

may well prove to be the decisive force in bringing about the musical maturation of this country.

*REPORT FROM QUEENS:  
Meeting of the Greater New York Chapter  
of the American Musicological  
Society  
Cheryl Seltzer*

**A**N ALL-DAY MEETING OF THE NEW YORK CHAPTER OF THE American Musicological Society was held at Queens College on May 21. In the morning papers were read by Samuel Pogue, Joel Newman, and Douglas Townsend, accompanied by excellent musical demonstrations by Paul Maynard and the Queens College Vocal Ensemble, the Morningside Consort, and Henry Schuman's New York Wind Society Ensemble Workshop. At luncheon, Emmanuel Winternitz's talk, announced as "A Treasure from Hungary—The Mysterious Cimbalom," turned out to be a seventy-fifth birthday tribute to Egon Kenton. After lunch, Saul Novack spoke about Queens College's recently-acquired collection of old instruments, named in honor of the late Noah Greenberg; and Paul Maynard, Greenberg's colleague, directed the Queens College Collegium Musicum in a remarkable memorial concert.

This report concerns the concluding event of the day, a symposium on the topic "Musicology 1966–2000: A Practical Program." Under the chairmanship of Barry Brook short papers were presented by Professors Luther Dittmer (Brooklyn College), Jan LaRue (New York University), Edward Lippman (Columbia University), Claude Palisca (Yale University), Lewis Lockwood (Princeton University), and Franklin Zimmerman (Dartmouth College). The papers will eventually be published in a bulletin of the AMS. The topic offered the opportunity for a few facetious projections about musicological activity in the year 2000, including conjectures about "Super-

---

This report is the result of a collaboration among Joel Sachs, Cheryl Seltzer, and Judith Zessis, all doctoral students at Columbia University.

musicologist,” “astro-musicologist—the true traveling fellow,” etc. The aim of the session was to underscore the major tasks facing musicology in the next thirty years and to continue discussion about the nature and purpose of musicology in line with such recent publications as Harrison, Palisca, and Hood’s *Musicology* (1963), the Kerman-Lowinsky exchange (*JAMS* 1965), and Edward Lippman’s article in *Current Musicology* (Spring 1965).

Luther Dittmer stated that present research methods would eventually make available all major sources of medieval music and treatises. With the end of this “Paleographic Period” musicologists would be free to concentrate on analysis of musical structure and style, performance practice, rhythmic questions, non-liturgical music, the context of musical creativity, and the relation of Islamic and Western European music. Furthermore, we will have to define *our* relationship to the music before 1400: is a true “aesthetic attachment” to music of this era possible, or must we ultimately agree with Tinctoris that music worth hearing began with Dunstable, Dufay, and Binchois?

Jan LaRue also expressed the opinion that attaining greater command over sources should enable us to focus attention on analytic and critical work. Our goal will be to develop a comprehensive theory of style analysis, applicable to all ages. We must discover the “inner concinnities” of a composer’s style, that is, the dominance of any two of the following factors: harmony, rhythm, melody, and sound. In the hands of a discerning researcher, the objective, comprehensive, and supremely efficient computer will be the most important tool of musicology in the next decades. LaRue also suggested that since new ideas are invaluable to the profession, the presence of younger members on the committees and board of the AMS would be highly desirable.

Edward Lippman stressed the importance of a knowledge of major theoretical writings. He called for a concerted effort to translate and publish reliable critical and annotated editions of these documents. We need a new comprehensive history of theory to supersede Riemann’s, which would trace theoretical issues through time, categorize types of treatises according to their speculative or analytical functions, and correlate theory of each age with neighboring intellectual pursuits. Our study should relate theory and practice, with special focus on the writings and music of composers. The theory of a period could delineate appropriate criteria for stylistic analysis of its music.

Proceeding from Manfred Bukofzer’s opinion of style criticism as

the core of modern musicology, Claude Palisca stated that special attention should be given to the process of stylistic change in transitional periods. We should attempt to formulate hypotheses of stylistic change and valid means of correlating style with culture. Great caution should be exercised in applying the *Zeitgeist* principle. In line with Lippman's remarks, Palisca noted that theorists' and composers' writings can be a valuable clue to stylistic *changes*.

Commenting further on the Kerman-Lowinsky exchange, Lewis Lockwood cited the diversity of "musicologies." The sphere of musicology will be expanding; increasing specialization will necessitate better communication within the field. We need "scholarly socialism": sharing of ideas at symposia, institutes, and national AMS meetings. And while musicology has extended its sphere in "time and geography," a further dimension is needed through contact with related fields. Lockwood decried invasion of the field by amateurs and pseudo-musicologists and called for a clearer definition of the professional nature of musicology. "A professional professes." Professed experts must know music better. As Oliver Strunk said, we should know the history of music through scores, instead of through non-musical data.

Franklin Zimmerman gave his definition of the ideal musicologist as a scholar-writer, performing musician, and teacher. He emphasized that the responsibilities of teaching both musicologists and laymen will have to be redefined in the immediate future. As population increases, more efficient teaching methods will have to be devised. The dangerous gap between musical laymen and the specialists must be bridged. Within the field itself we need more "generalists" to synthesize the work of the specialists. He agreed with Harrison on the role which sociology could play in studying music and man. Citing Kerman's argument, he stated that the formulation of history through style analysis and the combination of biography and thematic cataloguing (Zimmerman's specialty) should ultimately result in more enlightened performance and criticism, and greater dissemination of music.

Because of the late hour the discussion and question period which followed was curtailed. There was little opportunity for the panel and audience to clarify and amplify some of the ideas which were only sketched in the short papers. There was a brief discussion on the role of the computer. Lippman questioned LaRue's proposal that the computer be used to analyze style, since in Lippman's opinion style is essentially a more complex combination of factors than the printed note would indicate. Arthur Mendel, called upon to make

concluding remarks, criticized the term "computer analysis." A computer "cannot analyze," but it *can* collect and organize data. Mendel said that we need to analyze what is behind the notes, but not "*too far behind.*" He also cautioned that valid generalizations must be supported by thorough knowledge of individual works. In this regard he called for better communication between historical musicologists and music theorists, a point which none of the panelists had made.

Let us consider, in light of the symposium's title, which issues were stressed and which were ignored. The panelists enumerated the following activities of a "practical program": transcription and publication of medieval sources; translation, analysis, and publication of all-important theoretical writings; the writing of a new history of theory; a study of the relationship of theory and practice; the formulation of principles of style analysis and stylistic change; freer exchange of ideas within musicology and with other relevant disciplines; more strictly-defined professional standards; clarification of the musicologist's responsibilities as a teacher.

Important areas were ignored. First, the value of *analytic* theorists (as differentiated from *historical* theorists) to musicology. (This was mentioned only at the end by Mendel.) If style analysis is indeed the focal point, if historical musicologists want to draw meaningful conclusions, it is imperative that they sharpen their analytic tools. Second, despite the talk about improving communication, no reference was made to increasing contact with contemporary composers. This is essential. Not only do composers have their own very special insights into music, not only would we endow musicology with a fresh spirit, alive to the creative activity of our own age, but musicologists well-versed in compositional procedures could contribute to bridging the gap between the lay public and contemporary music. Third, aside from Zimmerman's remarks, there seemed to be little concern for the important role which musicologists will have to assume in all phases of music education—from the replacement of John Thompson to the improvement of graduate school. Last, no one mentioned the relationship of musicology to performance, although, thank heavens, at least one speaker remembered to acknowledge enlightened performance as an important aim of musicological effort! Judging by the refreshing emphasis placed on live performance in the day's activities, one can hope that this was an oversight. We would have reservations about Lewis Lockwood's attempt to define the exclusiveness of professional musicology. Although his statement is relevant, perhaps, for "DeKovenism," any attempt to isolate

musicology from performance could only have negative results. There was one good question from the floor concerning the value of a theory of performance, that is, the study of a relationship of music to its instrumental or vocal medium. To our regret, the panel member answered, “It doesn’t concern us if you play with a loose wrist or a stiff one!”