fostered by the emergence of nativist-
nationalist intellectual and artistic movements such as the Mexican post-revolutionary Aztec Renaissance, the *afrocubanismo* trend, the Peruvian-Andean *indigenismo* movement and the Brazilian *modernismo*. For the most part, however, field research was not undertaken seriously until World War II. This has resulted in a better, more representative account of various aspects of folk and traditional music, but the majority of ethnomusicologists and music folklorists have maintained an essentially descriptive approach to such music. Because of this emphasis, neither music folklore nor the incipient Latin American ethnomusicology of the last four decades of the 20th century contributed substantially to a general theory of ethnomusicology. Since the 1980s, however, a broader conceptual approach to ethnomusicological studies has emerged, especially in Argentina, Chile, Peru, Brazil, Mexico and Cuba.

An important issue for Latin American ethnomusicologists has been the study of origins within the tri-ethnic make-up of Latin American music (Iberian, Amerindian, African). Generalizations have frequently resulted from the search for ‘pure’ retention of a given musical trait believed to be attributable to a specific cultural root. This diffusionist, evolutionist and neo-colonialist attitude is reflected in the influential theories of Carlos Vega, who raised the characteristics of regional songsters (*cancioneros*) to the level of universal criteria. A more basic problem has been a lack of conceptual distinction between ‘music folklore’ as thought of and practised throughout Latin America and ethnomusicology. Music folklore has had little or no theoretical and methodological formulation; the social uses and functions of music, for example, are hardly mentioned in most studies of folk and popular music. Until the late 20th century, Latin American researchers in the field tended to believe that they possessed unique understanding of the music and culture of their country, without questioning the objectivity of their observations. However, most Latin American folklorists and ethnomusicologists come from the dominant social groups, which in general exhibit a high degree of eurocentrism. Rather than blindly following the lessons of European or American ethnomusicology, Latin American scholars must attempt to formulate theoretical objectives based on their own conceptualization of research problems and purposes in specific countries. The problems of cultural hegemony and cultural populism in some regions of Latin America must also be faced; for example, consideration of the internal market pressures exerted by
the multi-national music industry that tend to alienate folk communities, precipitating changes or requiring adaptive strategies, has become a necessity in the study of these communities.

Like historical musicology, Latin American ethnomusicology has suffered from a lack of attention in institutions of higher learning. Schools of music, conservatories and university music departments recognize the need to provide at least a general introduction to local musical traditions, but most continue to treat ‘music folklore’ as an exotic subject. When it is recognized as a discipline in its own right, ethnomusicology tends to receive more attention from social scientists than from musicians, although younger musicians trained either abroad or in anthropology are developing a broader conception of the field (see Béhague, 1993).

Gerard Béhague


Japan's long tradition of music scholarship began in the 12th century when Emperor Goshirakawa in his retirement compiled Ryōjin hishō, a collection of popular songs of the time. In 1233 Koma-no-Chikazane completed a ten-volume study of court music (gagaku) and dance entitled Kyōkun-shō. Other important works on gagaku include Taigen-shō (1512) by Toyohara-no-Muneaki and Gakka-roku (1690) by Abe-no-Suehisa. Zeami (c1363–c1443) discussed the aesthetic principles of no theatre in a series of writings, notably the Kadensho (‘Book of Flowers’). Seikyoku ruisan (1839; published 1847) by Saitō Gesshin is a detailed study of vocal music in the Edo period. Konakamura Kiyonori provided a history of traditional Japanese music and dance in Kabu ongaku ryakushi (1887).

Tanaka Shōhei (1862–1945) and Kanetsune Kiyosuke (1885–1957), both physicists, were the precursors of modern musicology in Japan; the former is known for his study of temperaments, the latter as a music critic and collector of folksongs. Tanabe Hisao (1883–1984), one of Tanaka's pupils, is regarded as the first Japanese musicologist in the European sense; he studied music of Japanese and other Asian traditions. Outstanding among his pupils are Kikkawa Eishi, a specialist on Japanese music, and Kishibe Shigeo, a leading scholar of Asian music. Hayashi Kenzō made a detailed study of ancient
instruments, and Machida Yoshiaki (Kashō) collected folksongs extensively. In 1936 they and other scholars founded the Society for research in asiatic music. Koizumi Fumio was the leading ethnomusicologist in Japan in the 1950s and 60s; he was followed by Fujii Tomoaki, Tokumaru Yoshiko, Tsuge Gen'ichi and Yamaguti Osamu. Among the outstanding younger scholars of Japanese music are Hirano Kenji, Yokomichi Mario and Kamisangō Yūkō. Tanimoto Kazuyuki is the foremost authority on Ainu music.

Tsuji Shōichi (1895–1987), a Bach scholar, was the first Japanese musicologist to specialize in European music. After World War II the field grew significantly, led by Nomura Yosio and Hattori Kōzō, and in 1952 the Musicological Society of Japan was founded to promote studies of Western music. Younger Bach scholars include Sumikura Ichirō, Kobayashi Yoshitake, Isoyama Tadashi and Higuchi Ryuichi. Ebisawa Bin has written extensively on Mozart. Other areas of scholarly activity include Romanticism (Mayeda Akio, Morita Minoru and Osaki Shigemi), contemporary music (Funayama Tadashi and Takeda Akimichi) and early music (Toguchi Kosaku, Minagawa Tatsuo, Kanazawa Masakata and Imatani Kazunori).

The majority of Japanese universities do not have a department of music or musicology. As a result, students seeking a higher degree in musicology usually pursue his or her study within a Department of Literature or Aesthetics (e.g. Tokyo University or Osaka University), or of Education (e.g. Tokyo Gakugei University or Nagoya College of Music). There were about two dozen such institutions in 2000.

The first institution with a higher degree programme in musicology was the Tokyo Geijutsu Daigaku (Tokyo National University of Fine Arts and Music; MA in 1963, and PhD in 1976). The example was followed by the Musashino College of Music (MA in 1964), the Kunitachi College of Music (MA in 1968), the Osaka College of Music (MA in 1968) and Elisabeth University of Music in Hiroshima (MA, 1990; PhD, 1993). By the end of the 20th century several other institutions had started a graduate programme in musicology, most offering only a masters degree.

Masakata Kanazawa
11. Australia and New Zealand.

Musicology in Australia and New Zealand constitutes a Western intellectual tradition within a culturally complex Asian-Pacific environment. The high importance of indigenous music studies, the conspicuous presence of transplanted traditions from Europe and South America and the propinquity of Oceanic and Asian traditions have long encouraged a confluence of musicological and ethnomusicological disciplines. Most university music courses combine studies in both disciplines from the first-year undergraduate level. The confluence colours even the most overtly eurocentric studies by encouraging a dialectic between literacy and orality, tradition and innovation. Moreover, by giving immediacy to questions of aesthetics, meaning and interpretation, it fosters consideration of the particular nature of mainstream Western musical culture.

Concerted developments in music research began after World War II, though serious studies had been made in both indigenous Australian and Maori music from early in the 20th century. In New Zealand, university music departments were from their beginnings associated with humanities faculties and readily able to take advantage of postwar developments in music scholarship emanating from the USA and Europe. In Australia the first musicologically orientated music department (as opposed to those with a vocationally-based structure) was founded in 1948 at the University of Sydney by the English scholar Donald Peart. He was soon joined by another English musicologist, Peter Platt, who was later able to build on work began by Mary Martin at the University of Otago in New Zealand. Andrew McCredie, who studied in Sydney, Scandinavia and Hamburg, developed a musicology department at the University of Adelaide with an important postgraduate school owing its ethos to American and continental European models.

In Australia, important centres of musicological study are the universities of Sydney, Adelaide and Melbourne (the latter housing the Grainger Museum and the Centre for Australian Music Studies), the University of Queensland, the University of Western Australia, Monash University in Melbourne, the University of New South Wales in Sydney and the University of Western Sydney. The principal centres in New Zealand include the universities of Auckland, Christchurch, Otago and Wellington. The region's most distinguished scholars in Western musicology have included Gordon Anderson,
David Tunley, Jamie C. Kassler and Richard Charteris in Australia, and John Steele in New Zealand. Roger Covell and John M. Thomson have done pioneer work in Australian and New Zealand studies respectively; Thomson was the first editor of the journal *Composer* (1963–6) and founding editor (1973–86) of *Early Music.*

The Musicological Society of Australia was founded in 1963 by Peart, Dene Barnett, Ian Spink and others; Peart served as its first president. In 1976, on the initiative of Graham Pont and Michael Kassler, the society became a truly national body with regional chapters that sponsored an annual conference and study weekends. The society's occasional journal *Musicology* became an annual from 1985 under the title *Musicology Australia.* The New Zealand Musicological Society dates from 1981; Warren Drake was its first president. The society holds a yearly conference and publishes the annual *Research Chronicle.* Other scholarly journals include *Miscellanea Musicologica* (from 1966), *Studies in Music* (1967–92), *Music in New Zealand* (1988–96), *Context* (from 1991), *Australasian Music Research* (from 1996) and *Perfect Beat* (from 1992). The anthropological journal *Oceania* and publications of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies are of great importance in the field of indigenous music research.

Peter Platt