

Introduction and Overview

Léonie Rosenstiel, Project Editor

The articles in this section of *Current Musicology* form the second and concluding part of our project, "The Spheres of Music: Harmony and Discord," which was begun in Issue Number 14/1972. In Issue Number 15 our contributors have also concerned themselves to a great extent with past, present, and possible future problems of communication among the various branches of music and related fields and with the positive and negative effects that these disciplines may have on each other. Again, the articles are written from widely differing points of view and treat their subjects in diverse manners, but this variety is, itself, inherent in the nature of the project.¹

Malcolm Frager uses his own experience with the manuscript of Robert Schumann's Piano Concerto as a case study, demonstrating how musicological methods and information may help a performer "to better realize the original intent of a composer," as well as to correct errors in published editions. The differing reactions of composers to musicologists and the potential uses of musicology as an aid both in unearthing music for performance and in understanding contemporary scores are emphasized by Edmund Haines. Citing early exposure to musicology as a factor in his positive reaction to the field, Mr. Haines describes his own methods for researching contemporary Spanish music. The ubiquitous quality of musicological research is stressed by Otto Luening, who shows how his own background in that field influenced his development as composer, teacher, and "practitioner in the arts." Going a step farther, he discusses the significance of environmental factors in the continued survival of the art of music and the need for an understanding of related disciplines.

In describing the relatively recent recognition of musical performance as an integral part of teaching music within the liberal arts curriculum at Wesleyan University, David McAllester argues for the universal acceptance of this procedure as the equivalent of laboratory or field experiences in other liberal arts and sciences. Susan Thiemann Sommer believes that problems of communication lead many musicians to the false conclusion that there is little or no relationship between musicology and performance. Performance decisions should remain with the performer, but he should also be aware of his options, and the musicologist can provide this information. As a record reviewer, Mrs. Sommer notes with approval the growing trend toward more historically valid performances of early music.

The writers, be they performer, composer, scholar, or critic, show a common interest in the ways in which musicological research and resources may be of particular help to both composers and performers. They all stress the need for better communication and greater understanding, so that each specialist may benefit from the insights of others.

Using their own experiences and those of their friends and colleagues, the contributors to this issue argue strongly—both implicitly and explicitly—for the exposure of the developing musician, no matter what his ultimate field of specialization, to the information and techniques of both the practical and the theoretical aspects of his art. In so doing, they scrutinize past and present practices and attitudes in the various areas of music and offer suggestions for the modification of those aspects which they feel have been and will continue to be detrimental to the best interests of music and musicians in general. The authors of the present articles, as well as of those in Issue Number 14 not only pinpoint areas of discord but also set forth concrete, constructive suggestions for achieving greater harmony and more effective communication among members of the musical community.

NOTE

¹ See Léonie Rosenstiel, "Introduction and Overview," *Current Musicology* 14 (Fall 1972): 81-83.