The German Musical Exile and the Course of American Musicology

David Josephson

On the face of it, the subject would seem not to need a paper. Musicology was a European discipline fed from many sources, named by Friedrich Chrysander (1863, 1867), defined by Guido Adler (1885), and, during its early twentieth-century course, shaped by Friedrich Ludwig[1] and Hugo Riemann.[2] Like other humanities during the muscular growth of Wilhelmine Germany, it became a German province. As America had taken its classical music from Germany during the nineteenth century, so it took its musicology from Germany in the early years of the twentieth. But our pioneers soon set out to create a distinctly American musicology, and were on their way to doing so from the founding of the *Musical Quarterly* in 1915 to the creation of the New York Musicological Society in 1931 and its reorganization as the American Musicological Society (AMS) three years later.[3] They were soon overtaken by an unexpected influx of émigré scholars in flight from central Europe whose numbers and prestige charted the course of the fledgling discipline anew. Eventually, as the émigrés passed from the scene, and the generations of those they had taught began to pass from it as well, their influence eroded and American musicology reclaimed its national character, however that character would come to be construed. It seems a straightforward story.

It isn't. That story tells us little about why we did what we did during the early decades of our Society's existence. It narrates the meteoric rise of the émigrés' influence, but fails to account for its seemingly sudden collapse. When in 1985 Joseph Kerman published a stunning critique of postwar Anglo-American scholarship—he had been fighting the battle for twenty years before that—Margaret Bent responded as President of the AMS with an Address at the Society's annual meeting that year in Vancouver, defending the classic paradigm with the authority of one who was its elegant voice and the passion of one who recognized what was at stake (Kerman 1985; Bent 1986). But by the annual meeting in 1990 in Oakland the field had become a Babel of voices. When Howard Brown died three years later in 1993, the writers of what amounted to his authorized obituary, Frank D'Accone and Colin Slim—both, like Brown, Renaissance scholars trained at Harvard in the heyday of Renaissance musicology—felt compelled to defend his work, writing:

Current Musicology, Nos. 79 & 80 (2005)

> At a time when "positivistic" achievements such as Howard's—and his are surely among the most outstanding—were being called into question or even derided, he maintained the pace he had established and serenely continued to follow the path he had marked out for himself so many years ago. (D'Accone and Slim 1993)

It was a telling statement. No one, to my knowledge, had published a word questioning, much less deriding, Brown's fastidious work. Nor had its path come under direct attack in any publication I had read. But D'Accone and Slim recognized that the study of Renaissance music no longer held the pride of place in American musicology; it had come to stand, in fact, for an embattled orthodoxy of which Brown had been a leading voice. For them, our Society was a community whose cherished common mission and shared goals were dissolving. For many in a rising generation, though, that same Society was finally, after the debates of the late 1970s and 1980s, an open community, a free marketplace of ideas and approaches and interests where no one group had the power to define the mission, set the goals, or control the patronage. We of a certain age were living through a barely-examined revolution. The European émigrés had created our program and handed it down to us in high idealism. Underlying that program was an ideology, for lack of a sharper word, and that ideology had deep sources and a character that gave it its strength. Once those sources dried up with the passing of generations, the ideology shriveled and the program unraveled. The ground has been shifting under our field ever since.

A few confessions before proceeding: first, this work, begun more than a decade ago, grew out of a personal and long-overdue attempt to understand why my peers at Columbia and I had groped our way through graduate school in the 1960s as if in a fog, wondering what our teachers expected from us, trying to make sense of why we were learning what we were learning and how we were to connect it to the rest of our lives. They were émigrés or students of émigrés, and when it finally dawned on me that they were in thrall to their own teachers, and that they could not have answered the questions we ought to have asked them, I knew that I had to write this paper.

Second, this is a provisional as well as personal paper, a work in progress nowhere near a conclusion. I have much still to sort out. I present this work not as a disinterested or exhaustive history but as an attempt to come to terms with my experiences in and of the field as it has evolved during my adult lifetime.

Third, I am more comfortable on the outside than on the inside. At sea in the mandatory paleography class in graduate school at Columbia, I experienced the Wolfenbüttel and Bamberg manuscripts with their thirteenth-century liturgical music as hurdles to be jumped,[4] and threw up my

hands at Ludwig's *Repertorium,* as we knew that forbidding work with its indigestible title.[5] The labor was a challenge of sorts, but technical rather than musical, and the reason for our having to do it at all remained a mystery until Kerman put it into its postwar context two decades later.[6] Later on, while working on my dissertation, I directed the Columbia Concert Band despite the advice of my teachers who suggested that the wind repertory was not worthy of one seeking entry into musicological society. For my dissertation I chose a composer then on the fringe, John Taverner. The Straits of Dover separating England from the Flanders beloved by the Renaissance scholars who dominated the field might as well have been the Pacific Ocean. (Paul Henry Lang, one of the readers of that dissertation, congratulated me on my work on Tallis, the less-obscure Tudor composer whose surname also began with a T.) At the same time I undertook work to rescue from oblivion the recently-deceased Percy Grainger, at that time beyond the fringe, by programming an all-Grainger concert and later publishing a series of articles on him. The only musicologist to show any interest was Gustave Reese, and his reasons were personal. Grainger had been chairman of the Music Department at New York University in 1932–33, just as Reese, a young teacher there, was beginning work on his path-breaking *Music in the Middle Ages* (1940). The then-famous composer showed "friendly interest [and] provided most helpful encouragement" to Reese then and in the years that followed, and Reese recalled him with affection (1940:xv).

Fourth, while I am fascinated by the émigré generation, my interest in this essay lies in the American response to them, not in the lives they lived before their forced departure from Europe.

One final clearing of the throat concerns our perception of the musicological émigré presence. We who studied with one or more of the émigrés, or with students of theirs who adopted their attitudes and interests, tend to clump together this band of men as if they had arrived from pretty much the same place at pretty much the same time, and were of pretty much the same age; that is to say, as if they were a community. They were not. Most arrived across a band of fifteen years, from Hugo Leichtentritt in 1933 to Fritz Oberdoerffer in 1948. Their ages, too, stretched across a generation and more, from Ludwig Misch at sixty and Hugo Leichtentritt and Alfred Einstein at fifty-nine, to Alfred Mann at twenty-two and Reinhard Pauly at sixteen.

My peers and I also assumed that since these men were our teachers in America, they had come from Europe as university teachers, bringing their profession and skills with them. But only seven had taught music at universities in central Europe, and only two among them, Erich von Hornbostel and Curt Sachs, had held professorships, both at Berlin. Five

others had held lesser university positions: Max Graf at Vienna, Paul Nettl at Prague, Theodor Adorno at Frankfurt, Leo Schrade at Bonn, and Dragen Plamenac at Zagreb, on the periphery. Ten more had held conservatory positions: Hugo Leichtentritt had taught at the Klindworth-Scharwenka Conservatory in Berlin until 1924. Erwin Bodky and Herman Reichenbach had taught at the State Academy for Church and School Music in Berlin, Bodky going on to conservatories in Amsterdam and Haarlem after his flight in 1933; Reichenbach going on to the Central Institute for Education and Teaching in Berlin. Ludwig Misch had taught at the Stern Conservatory in Berlin, as had Oswald Jonas until his flight to Austria, when he joined Felix Salzer at the Schenker Institute of the New Vienna Conservatory. Erich Werner had taught at the Saarbrucken Conservatory until his dismissal, and afterwards at the Jewish Gymnasium and Theological Seminary. Ernst Ferand had taught at the Dalcroze School on the outskirts of Vienna, Fritz Oberdoerffer at various Berlin conservatories, and Manfred Bukofzer, briefly, at a Volksschule in Basel.

Of the other émigrés, eight—Frederick Dorian, Alfred Einstein, Otto Gombosi, Erich Hertzmann, Gerhard Herz, Hans Nathan, Paul Pisk, and Rudolph Réti—had earned their livings in Europe as critics; two—Karl Geiringer and Henry Rawski—as librarians; two—Walter Kaufmann and Hans Moldenhauer—as conductors; Kathi Meyer-Baer as a private librarian and bibliographer; and Boris Schwarz as a violinist. Ludwig Landshoff was unemployed before he left Europe. In short, we inherited a congeries of musicians, musical writers, and scholars who, with the exception of Meyer-Baer, the one woman in this account, became a community of teachers only after they settled here.

One of the five immigrants among the fourteen founders of the AMS in 1934 was Paul Henry Lang, among the earliest European musicologists to land on our shores, and one of the last of his generation to die, at the age of ninety in 1991 at his home in rural Connecticut.[7] One fact after another set him apart from the wave of forced emigrants that was about to land on America's shores. He was Hungarian and Catholic. His undergraduate training was at the Liszt Academy in Budapest. Apart from a brief stint at Heidelberg, he did graduate work at the Sorbonne and earned his PhD in literature, not music. He arrived in America in 1928 as a junior scholar of the Rockefeller Foundation, leaving a prosperous and peaceful Europe. His immigration was voluntary and enthusiastic. After teaching briefly at two women's colleges (Vassar and Wells) he earned an American PhD in musicology under Otto Kinkeldey at Cornell in 1934, and that year became an American citizen. So he was firmly rooted here when the first refugees arrived

from Germany. Although he knew their culture and spoke to them in their native tongue, he was not one of them, and he kept a certain distance from them. To him, they were "they," not "we." Still, he looms over this essay. He taught at Columbia from 1933 to 1970 and built the musicology program there. A founding father of the AMS, he served as Treasurer during its first thirteen years and as Vice-President for the next two. He was appointed editor of the *Musical Quarterly* in 1945, and for the next twenty-eight years used his position to determine the field of ideas and subjects on which the future of American musicology would be played out. He was chief music critic of the *New York Herald Tribune* from 1954 to 1963, using his bully pulpit to educate his readers in music literature and history. As editorial advisor to W. W. Norton, he created a music list that came to define mid-century American musicology. He is remembered for his classic *Music in Western Civilization* (1941), the great anchor of the Norton history series that reached out to educated Americans for a generation. Published in the most perilous year for the European theater of the war with Germany in control of Europe, it now reads as a sweeping valedictory to the priceless legacy of European music, an "elegy to a way of life that was being perverted and dismembered before his eyes" (Botstein in Lang [1941] 1997:ix).

The flight of cultivated Germans began shortly after the Nazi take-over of their homeland at the end of January 1933. The first German musicologists to flee to the United States, Erich Hornbostel, fifty-six years old, and Hugo Leichtentritt, fifty-nine, were scholars of international reputation who were familiar with America.[8] Hornbostel, director of the Berlin Phonogramm-Archiv, came at the invitation of the New School for Social Research, where he joined fourteen other distinguished émigrés in founding the School's graduate University in Exile. He arrived in New York in September 1933—his arrival was reported in the *New York Times*[9]—with plans to bring the famous recording archive to the United States and create an Institute of Comparative Musicology with Charles Seeger. He left his mark on American musicology in good part through his friendship with Seeger and Henry Cowell,[10] with whom he taught the first seminar offered in America on music cultures of the world. But ill health brought his plans to naught, and after barely a year in New York he joined his son in Cambridge, England, where he died in November 1935. Leichtentritt, whose arrival and appointment at Harvard in September 1933 was also covered by the *Times*,[11] taught there and at New York University until his retirement in 1944. He was the first émigré to deliver a scholarly paper in America (Leichtentritt 1936), and produced scholarly work without interruption here. But he played no role in the governance of the AMS, and remained apart from the development of American musicology.

A third eminence arrived in 1934, Paul Bekker, fifty-two, former chief music critic for the *Frankfurter Zeitung,* Intendant at Kassel and Wiesbaden, champion of the avant-garde, and author of some two dozen books. He succeeded Hornbostel at the New School, wrote his first (and only) book in exile, *The Story of the Orchestra* (1936a), and was the first émigré to America to have an article published by Carl Engel in the *Musical Quarterly* (1936b). He died three years after arriving in New York, beset by ill health and unable to adjust to American society. Also arriving in 1934 was Felix Gatz, a conductor with a doctorate and three books on aesthetics under his belt, a weak heart, and an abrasive personality. After four years of setbacks he found a seemingly secure position at Scranton University, where he organized and presided over the First American Congress for Aesthetics and became president of the American Society for Aesthetics. But when the university shut down its Art and Music Department in 1942 his fragile life shattered, and, unable to find another position, he died of a heart attack at fifty.

These first men arrived in America to find a small field fighting an uphill battle. In December 1932, W. Oliver Strunk, then at the Library of Congress, had published a survey of American musicology undertaken at the behest of the American Council of Learned Societies (Strunk 1932). He found "the recognition of musicology as an independent and fully privileged branch of scientific investigation and musical discipline . . . so rare as to be practically negligible" (quoted in Crawford 1984:6–7). Only three schools, Cornell, Vassar, and Yale, offered seminars in musicology. At that time only three PhDs had been granted in the field and opposition both within music departments and from university administrations had stunted its growth. Immigration was to alter that reality beyond recognition. It began in earnest in 1936, spurred by the promulgation of the Nuremberg Laws that stripped Jewish Germans of their citizenship and civil rights and led to a swift deterioration of their economic condition. Over the next five years some three dozen refugee musicologists would arrive in the United States.

The year 1936 brought a passel of younger men: Paul Pisk and Willi Apel, both forty-three; Hans David and Frederick Dorian, both thirty-four; Boris Schwarz, thirty; Hans Nathan, twenty-six; and Gerhard Herz, twenty-four. All but Dorian, who arrived from Vienna with the help of Eugene Ormandy and quickly found a permanent home at Carnegie Mellon, foundered for a while, though eventually all secured positions.[12]

Pisk alone among them had established a solid career in Europe, playing a significant role in the musical life of interwar Vienna. He was a founding member of Schoenberg's Society for Private Musical Performances[13] and of the Vienna chapter of the International Society for Contemporary Music, headed the music department at the Volkshochschule, taught at the New Vienna Conservatory, and briefly edited Universal Edition's prestigious *Musik-*

blätter des Anbruch. A protégé of Guido Adler, his musicological credentials were impeccable.[14] Although he arrived in New York fluent in English and with a name as an avant-garde composer, his first year was a struggle.Like Bekker before him and many scholars who would follow him, Pisk was helped in his adjustment by the heroic Engel, who gave him part-time work at G. Schirmer, published an article of his in the *Musical Quarterly* (Pisk 1938), and helped in the job search that yielded a position at the University of Redlands in California.[15] Eventually Pisk moved to the University of Texas, where he built a doctoral program in musicology, then to Washington University in St. Louis in retirement. His long years of teaching left generations of students in his debt,[16] but he published no significant scholarship and played little role in the development of the field,[17] perhaps because he rejected the dry modernist course it had taken. In 1963 he published a text with Homer Ulrich, *A History of Music and Musical Style*, in "protest against" Donald Grout's recently published *History of Western Music* (1960); the failure of that text to dislodge Grout's signaled Pisk's outsider status in his adopted land, and he recalled in his old age that "the real professional guild of the musicologists don't like me too much, because I'm a musician."[18]

Willi Apel settled in Boston and found piecemeal work there at Harvard and elsewhere. Within a decade he established himself as a scholar of unmatched productivity, beginning with a scholarly paper for the Greater New York Chapter of the AMS in the year of his arrival (Apel 1936) and an article published by Engel in the *Musical Quarterly* (Apel 1937), continuing with a stream of articles in the *Bulletin* and *Papers of the AMS,* the *Musical Quarterly,* and *Acta Musicologica,* and culminating in the publication of three works that achieved classic status: *The Notation of Polyphonic Music, 900–1600* (1942), *The Harvard Dictionary of Music* (1944), and the first volume of *The Historical Anthology of Music* (Apel and Davison 1946). But he found a secure teaching position only in 1950, when at fifty-six he was appointed Professor at the University of Indiana.

Gerhard Herz arrived after an unusually circuitous saga.[19] Engel invited him to give a paper before the Greater New York Chapter of the AMS early in 1937 and published it in the *Musical Quarterly* (Herz 1938), and the next year he found a position at the University of Louisville, where he spent his career becoming a leading Bach scholar and contributing to the musical life of his Kentucky home.[20]

Boris Schwarz worked as a professional violinist after arriving in New York until his appointment in 1941 at Queens College, where he helped establish a major center of musicology.[21]

Hans David arrived after a three-year exile in Holland, and, helped by Engel's publication of an article by him on *The Musical Offering* (David 1937), found work as music editor at the New York Public Library. While

there he discovered the music of the Moravian community in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and over the next six years published four essays and a catalog on the subject, a fitting integration of his German past and American future.[22] His teaching career began at New York University in 1939, continued at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, and ended at the University of Michigan.

Hans Nathan settled in Boston, undertook post-doctoral studies at Harvard, worked at adult education centers, and spent a year at Tufts before going to Michigan State College (later University) in 1946, remaining there until his retirement in 1981. His embrace of America was unusually wholehearted; he is best remembered for his study of the music of his adopted land, notably blackface minstrelsy and the music of William Billings.[23]

Curt Sachs, former Professor at Berlin University, director of the German State Instrument Collection and junior colleague of Hornbostel, arrived in 1937.[24] The minute that towering figure set foot on American soil at fifty-six he became the leading figure here.[25] He had spent the first years of his exile in Paris at the Sorbonne and the Musée de l'Homme, and as director of the visionary recording project Anthologie Sonore. His triple appointment in New York as Visiting Professor at New York University, Curator of the Crosby Brown Collection of Musical Instruments at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Chief of the Dance and Phonograph Collections at the New York Public Library was greeted with another article in the *New York Times.*[26] With his first graduate seminar, and his paper at the third annual meeting of the AMS in Pittsburgh at the end of the year (Sachs 1937), American musicology ceased to be an outpost.[27]

In 1938, the year that brought Jewish life in central Europe to an end with the Anschluss, Munich, and Kristallnacht, the manageable series of arrivals of individuals turned into a flood of desperate refugees for whom finding employment was a challenge and occasionally a heartbreak. Among the fistful of refugees arriving that year were Erwin Bodky at forty-two from Berlin via Amsterdam, Oswald Jonas at forty-one from Vienna via London, Emanuel Winternitz at forty from Vienna, Erich Hertzmann at thirty-seven from Breslau, Leo Schrade at thirty-five from Bonn, and Siegmund Levarie at twenty-four from Vienna.

The year 1939 brought a giant to stand beside Sachs: Alfred Einstein, his arrival marked by an article in the *New York Times.*[28] Other arrivals that year were Ernest T. Ferand at fifty-one from Vienna, Paul Nettl at fifty from Prague, Dragan Plamenac at forty-four from Zagreb, Eric Werner at thirty-eight from Berlin, Otto Gombosi at thirty-seven from Berlin via Rome and Basel, and Manfred Bukofzer at twenty-nine from Basel via London. In September of that year, two weeks after the German invasion of Poland had set

off World War II, the AMS hosted a week-long International Congress in New York, attracting some 750 people to its sessions, led by a fistful of eminent non-German European, Latin American, and émigré musicologists.

By 1940, when the émigré flood had abated after the arrival of Kathi Meyer-Baer at forty-eight from Frankfurt via Paris, Karl Geiringer at forty-one from Vienna via London, Edward Lowinsky at thirty-two from Heidelberg via The Hague and Havana, and Felix Salzer at thirty-six from Vienna, the center of musicological gravity had shifted from Germany to America.[29] It may not yet have been apparent, for Germany kept many of her scholars. But they were already either compromised or silenced. Then, as the war turned inexorably against Germany, destroying her cities, her economy, and her culture, German musicology curdled. Meanwhile, the émigrés were establishing themselves in America with growing self-confidence, and at the annual meeting that year in Cleveland they gave seven of the fifteen papers.[30] Of the class of 1940, only Meyer-Baer failed to secure an academic position, for reasons that would have been apparent to every woman who dreamed of or sought employment in the academy at the time; nevertheless, she lived a full and productive life as a private scholar and was an active member of the community until her last years.

Among those who fled were students who would complete their education in America and go on to positions in the field here: in 1938, Frederick Sternfeld at twenty-three from Vienna via Cambridge, Hans Tischler at twenty-three from Vienna via London, and Ernest Sanders at twenty from Hamburg; in 1939, Alfred Mann at twenty-two from Berlin via Milan. Two survived the Nazi years in Europe and came to America afterwards: Alexander Ringer in 1946 at twenty-five, Fritz Oberdoerffer in 1948 at fifty-four. They would all eventually thrive as productive scholars.

The high point of émigré influence as leaders in the AMS, as teachers, and as scholars, came during the 1940s and 1950s. The two giants and four younger men held its highest posts: Sachs (1949–50) and Geiringer (1955–56) as President; Einstein (1945–46), Gombosi (1952–53), Schrade (1953–54), and Plamenac (1956–57) served as Vice-Presidents. Twelve were members-at-large of the Board between 1939 and 1969: Apel, Gombosi Mann, Pisk, and Ringer for one term each; Einstein, Lowinsky, and Winternitz for two; David and Plamenac for three; Sachs for four; Bukofzer for five; and Geiringer for seven. On the other hand, none ever became editor-in-chief of the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* aside from Sachs (and he only shared that position with Kinkeldey for the first issue of volume 5 in 1952), no doubt because none was a native Anglophone.

Most émigré scholars adjusted successfully to academic life in America. Thanks in good part to their prestige as scholars, they were decisive in in-

stitutionalizing musicology at the major universities, as well as at colleges throughout the United States. The year 1950, for instance, found Sachs at New York University, Hertzmann at Columbia (where Lang had appointed him), Schwarz and Lowinsky at Queens College, Salzer at the Mannes College of Music, Winternitz at Yale and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Ferand at the New School, Einstein at Smith, Sternfeld at Dartmouth, Geiringer at Boston University, Schrade at Yale, Bodky at Brandeis and the Longy School, David at Michigan, Nathan at Michigan State, Levarie and Gombosi at Chicago, Jonas and Tischler at Roosevelt University, Nettl and Apel at Indiana, Werner in Cincinnati, Herz at Louisville University, Oberdoerffer at Texas, and Bukofzer at the University of California, Berkeley.[31] It was a list unimaginable only twenty years earlier when there was not one American chair in the field.

As scholars, the émigrés produced a crop of books in their first full decade (1940–50) that had no precedent in this country: Sachs's *The History of Musical Instruments* in 1940 (1940a); Lang's *Music in Western Civilization* in 1941; Apel's *Notation of Polyphonic Music* and Dorian's *History of Music in Performance* in 1942; Sachs's *Rise of Music in the Ancient World* in 1943; Apel's *Harvard Dictionary of Music* in 1944; Einstein's *Mozart* in 1945; Lowinsky's *Secret Chromatic Art in the Netherlands Motet* and the first volume of Apel's *Historical Anthology of Music* (with Davison) in 1946;[32] Bukofzer's *Music in the Baroque Era,* Einstein's *Music in the Romantic Era,* and Karl Geiringer's *Brahms* each in 1947; Sachs's *Our Musical Heritage: A Short History of Music* in 1948; Einstein's *The Italian Madrigal* in 1949; Bukofzer's *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Music,* Schrade's *Monteverdi* and the second volume of Apel's and Davison's *Historical Anthology of Music* all in 1950.[33] (The role of W. W. Norton in this procession and, beyond it, in the shaping of the field, remains to be told.)

The list is telling. Lang's history was the successor to August Ambros's *Geschichte der Musik*;[34] it would be the last of the great European Romantic one-man music histories. Sachs's *Rise of Music in the Ancient World,* Bukofzer's *Music in the Baroque Era,* and Einstein's *Music in the Romantic Era,* installments in the Norton series, were successors to volumes in Ernst Bücken's *Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft* (1928–34).[35] Apel's *Notation of Polyphonic Music* was the American child of Johannes Wolf's *Handbuch der Notationskunde* ([1913–19] 1963); *The Historical Anthology of Music* was our version of Arnold Schering's *Geschichte der Musik in Beispielen* (1931). Two of the three monographs, Lowinsky's *Secret Chromatic Art in the Netherlands Motet* and Schrade's *Monteverdi,* did not stray far from the musicological heartland: medieval and Renaissance music, the problem areas of pre-war European musicology, were, thanks to the concerns and influence of the

émigré teachers, fast becoming the problem areas of post-war American musicology. The slim production of books by American-born scholars in the 1940s fits the inherited pattern neatly: Gustave Reese's *Music in the Middle Ages* (1940), the book that inaugurated the Norton histories; Glen Haydon's *Introduction to Musicology* (1941), the closest we would come to Adler's *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte* (1924); and Oliver Strunk's *Source Readings in Music History* (1950).

The other side of the scholarly coin was the production of editions. These began more slowly, with Apel and Plamenac the pioneers, but by the 1950s, as the publication of books and monographs waned, that of historical editions waxed. Notable early editions by American-born scholars such as Leonard Ellinwood's of Francesco Landini (Landini 1939), Helen Hewitt's of Ottaviano Petrucci's *Odhecaton A* (Hewitt 1946), Thomas Marrocco's of fourteenth-century Italian music ([1942] 1961; Bologna 1954), and Louise Cuyler's of Heinrich Isaac's liturgical music (Isaac 1950; 1956), were overwhelmingly devoted to the problem areas of the émigrés: medieval and early Renaissance music.

The teaching trail traces the émigrés' influence at its most direct, i.e., through the students they taught, and through their students' students. Apel, Bukofzer, Einstein, Ferand, Gombosi, Hertzmann, Lowinsky, Plamenac, and Schrade: all were Renaissance scholars. If we seek an explanation for our erstwhile concentration on that music, we must look not to its beauties, or to the culture that produced it, or to the gripping philological and performance problems that attend its unearthing, but to the presence of a few towering scholars to whom young Americans flocked and who served as their teachers and role models. Take Schrade. In the twenty years he spent at Yale, he begat Nan Cooke Carpenter, Richard Crocker, Alvin Johnson, Sylvia Kenney, Janet Knapp, Edward Lerner, Albert Seay, and William Waite.[36] The Renaissance came to musicological America and flourished because German scholars brought it with them and gave it to us, or perhaps imposed it on us; its day waned because our concerns shifted. Renaissance study will not soon again dominate American musicology. Many younger scholars seemed indifferent to it, moving into centuries, repertories, and theoretical stances that the émigrés and their students considered off-limits. The very habit of slicing the past into a line of distinct periods, the Renaissance among them, was coming under attack. That was the grim reality that D'Accone and Slim faced in their obituary of their friend.

The period around 1950 marked the high tide of émigré activity and influence. In 1951, the American Council of Learned Societies recognized the AMS as one of its constituent members. The death of Leichtentritt in that

year at age seventy-seven was little felt; despite his Harvard position, he was a proud outsider of little influence. But Einstein's death the next year at seventy-one removed a titan, while the premature deaths in 1955 of Bukofzer, the outstanding émigré musicologist of his generation, at forty-five, and Gombosi at fifty-two removed two future leaders. Schrade's return to Europe in 1958 removed a third. When Sachs died at seventy-seven in 1959, an era died with him. Hertzmann mourned: "We . . . have lost a great man, one of the last of the generation of pioneers who established musicology as a subject of academic pursuit" (Hertzmann 1958:1). These men had done their work: the ascendancy of America within the international field, and of native-born Americans within the national field, was acknowledged in 1961 with the holding of the Eighth Congress of the International Musicological Society in New York City and Donald Grout's election as its president. Retirements and deaths in the 1960s marked the end of the émigré high water. Hertzmann and Schrade died at sixty in 1963 and 1964 respectively, and David at sixty-five in 1967. While Geiringer and Lowinsky remained active, the leadership of our Society was passing quickly to a younger generation, most of them students of émigré scholars.

The émigré presence should not blind us to the influential native Americans whose names march through the lists of Society officers and board members throughout these decades: in the 1940s, alphabetically: Donald Grout, Glen Haydon, Otto Kinkeldey, William S. Newman, Gustave Reese, Charles Seeger, and Harold Spivacke; in the 1950s: David Boyden, Nathan Broder, Louise Cuyler, Jan LaRue, Arthur Mendel, William J. Mitchell, and Oliver Strunk. But for all their erudition and achievement, there was in these men and women a genuflecting reflex, an unspoken conviction that the émigrés carried in their blood the authentic tradition; that what they had inherited by right, the native-born would have to earn.

That was difficult. Emulation and industry were not enough. American-born scholars could adopt the interests and attitudes of the émigrés, their language and manners, but the culture that had taken generations to build lay beyond them. They could not inherit the émigrés' experience, and that experience was at the core. Educated Germans and Austrians, exposed to a vibrant intellectual life, knew in their bones that their culture was peerless. The names of their culture were the names of defining genius. Behind Schütz lay Luther, behind Mozart Kant, behind Beethoven Goethe, behind Wagner Nietzsche, behind Mahler Freud. Americans grew up with no such pedigree. Whom did we have in our past? Billings, Foster, Gottschalk, Kern, Gershwin, Ellington, Ives, and whoever might have lain behind *them,* names meaning nothing to the émigrés and therefore of little interest to their dutiful American students. Austro-Germans grew up with a powerful cultural identity born of Romantic nationalism, and an ideology of aesthetic autonomy that,

they believed, kept their sacred art removed from profane politics. (And in the 1920s, as German and Austrian politics became worse than profane, art had to be kept at a greater and greater remove, its autonomy enforced ever more strictly.) Americans had no such identity as musicologists. We lacked the grounding in European intellectual history and continental philosophy that our best teachers had in their bones. We could learn the nuts and bolts, the clinical data and tasks that Kerman came to identify as positivist, but the underlying assumptions, concerns, and questions of the German scholars were outside our interests and training. And so we took the work of our teachers, removed it from the cultural soil in which it was embedded, and cautiously framed it in universal terms so that we could become its heirs. At the same time, the émigrés had to adapt to the intellectual traditions of their adopted universities, and to the interests and abilities of their students, if they were to succeed here. Adapt they did. They neutralized their work, and we responded. No wonder so much of our work was colorless and dutiful. Indifferent to all standards except objectivity, system, and science, we constructed a scholarly apparatus buttressing stories, facts, and their organization and presentation. Spitta's Bach, for instance, was denatured: though we could not adopt him as a great Lutheran German, neither could we make him a great secular American, so we made him simply a great musician. As Richard Taruskin has insisted, we lost something vital in the translation ([1991] 1995).[37]

It was never difficult to see the contribution of the émigrés to American musicology, nor to find paeans to them as men and scholars. What was difficult was to identify the cost of that contribution. Nothing comes free. One culture cannot easily be deposited wholesale into another. What went were all but the most conservative values, and they ran deep. Karl Geiringer and Erich Hertzmann, products of that heritage, gave us some idea of what it was like to sit in on musicology lectures and seminars given at the University of Berlin in the 1920s by the legendary Hermann Kretzschmar and Johannes Wolf. Geiringer recalled the seminars of Kretzschmar, then an old man, in which students had to illustrate their papers at the piano: "As soon as the playing began, Kretzschmar invariably fell asleep and awoke only when the performance stopped." As for the lectures of Wolf, "a charming man" who would become a friend and benefactor, they "were deadly. What he gave us was mainly footnotes from his research, endless numbers of codices, dates, and meaningless facts" (Geiringer 1993:35–36). Hertzmann was more diplomatic; he did not name names.

> Musicologists at the University . . . would read a script, sometimes quite dated, sometimes slightly touched-up, but often just a summary of ma-

> terials that had been previously published. We even had to listen to the reading of inventories of medieval manuscripts in European libraries, in alphabetical order from Annaberg to Zwickau, call numbers and all. (Hertzmann 1958:3)

True, what Geiringer and Hertzmann described sounds worse for its stuffiness than for its conservatism. But the two went hand in hand. Hertzmann's single example, after all, involved medieval documents. And though we were to discover that the subject need not have been so clotted, it seemed so to most of us at the time, struggling as we did to examine the Middle Ages, via Ludwig and Wolf and Apel, through the lens of early twentieth-century Germany, i.e., of one alien society through the scholarship of another.

The conservatism was also profoundly musical, and it came directly from the musicological émigrés, few of whom had lined up in the contest over the future of German music in the 1920s. Mahler, Schoenberg, Berg, Webern: these were not common names in our classrooms and journals. Here most of the émigrés were at one with their colleagues who had remained in Hitler's Europe. Read, for instance, Friedrich Blume, who had stayed in Germany and carefully made his peace with Nazi society, writing in 1947 of the Bach Edition: "An achievement of incalculable significance . . . an event without parallel in the whole of history," he called it, as he noted its impact on composition:

> Which of the great composers from Schumann to Reger, from Mendelssohn to Strauss and Pfitzner, from Brahms to Wagner, and from Bruckner to Verdi had not somewhere been deeply influenced by the complete edition of the works of Bach? It opened the sluice through which his art and technique, as well as his mind and faith, poured into the creative work of the neo-Romantics and neo-Classicists . . . For the first time in history creative minds in music experienced the overwhelming influence of past greatness so profoundly that it set the whole direction and standard for their own work. An epoch-making change took place in the half-century covered by the Bach edition, since for the first time European music was part of a definite historical process. Musical historians began to interpret Bach as the centre of gravity of the whole history of music. Wagner saw in Bach "the history of the innermost life of the German spirit during the cruel century in which the German people were completely blotted out." (1950:60–61)

Note that in his list of composers influenced by Bach, Blume acknowledged only one non-German, Verdi, and that the twentieth-century Germans he named were Reger, Strauss, and Pfitzner, ignoring Mahler, Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern. Note also his use of Wagner to nail his argument. True, he would follow Wagner's words with more reasonable ones from Brahms, Reger, and

Beethoven. But he gave pride of place to Wagner, and quoted words that cast Bach strictly in German terms, and, strikingly, in terms that cast Germans as victims. The words, "the innermost life of the German spirit during the cruel century in which the German people were completely blotted out," could have passed for Third Reich copy. That Wagner could write them, fine. That Blume would quote them in the discredited Germany of 1947 is appalling. How blind to history could a historian be?

Manfred Bukofzer, of the generation following Blume's, was no apologist for the German people or the German spirit that so gripped the older scholar. His adoption of America and of the English language was enthusiastic. But he brought his schooling with him. He published *Music in the Baroque Era* in the same year as Blume's paean to the German Bach, and supplied it with a Preface whose caution, conservatism, and exclusion of the subjective and the aesthetic embodied the program of the émigré musicologists and their American colleagues and students. We would need forty years to shake free of their stern self-discipline:

> If the history of music is to have more than an antiquarian interest and significance, it must be seen as the history of musical styles, and the history of styles in turn as a history of ideas. The ideas that underlie musical styles can only be shown in a factual stylistic analysis that takes music apart as a mechanic does a motor and that shows how musical elements are combined, how they achieve their specific effect, and what constitutes the difference between externally similar factors. This analysis is at once historical and "technological" and takes beauty for granted. Those writers to whom the description of music is no more than a matter of elegant variation in judiciously chosen adjectives may be shocked to learn that the word "beautiful" does not occur in this book. My aim has been not the expatiation on the obvious but the explanation of the specific musical results of baroque style. This explanation must of necessity rely on words, but it must be clearly understood that words cannot render the aesthetic experience of music itself, let alone replace it. (1947:xiii-xiv)

Lang had warned of the conservatism in his inaugural editorial in the *Musical Quarterly* in 1945 as the Germany that had destroyed Europe, murdered its Jews, and sent us our émigrés, was in its death throes:

> We have been fortunate in being able to welcome to this country some of the best musicologists the folly of a perverted nation cast adrift. For the most part they are eminent scholars, true humanists who are at home wherever men of goodwill dwell. They have joined whole-heartedly in the spirit of their new community, animated by the realization that genuine scholarship, true humanism, knows no boundaries. Yet some of our newly won colleagues still do not realize that the times have changed, and that most of all, their surroundings have changed. (1945:374–75)

With those bold words, Lang established himself as an American, marked his distance from the forced émigrés (note his use of "we" and "they"), and warned them that they would have to adapt to their new homeland professionally as well as personally. Philology, he insisted, must not be "divorced from living art." Musical scholars of German training "confound the means—research—with the aim—understanding," he declared, anticipating Kerman's argument by almost twenty years (1945:375). There must be room for beauty as well as history, enjoyment as well as positive science and objectivity. Lang rambled, he sidestepped definition of his terms, and he could not make up his mind about the Germans. But he put his finger on one critical facet of the problem: that some émigrés carried ball and chain, and that their heritage and accent bestowed on them a prestige that put them in a position to influence the field in a narrowly technical direction.

Four years later, in 1949, Sachs wrote a shrewd editorial in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* in which he decried the narrow view of musicology that he saw settling among some of his colleagues. He divided them into two groups, humanists on the one hand, and what he called "nothing-but-specialists" on the other. The specialists, indispensable as they were in providing the patient detail work needed in the field, posed a threat to American musicology. As Lang had done, Sachs tried to keep his footing, but at the end he slipped, urging students to "keep to this kind of neat and devoted research" exemplified by the nothing-but-specialists (Sachs 1949:6). Kerman would later focus his hawk eye on this peculiar suggestion, and ask:

> How will students who have been programmed to be "nothing-but-specialists" turn into scholars with broad, original, humane horizons? Sachs does not say. In the event the metamorphosis was not often witnessed. Perhaps American students never grasped what was supposed to happen to them. Perhaps, in class, they were never even told. (1985:46)

As Kerman recognized, the metamorphosis was a mirage. Sachs's students listened not to his plea for breadth but only to his admonition that they stick to the "detail work, patient, careful, faithful, done for the sake of knowledge and for nothing else" (1949:6). And that is largely what those students delivered, through the 1950s and beyond. For as they absorbed the influence of their European teachers, they also brought to bear on their work the powerful legacy of Anglo-American positivism, a legacy that the émigrés had had to come to terms with in order to adapt themselves to the universities that became their homes. In short, the émigré scholars adapted to their students, and their students adapted to their adapting teachers. Both sides of the equation did their best to please the other, and neither

side seems to have considered the cost of their mutual courtesy. The inquiry into intellectual history and philosophy that the best of the Europeans had once considered their daily bread had almost no place in the American academy. American music historians dug dutifully into sources, then produced biographies and critical editions, and more biographies and critical editions, and then more, threatening to make good Sachs's nightmare prediction that one day "specialized research [will have] filled and over-flooded our libraries so completely that the librarians will have to stack the books and journals on the sidewalks outside the buildings" (1949:6). There was no end to their work. They rarely concerned themselves, however, with what would be done with it and by whom. As Tom Lehrer had a postwar émigré of another ilk observe in another context,

> "Once the rockets are up,
> Who cares where they come down?
> That's not my department,"
> Says Werner von Braun.[38]

Enter the 1960s, the decade that blew away so much in America. The list of AMS officers and board members in the decade that began with Kennedy and ended with Vietnam and Apollo 11 resonates with fresh names: William Austin, Howard Brown, Richard Crocker, Charles Hamm, Daniel Heartz, H. Wiley Hitchcock, Joseph Kerman, and Claude Palisca. In 1963, a book entitled simply *Musicology* was published as a volume in a series commissioned by the Council of the Humanities at Princeton on a grant from the Ford Foundation (Harrison, Hood, and Palisca 1963). With that impeccable pedigree, it strove, in the words of General Editor Richard Schlatter, "to present a critical account of American humanistic scholarship in recent decades . . . [so that we could] see just what that scholarship has contributed to the culture of America and the world" (Schlatter 1963:ix). Schlatter then described our profession in two sentences, and the function of the volume in a third:

> Musicology is one of the newest of the scholarly disciplines in the American university. Imported from Germany in the twentieth century, quickened by the work of excellent scholars who fled from the Nazis, musicology, like art history, has had to be domesticated in the United States. The three essays in this volume tell the story of that domestication and draw some morals for the future. (Schlatter 1963:ix–x)

The book consisted of three surveys: Palisca's from the inside, Frank L. Harrison's from the outside, and Mantle Hood's, "about the struggle to found

a disciplined study of non-Western music in this country" (Schlatter 1963: x). Schlatter saw a field in its adolescence, and found its path unclear.

It was not the first review of our field. There had been several since 1929, when Oliver Strunk undertook one for the Committee on Musicology of the American Council of Learned Societies. As much a plea for support as a review, he published it three years later as *State and Resources of Musicology in the United States* (Strunk 1932). The most significant and symptomatic of the émigré positions came in 1957 with the posthumous publication of Bukofzer's brief *Place of Musicology in American Institutions of Higher Learning* which advocated a double approach to the teaching of music as a liberal art to the many and as a profession to the few. But now Harrison found that approach unpalatable, for it would drain musical study as a discipline on the one hand, and produce "specialized and uncommunicative" scholarship on the other (Harrison 1963:6). For him, musicology had to enhance "communication and understanding between man and man and between the present and the past," provide composers with a record of past music, and help performers recreate that music faithfully (Harrison 1963:7). But he could only read the future darkly, for he found a field here in which scholars wrote "for a circle of colleagues and specialist students rather than for those who read and write general history," and while he could cajole, he could not prescribe a new path (Harrison 1963:83).

Palisca was sterner in his definition of the field, more optimistic in his prognosis for its future. Musicology represented what he called a new dimension of musical scholarship, "a nonartistic, nonhedonistic attack upon a subject that should have been in the view of many all pleasure, creativity, and inspiration" (Palisca 1963:90). He embraced such a musicology, and accepted, too, the fact that the stream of the field had narrowed radically since Adler's classic program in 1885, with its twofold division into a historical method subdivided into notation, types of compositions, principles of composition, principles of performance, and instruments; and a systematic one subdivided into theory (harmonics, rhythmics, and melics), pedagogy, aesthetics, psychology, and non-Western music; and Riemann's, with its fivefold division into acoustics, physiology and psychology, aesthetics, theory of composition and performance, and history (Riemann [1908] 1919). Both programs had been attacked over the years by Waldo Selden Pratt (1915), Seeger (1924), Strunk (1936), and Sachs (1940b). Haydon's *Introduction* in 1941 harkened back to Adler, but it was Sachs's proposal that we focus on history alone that won out. By the émigré high water of the 1950s, the two American journals in the field, the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* and the *Musical Quarterly,* were publishing virtually nothing on acoustics, physiology, psychology, aesthetics, pedagogy, theory, or compara-

tive musicology. The establishment of *Ethnomusicology* and the *Journal of Music Theory* in 1957 confirmed that musicology had become synonymous with music history. Palisca sealed Sachs's vision: "The musicologist is first and foremost a historian" (Palisca 1963:119). The broader vision that Kinkeldey had brought with him from Berlin and Breslau and that had been the foundation of his pioneering seminars here in the 1930s was, in the words of our students, toast.

On one subject Harrison had particularly strong words: American musicology, having absorbed what he called the "official" musicological outlook of Europe, lacked real involvement in the musical culture of either Europe or America. He noted specifically our ignoring most of jazz and all of our popular music, down to rock 'n' roll, despite its enormous world standing. If minstrels and *laude* and the Lutheran *Kantorei* were acceptable subjects of research, he asked, why not music hall and pop? Perhaps the courtesy of that genial scholar prevented him from answering it; perhaps as a guest he was simply too much taken by his hosts to see the answer staring him in the face.

Palisca as well was uncomfortable: "Very few American musicologists can have an easy conscience about the subject of American music... [It] has only a negligible role in graduate study and is treated as a serious research specialty by only a handful of American scholars, few of them in teaching positions" (Palisca 1963:210). Like most observers of the field—Voltaire and Swift would have been merciless—he saw what he called a healthy trend. That was in 1963. The trend was slow in coming. It took another thirty years for the AMS to begin producing an American Denkmal, and its inaugural volume was slim and marginal, a patch of dry modernism in the rain forest of American music that it would explore in later volumes (i.e., Crawford Seeger 1993).

If Harrison and Palisca summed up the state of American musicology for American humanists in 1963, Donald Grout had done the same for American college students three years earlier (Grout 1960). Whereas Harrison and Palisca presented the scene, Grout had acted on it, producing a textbook self-confident in its organization and presentation of what it construed as our musical heritage, covering the ground it privileged as no other English-language text had done before it. It was a gray summation of what American musicology had produced by 1960, reflecting the interests of the stolid field it represented. The influence of its tone, content, and emphasis was so enduring that it went through three revisions over three decades. What strengths the original had, later revisions damaged, although they

dutifully followed the data-laden progress of the field as it continued to define itself. The first revision, in 1973, ignoring the first probing questions posed by Leo Treitler, updated its facts but not its historiography or ideas, despite the revolution that had taken place in the 1960s in the American student generation at whom it was directed (Grout 1973). The third edition of 1980, remaining rooted in the 1950s in every respect but its facts, was so uneasy that it removed the original 1960 preface that had set forth, however perfunctorily, its principles of selection and omission (Grout 1980). With the fourth edition Claude Palisca took over (Grout and Palisca 1988), and with the seventh, Peter Burkholder (Grout, Burkholder, and Palisca 2006). Each succeeding version has been longer, slicker, and determinedly up-to-date, but the tone, the language, the style, cannot—perhaps do not wish to—wriggle free of an increasingly distant past. Grout's original text had an integrity that could not be washed away, an integrity born of the 1950s adaptation by American musicologists of a German field. Whether or not we ever found ourselves comfortable with that adaptation, it was in retrospect a stubbornly individual one—optimistic, focused, energetic, and comfortable—words that apply not only to the field but also to its time and place. To know where we stood in 1960, at the height of our absorption of what we read as the émigré model, read the original Grout.

Two years after publication of the *Musicology* volume came a bold response from Kerman, in his now-famous "Profile for American Musicology," that threatened the foundations of the Society's work by displacing history from the center of musicology to a subsidiary place, "a step on a ladder" whose top step afforded "a platform of insight into individual works of art" (Kerman 1965:63). It was his first call to the serious criticism and interpretation of great works, to the interjection of a personal voice into a field rooted in a tradition of empirical, objective, apparently value-free scholarship. Like Lang, he did not define his terms precisely, and he wrestled with the German problem. German musicologists had well earned our affectionate, great, and deep-rooted debt. We had paid that debt, and now had to stake our own claim in the field:

> Until American musicology catches something of the resonance of the American personality, it will remain an echo of the great German tradition . . . That tradition was not dictated by objective truths of nature, it arose out of a certain national current of thought at a certain point in its history . . . Presumably we too should be echoing our own current and our own time . . . Our identity as scholars depends on growth away from an older alien tradition into something recognizably our own. (1965:67)

But the grip of an alien authority remained so powerful that Kerman faltered at this critical juncture in his argument. Our musicological tradition could not embrace our American heritage, he went on, not when that heritage could put up only a Francis Hopkinson, Lowell Mason, or Theodore Chanler against the claims staked by Beethoven, Luca Marenzio, or Louis Couperin. If Kerman didn't recognize that he was playing here with loaded dice, virtually no one else did either; those were the only dice our field recognized. His conclusion was embedded in his implicit premise: having pitted our mediocrities against Europe's titans, Kerman retreated from the full import of his challenge, abjured the study of American music, and asked only for "a native point of view" in the study of European music (1965:68). The field remained safe, for the time being at least.

Or so it would seem in retrospect. It did not seem so then. The response was swift. Lowinsky, speaking in the name of a thriving enterprise stung by Kerman's distinctions among national points of view and appalled by his proposals, took meticulous aim at every one of them and fired in a magisterial reply published that same year (Lowinsky 1965). Whose hill one stood on determined how one read the outcome of the battle; the establishment that determined such matters stood virtually to a man—and, like the rest of the academy, it was a society of men—on Lowinsky's hill. But if Lowinsky appeared to have won the battle, Kerman would win the war, and he would do it the old-fashioned way: through the example of his brilliant writings, through the disciples he would attract (some of them former scholars of medieval and Renaissance music), and through the journal he founded, *19th-Century Music,* which would turn nineteenth-century studies from the wasteland we had found as graduate students to the boom industry it has become.

In 1966 William Austin took the small step that Kerman had all but suggested before stepping back, when he devoted two chapters to jazz in his *Music in the 20th Century,* the final installment in the multi-volume Norton history (Austin 1966), a fact noted sourly by Charles Wuorinen as an "overemphasis" in a savage review published in *Perspectives of New Music* (Wuorinen 1966:145).[39] It was, I believe, the first appearance of Jelly Roll Morton, Louis Armstrong, Duke Ellington, Coleman Hawkins, Charlie Parker, Miles Davis, John Lewis, Ray Charles, and Ornette Coleman, among others, in a book published by the American musicological establishment.

In the following year Leo Treitler attacked the the master narrative of the history of European music that assigned relative values (Treitler 1967). Having tuned his ears to the "rattling of skeletons in the halls of humane learning" outside our field as a cultural and political earthquake shook American society (1967:188), Treitler dissected the doctrine of development

that had been propounded by Adler in his *Methode der Musikgeschichte* (1919) and reached our shores via the émigrés and their students. He concluded that the resulting method of style analysis, the centerpiece of our work, had yielded a music history that focused on causality and fetishized style periods, creating an intellectually unsustainable basis for the evaluation of the individual works that made up our musical heritage.

There seemed to be no takers. Musicology passed through the social turbulence of the late 1960s and early 1970s, and the concurrent leftward shift of the humanities in the academy, largely untouched. It was no accident that rock criticism entered the academy through Departments of English, not Music. Rock, the antithesis of our music and of everything we stood for, was best ignored.[40] The old German academic model separating humane scholarship from the political and social issues of the day seemed to hold.

In fact that model was cracking, and the cracks now made their way to the surface with increasing frequency and intensity. The study of paper and rastrology at the patient hands of Alan Tyson and others undermined Guido Adler's style-history postulate, and with it, incidentally, the certainties of Alfred Einstein's Mozart chronology in his 1937 edition of the Köchel catalog (Köchel [1862] 1937).[41] We should have recognized the vulnerability of the style-history model in any case when, despite decades-long work of an army of dutiful scholars, our efforts to attribute hundreds of anonymous Renaissance compositions foundered except where sources and stories came to our rescue.

Two acts of individual courage would alter the American musicological landscape decisively in 1976: Rose Subotnik forced Theodor Adorno on us in the first of a series of studies that would shake the temple of empirical musicology (Subotnik 1976), and Philip Brett challenged us to recognize the homosexual culture in our midst in his outing of Benjamin Britten, *Peter Grimes,* and himself.[42] (Both initiatives would create such thriving industries that by the time Subotnik published *Developing Variations* in 1991 and Brett published *Queering the Pitch* three years later, the old controversies had become new orthodoxies (Subotnik 1991; Brett, Thomas, and Wood 1994). 1977 brought *19th-Century Music,* a breath of fresh air inspired by Kerman's determination to provide a forum for humane criticism of music as aesthetic experience, and, incidentally, a rare American home for stylish English prose in the field. Elegantly edited, it became a route for some musicologists who had teethed on earlier music to discover the scholarly challenges of the nineteenth century.[43] More significantly, it became a forum for others, most of them from the rising generation, to write about music with newfound freedom and a personal voice, and to introduce other disciplines and modes of inquiry to American music scholarship.

Perhaps most decisively in the later 1970s, Stanley Sadie pushed forward a new generation of scholars to help him compile *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (Sadie 1980), and Don Randel did likewise for his *New Harvard Dictionary of Music* (1986). Both reference works were fresh in every respect; both relegated their respective predecessors to the archives. Our ties to a declining Europe and her culture were now facing a maturing and questioning scholarship. Still, those ties could do real damage, if only briefly. They did, in two cases that I want to examine.

The first was the publication in 1979 of an English translation, newly edited, by Ernst Oster of Heinrich Schenker's *Der Freie Satz,* with the ostensible intention of presenting a faithful version of Schenker's text (Schenker [1935] 1979). The scholarly apparatus was thorough, the tone devout. After all, Schenker had developed a mode of analysis that had spread throughout the English-speaking world, largely through the energetic work of his student Felix Salzer and the American Saul Novack (who had brought Salzer to Queens College in 1963), and was now coming to dominate the teaching of theory at American universities; and *Der Freie Satz* was "his culminating statement."[44] So significant was the undertaking that it was given the imprimatur of the AMS, the only theoretical treatise thus honored.

There is one decidedly odd feature about the edition. The text takes up 147 pages; material that absorbs about five of those pages has been removed from the body of the text, separated from it by three appendices, and reinserted as "Appendix 4: Omissions from the Original German Edition." Why did Oster not reinstate the omitted passages to the places where Schenker had written them? If his intention was to restore the text, why not restore it as Schenker wrote it, rather than create an abridged version with the deleted material hidden at the end?

The answer to that question begins with the original 1935 edition, published shortly after Schenker's death in Vienna that year and seen to press without his authority (Schenker 1935). In 1956, his disciple Oswald Jonas, then on the faculty at Roosevelt University in Chicago, produced a second German edition (Schenker [1935] 1956). In the intervening twenty-one years Germany had devastated Europe, discredited its own culture, and left the continent a battleground contested by Soviet Russia and Jonas's adopted America. Jonas, responding to a world Schenker could not have imagined and attempting to salvage Schenker's theory for that new world, deleted several portions of the original text that were now seen as ideologically sensitive.

Twenty-three years later, with Schenker's influence ascendant, Oster produced an English translation. He based his text on Jonas's 1956 edition. While reinstating "a few short passages" of an undisclosed nature from

the 1935 edition, he retained other deletions of Jonas's, neither few nor short, from Schenker's introduction and the first chapter on the grounds that they "have no bearing on the musical content of the work." He noted parenthetically:

> The introduction and first chapter in the original edition give the impression of being a collection of more or less unrelated remarks and aphorisms; it is impossible to determine whether this material was given its final, published form by Schenker himself or by an editor. (Schenker [1935] 1979:xiii)

It was a slippery procedure. Having acknowledged his discomfort with those "unrelated remarks and aphorisms," Oster could remove them in good conscience by attributing them possibly to an unidentified editor and thus bringing their authority into question. But the tactic was groundless, for Schenker had larded his introduction and first chapter with so many statements having "no bearing on the musical content of the work" that Oster had to allow several to stand. Here is one example:

> Every organic being yearns for another organic being. And art, which is organic, drives toward the organic human soul. However, in these times when man himself destroys his organic nature, how is he to respond to organically developed art? ([1935] 1979:xxiv)

Oster went further than Jonas had, in fact, by removing items from Schenker's introduction and first chapter that Jonas had missed, explaining: "I felt it best to omit several additional passages of a very general, sometimes semi-philosophical nature here; these omissions are not expressly indicated" ([1935] 1979:xiii).

In an ironic recurrence of the fate that had befallen his teacher, Oster died before the first stages of publication, and unnamed friends and colleagues assumed the "many authorial responsibilities" required to complete the project. The editor of the Longman Music Series in which *Free Composition* was published, Gerald Warfield, noted in the "Series Editor's Acknowledgment" that, "for the sake of comprehensiveness it was decided to provide these [deleted] passages in an appendix. John Rothgeb translated the deleted passages which appear in Appendix 4" ([1935] 1979:x).

Although Rothgeb and Gail Rehman made several other contributions to the project, neither seems to have had final authority over it, and Warfield's use of the passive voice—"it was decided"— masked responsibility for the decision to reinstate the deleted material and relegate it to an appendix. We are left to imagine that the decision was Warfield's. But imagine is all. For

when the subject comes up again a few pages later in a footnote entered anonymously into Oster's Preface, we read only that, "all deletions have, in fact, been reinstated in Appendix 4. For an explanation, see 'Series Editor's Acknowledgment,' p. vii [*sic*]" ([1935] 1979:xiii).

As we have seen, the explanation does not explain, and we still do not know who authorized their reinstatement; note the second use of the passive voice—"all deletions have been reinstated"—that allows all avoidance of attribution.

What was Oster protecting? And what bothered his anonymous friends and colleagues, who, while they had the integrity to retrieve Schenker's material in a form that allows us to reconstruct the original text, lacked the courage to reconstruct it themselves? The answer lies in Schenker's reputation in 1970s America. His theory, like all German music scholarship, had taken root in an American intellectual environment that was so profoundly anti-ideological that Subotnik had to defend her very use of the word "ideology" in a paper read at the national meeting of our society in 1981, two years after the publication of *Free Composition.*[45] Neither as word nor as concept did ideology wash with our teachers, who associated it with a Marxist world movement that threatened America's and the free world's ideals, values, and freedoms. But they knew that an ideology underlay the entire construct of German culture in the nineteenth century, for they had grown up with it. At the height of the cold war, however, with hostile armies facing each other across the wall that had once been Germany, Schenker could not stand as the articulate voice of German musical superiority; he could stand only as the spokesman of great music irrespective of its national, especially German, underpinnings.

Jonas in 1956 had had to strip Schenker's theory of its ideological foundation so that it could claim universality and be applied to all music, even that which lay outside the German tradition; for Jonas's successors twenty-three years later, time had stood still. The problem was that the Schenker stripped of his "collection of more or less unrelated remarks and aphorisms" could not remain authentically Schenker. His thought, his cultural suppositions, his musical identity were German to the core. His program was no different in that respect from Schoenberg's: just as the composer's invention of serial music would, he asserted, assure the supremacy of German music for the next century, the theorist's discovery of the organic connection of materials would assure survival of German music of the century past.

But such a dream was anathema to an America asserting its leadership of the West, and to the intellectuals who manned its academies. What Warfield and his colleagues did to Schenker was no less in keeping with

their American ideology than what Schenker had done in keeping with his German ideology. With the support of the AMS, they turned his text into a document usable in America, free of ideology, free of national feeling, free of all that might corrupt the investigation of music co-opted from the German people to become the inheritance of us all.

In 1980, one year after *Der Freie Satz*, came *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians.* Stanley Sadie's encyclopedia, given its ambition and declared mission, was the first postwar English-language publication that had to deal with twentieth-century German history up through the postwar era. That history included the 1930s and 1940s. The *New Grove* declined to do so. Instead, it tripped so lightly over the record of Nazi Germany and its rape of Europe that chunks of the history of European musical culture of that time were sanitized or, with the honorable exception of some entries on the captive eastern European cultures,[46] erased. Under "Germany, Art Music, 1918–45," the Nazi years that covered almost half the period were given one fifth of the entry.[47] In Berlin, "between 1933 and 1945 activities of progressive composers suffered from political suppression, but revived quickly after the war."[48] That is, in a city whose culture had been inextricably bound to its Jews, there was only a temporary hiatus of activity, after which the progressive composers responsible for that activity rapidly resumed their work. The entry declined to name those progressive composers, but few among them could have been Jews, for only a handful of those forced out wished to return (notably the Communists Paul Dessau and Hanns Eisler), and none of those who were murdered were able to do so. About Jews, non-progressive composers, or any musicians other than composers, for that matter, there was not a word. Nor was there any recognition that the German musical culture as it had existed before 1933 died or fled with them. The entry for "Musicology: National Traditions—Germany and Austria," attributed "the deterioration of musicological scholarship" to the military collapse of Germany and the expulsion of its Jewish musicologists, neglecting to note the corruption of the field and many of its practitioners long before the war had begun.[49] Among entries on individuals, we could read of Herbert von Karajan's party membership (parenthetically),[50] Hans Joachim Moser's role as director of the Reichsstelle für Musik-Bearbeitungen from 1940 to 1945,[51] and Elly Ney's role in having "played many times for war causes;"[52] but on Wolfgang Boetticher, Karl Böhm, Clemens Krauss, Joseph Müller-Blattau, Erich Schenk, Erich Valentin, and others, there was silence.[53]

The treatment of occupied and Vichy France was hardly better. The entry on France was silent.[54] The entry on Paris had nothing under "1914–45," although the section on "After World War II" opens with

> Musical life was inevitably affected by the German occupation (1940–45); significantly, the main new stage productions were of *Palestrina* at the Opéra (1942) and of *Ariadne auf Naxos* at the Opéra-Comique (1943). Teaching, however, was relatively undisturbed, and it was at this time that Boulez came under the tutelage of Messiaen at the Conservatoire, after the latter's release from a prisoner-of-war camp.[55]

The mixed record of the *New Grove Dictionary* in its coverage of a decisive period in the recent history of our musical and musicological culture betrayed the limits of our trustworthiness as historians when we were dealing with our own history, and suggested the depth of our implication in, and loyalty to, the German culture that did so much to shape our profession. Twenty years after the *New Grove Dictionary* was published, in an address to the annual meeting of the Music Library Association in Louisville in February of 2000, Sadie acknowledged his encyclopedia's retreat from the truth. "The recent reexamination of the Nazi era and the consequences of Nazi policies on music, musical life, and musicology" had forced a change in Grove's policy:

> In the 1970s, this was a topic on which most people felt it was best to keep silent so as not to reopen ugly old wounds. But the temper of the times has changed now that more dust has settled, and the history of those years has been considered more closely... It is clearly part of our responsibility to record candidly the roles different people played in the musical life of that era as composers, performers, and scholars, and the distortion of Nazi musicology. (Sadie 2000:18)

"Closely" is not quite the correct adverb. "Critically" is. If candor was our responsibility in 2000, it was our responsibility in 1980. The "ugly old wounds" remain ugly and old. Dust doesn't settle in scholarship, and "the temper of the times" does not change out of nowhere. What transpired during those two decades was the death of almost all the remaining perpetrators and beneficiaries of Nazi German policies and politics. There was something cheap about searching our conscience only when doing so no longer stepped on the toes of survivors. As the few honorable entries in the *New Grove Dictionary* of 1980 demonstrated, it was possible to acknowledge the historical record then; it was simply not convenient to do so.

None of the questions posed by the Schenker edition or the *New Grove Dictionary* entries underwent examination. In 1984 an expanding AMS celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in balloons of nostalgia and self-congratulation, and with a valuable essay by Richard Crawford on the history of the Society (Crawford 1984). After that stock-taking, the momentum

with which the past was peeling away gathered steam. The annual meeting of the Society in Vancouver in 1985 held a session on "Fact and Value in Contemporary Musical Scholarship" and admitted American popular music, jazz, and scat-singing as subjects. More significantly, 1985 saw publication of Kerman's *Contemplating Music,* a history both magisterial and personal of Anglophone musical scholarship since the end of World War II that, like his article in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* twenty years earlier (Kerman 1965), breathed freely, took risks, and, predictably, sparked a wealth of responses. Whereas in 1965 he had exhorted, now he reviewed with some satisfaction the progress of his dream of a critical musicology. Once again he received an impassioned response from a distinguished scholar of medieval and Renaissance music, this time from Margaret Bent, who defended empirical scholarship, source criticism, and the production of editions, and deplored the movement away from "the older repertories . . . where we have most to learn, and where critical engagement, both for establishing musical texts and for their aesthetic and contextual evaluation, are [*sic*] most urgent" (Bent 1986:88). However eloquent her argument and pointed her use of Kerman's language to rebut his ideas, the position Bent defended was fraying. But if the old order was passing, Kerman, who seemed to have read and absorbed everything worth reading in the field, could not articulate the direction the new order might take. All he could do was assert that "musicology, the stateliest of our means for construing music, is on the move" (Kerman 1985:229). An old ideology, like the old generation, was giving way to a new one.

The direction of the field became clear soon enough at the New Orleans meeting in 1987, where new disciplines, subjects, and languages broke through in earnest in session after session. At "Music in Social Contexts," Pamela Potter (1987) brought up the forbidden subject of the Third Reich with a paper on the Nazi takeover of the Berlin Philharmonic, and Alan Lessem (1987) examined the relationship between émigré composers and their American students. At "Musicology and its Canons," an introductory statement asserted that musicology is "a field that imposes order upon, or controls, the reception of music, writings about music, or even those cultural phenomena we consider to be music" (Bergeron and Bohlman 1987:17). It was the call to arms of a new generation, and Don Randel's paper, "The Canons in the Musicological Toolkit," fleshed it out: our studies of notation, the genres and forms we privileged, our bibliographies, and our historical and analytical models together allowed us to undertake "certain kinds of work on certain kinds of subjects" and to dismiss other kinds of work and subjects (Randel 1987:18). At "Philosophy, Literary Theory, and Music," Kofi Agawu (1987) proposed a use for semiotics in the field, Richard Justin

(1987) suggested one for phenomenology, and Thomas Whelan, invoking Michel Foucault and Hans-Georg Gadamer among others, urged that we regard the author's intention "as something whose relevance is contingent on the nature of a given historical or analytical inquiry" (1987). At "Deconstruction and Music," Subotnik and Carolyn Abbate showed us how we might apply the work of French poststructuralists to music (Subotnik 1987; Abbate 1987).[56] It was in 1987 as well that Susan McClary pried open musicology to feminist theory with two articles, one on Bach in a collection of essays that was to become a signature work of the new musicology (McClary 1987a),[57] the other on an little-known composer in an obscure journal (McClary 1987b).[58]

The two annual meetings that followed were quieter affairs than New Orleans, breathers perhaps, but there was no turning back. The Baltimore meeting in 1988 included a panel on "The Implications of Feminist Scholarship for Teaching," a session on "Feminist Scholarship and the Field of Musicology," and a joint session with the Society for Music Theory on "Text and Narrative," with papers on "metaphor and metonymy, intertext and narrative, and story and discourse."[59] The Austin meeting in 1989 put film music on the table, exposed us to Potter's work on the corruption of German musicology in the 1930s, and confirmed that feminist and gay identity politics, language, and subject matter were entering the musicological mainstream. It was at a session in Austin that seeds were sown for a conference devoted to gender and feminist theory, which came to fruition a year and a half later in an exuberant four-day gathering at the University of Minnesota.[60]

Austin was held in the shadow of the collapse of communist hegemony over central and eastern Europe, and on the eve of the reunification of the German state. The cold war was all but over, and with it the culture it had spawned in America over four decades. Many walls besides the notorious one in Berlin were collapsing, among them the walls behind which a secure and coherent American musicology had flourished. The old rules were coming up for grabs. When Colin Slim published his final Presidential Message in the *AMS Newsletter* in the summer of 1990, he looked back on the changes he had seen and looked forward warily to where they might lead:

> Because no viable society . . . can afford stasis lest it quickly become obsolete, ours, too, will undoubtedly experience changes over the coming years. Yet, its aims will surely continue to reflect those which it found so adroitly formulated, now over a half century ago. While remaining ever sensitive to present human needs and aspirations, we need to resist the blandishments of passing and fashionable "isms" and to reaffirm the purpose of our Society: "the advancement of research in the various fields of music as a branch of learning and scholarship." (Slim 1990:3)

Later that year, Slim would watch musical research advance, but not only as the branch of the learning and scholarship his own work represented. Instead, the Oakland meeting in 1990 produced, along with a rich menu of traditional papers, a blizzard of sessions on "Gender Roles and Ambiguity," "Gender Studies," "Representations of Women," "Composers and Sexuality," "Jazz Studies," "Theory as Text," "Music and Politics," "Music and Power Relations," "Music as Construct of Identity," "Reception Theory," "Narrative and Trope," "Jazz Scholarship Institutionalization," and a two-hour session called "Anatomy of a Song: An Exercise in Critical Analysis," in which the anatomized song was a rap song.[61] Topics embraced homosocial desire, gay discourse, subversion of gender boundaries, misogyny and homophobia, sexual ambivalence and ambiguity, the admission of jazz into the scholarly temple, strategies of capitulation and resistance, feminist deconstruction, gender coding, and Handel's sexuality. Lawrence Kramer, who published his influential *Music as Cultural Practice, 1800–1900* that year (Kramer 1990), read two papers, one with the titillating title "*Carnaval*, Cross-Dressing, and Women in the Mirror," the other with a question that was its own answer, "Hermeneutics and Musical Analysis: Can They Mix?" What some called "critical musicology" and others the "new musicology" invigorated the meeting with its energetic search for meanings and values. Had our émigrés returned to life and come to Oakland, they would have found plenty of sessions on their subjects as well, among them Byzantine and Neo-Byzantine Chant, Iconography, and Renaissance Secular Music. But these had to share the stage now, and the meeting will not be remembered for them.

At Oakland, the new musicology's brief flirtation with the insights and positions of poststructuralism, which had been seen most clearly at the New Orleans meeting, gave way to an embrace of postmodernism, with its ideological critiques, its recontextualizing of the past, its radical relativism and concomitant rejection of the notion of excellence (now seen as a tool to maintain the status quo) in favor of authenticity and diversity (honored as subversive of existing gender- and race-based power structures). A new generation of scholars was changing the way we thought about music and its contexts, the language in which we wrote about them, the issues we chose to examine, and the politics we brought to those issues. Kerman, ever sensitive to the state of the field, wrote a shrewd and generous essay accounting for the "classic paradigm shift" that took place after the publication of *Contemplating Music,* and concluded, "The 1990s look like exciting, rocky times for American musicology" (Kerman 1991:144). He could not have been more on target.

What New Orleans foreshadowed and Oakland witnessed was our splintering as a scholarly society into a series of communities, constituen-

cies, and ideologies. The faults cut every which way, fitting for a meeting that took place over a major geological fault: generational and incontestably Oedipal, socio-political, sexual-political, gender-political. Soon enough the issues would start playing themselves out in contests for control of the field in several arenas. Within the AMS the prizes were the Board of Directors and the bodies that reported to it: the Program Committee of the annual meeting, the Prize Committees, and the editorship of *JAMS* and the *Newsletter*. Beyond the Society they were other music journals, University Presses, conferences, and our universities and colleges with faculty, doctoral programs and their fellowships. Together these constituted the Establishment of our discipline, and that Establishment would conduct itself with remarkable openness to both the new musicology (or musicologies) and the older one (or ones). There would be no muzzling of voices.

The one social issue barely touched on was race, which remained marginal to the interests of the almost uniformly white membership of the Society. What little discussion focused on it was trumped by gender- and sexuality-based argument, as it was through much of the American academy. One ethnomusicologist, Philip Bohlman, published an article in response to the black riots ("insurrection" was his word) in Los Angeles following the Rodney King incident in the Spring of 1992, in which he asserted that musicology was not only in crisis, but also in a "profound moral panic" as it fought "to fend off feminist theory (and feminists)," reject McClary's insights, orientalize music in Islam, and ignore the blues and rap (Bohlman 1993). Musicology, he insisted, "is a political act." The refusal of musicology to confront music "physically and politically" or to include "the musics of women, people of color, the disenfranchised, or Others we simply do not see and hear" had created the crisis. To ignore that crisis, he concluded, was "a supreme form of the irresponsibility of scholarship, the dire consequences of which in the late twentieth century are no longer avoidable" (1993:436).[62] Bohlman's reinscribing of the binary opposition between Us and Them was itself a political act, a Manichean vision of the field positing a progressive musicology against its Other, the misogynistic, racist musicology he saw around him. He was not alone in holding to such a vision.

The liberating winds of the 1980s exacted a toll on what had once been a tight albeit exclusionary community of scholars. Hostilities between an assertive left and a defensive right—and we can no more deny our post-colonial politics than we can deny the cold war politics of our teachers and our teachers' teachers—occasionally broke out in professional meetings and journals, squeezing a bemused, shifting, accommodating center. Readings on the right conjured up a secure musicological world that was shrinking with every passing year and could no longer engage the interests of the

cream of a rising generation. Readings on the left privileged the subjective over the empirical, the interpretation over the document, and authenticity over authority, treating scores as gateways rather than as ends, even if the gateways occasionally opened back onto the authors rather than onto the objects of their ostensible gaze. Critical musicologists, Subotnik has observed, were read more for how they wrote than for what they wrote about. In that postmodernist sea change, with its pre-emption of a foundationalist view of knowledge by an aesthetic view, she saw the danger of an eventual "end of scholarship and the university as arenas that privilege knowledge" (Subotnik 2003:25).[63] But many committed young scholars did not see a danger. The sources of postmodernism, like those of the ideological stance of our early postwar predecessors, seemed to be going largely unquestioned. What was unmistakably different between 1950 and 2000, though, was that an orthodoxy was no longer possible, and that the vast majority of scholars embraced the new diversity of ideas and discourses. In any case, the divisions in the AMS mirrored those in the larger humanist enterprise in the American academy at the end of the twentieth century. And even had those divisions not been present, the extraordinary growth in our Society's membership would have eventually exacted a toll. The earlier coherence and sense of community became unsustainable when we started counting ourselves in the thousands.

If American musicology had become contested ground, it was also open, free-wheeling, exhilarating, and engaged with its fellow humanities in the academy. It had changed beyond recognition in the discourses it voiced, the language it voiced them in, the values it articulated, the cultural criticism it undertook, and the place it granted to the personal in our professional lives. It produced a new library rich in readings of all stripes on all imaginable subjects. In 1995, Kerman surveyed the field once again with characteristic insight and optimism, and ultimately, considering what he called his "track record as a prophet," declined to predict where the field might be headed (Kerman 1996). He need not have been so modest. In that same year, his younger colleague at Berkeley, Richard Taruskin, would publish *Text and Act* (1995), a collection of essays that turned the debate about authenticity in musical performance inside out and liberated performance practice in the music of composers from Josquin to Stravinsky. Four more books by Taruskin, dazzling in their erudition, independence, and audacity, were to appear within the decade (1993, 1996, 1997, 2005). The most recent of his grand projects, the enormous *Oxford History of Western Music* (2005), acknowledges its debt to the humane *Geistesgeschichte* of his teacher Paul Henry Lang and to the model of Lang's *Music in Western Civilization* ([1941] 1997). As I write this essay, the reviews have not yet begun to appear in our

scholarly journals. Their response to Taruskin's sweeping account of our priceless legacy will reveal much about the health and direction of current musicology, and about the tolerance of its various wings for each other's discourses. New wine in an old bottle, the *Oxford History* is unthinkable without the work of every musicological generation, from the émigré tide that brought European musicology to America's shores seventy years ago to our own.

That tide has finally washed away, leaving few traces. The last obituaries of émigré scholars recall them from a distance. They speak of a society of "founding fathers . . . who established musicology as a discipline in this country" (H. Brown 1986:6), "nurtured our field in its infancy" (Kellman 1984:3), and "alter[ed] the character and course of American musicology" (M. Brown 1988:14). Their elegiac tone is perhaps best captured in Robert Freeman's words on Karl Geiringer in 1989:

> He was one of the last surviving members of that legendary wave of central European scholars who, driven from their continent to ours in the 1930s, were to exert such a powerful influence on American musicology and culture as a whole (Freeman 1989:15).

We owe our predecessors the full story of their lives among us, while they were here and after their departure from this earth. If we are to understand how we came to be who we came to be as a professional community, we owe ourselves their full story as well.

Notes

I am delighted to acknowledge my old friend from Columbia days, Neal Zaslaw, who invited me to read the original version of this essay at Cornell, and Susan McClary, who invited me to read a revised version at UCLA. I am grateful to Stephen Hinton, Kim Kowalke, Richard Kramer, Pamela Potter, Michael Steinberg, and Bonnie Wade for their warm encouragement and helpful suggestions. I must single out three colleagues whose probing questions and criticisms enriched this essay time and again: Karol Berger, Joseph Kerman, and especially Rose Rosengard Subotnik, for more than forty years my beloved friend, patient mentor, and peerless colleague.

1. Like his mentor Gustav Jacobsthal, the first German professor of musicology, Ludwig was a medievalist whose goal of editing medieval theorists and repertories had a profound impact on the direction German musicology was to take in the early twentieth century. See Haines (2003).

2. A recent study of Riemann's contribution to musicology is Rehding (2003).

3. For the early years of American musicology, see Crawford (1984).

4. The Wolfenbüttel Codex, deposited in the Herzog August Bibliothek in that city and known to my generation of musicology students as W1, contains the earliest extant version of the Notre Dame repertory of organa, conductus, and other troped pieces from the Mass

repertory in the 1230s; the Bamberg Codex has over a hundred thirteenth-century motets and other liturgical fragments.

5. Friedrich Ludwig, *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili.* At his death in 1930, Ludwig had published only Volume I, *Catalogue Raisonné der Quellen, Part 1: Handschriften in Quadrat-Notation* (1910). Volume I, Part 2, *Handschriften in Mensural-Notation,* and Volume II, Part I, *Musikalisches Anfangs-Verzeichnis der nach Tenores geordneten Repertorium,* were published as *Summa Musicae Medii Aevi,* Volumes 7 (Ludwig 1961) and 8 (Ludwig 1962), just in time to torment an innocent entering graduate class in 1963. David Hiley, author of the entry on Ludwig in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians,* calls Ludwig's work on thirteenth-century sources of polyphony "perhaps the most important achievement made by one man in the study of medieval music," and the *Repertorium* "an indispensable textbook, research tool and guide to analytical technique" (see *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (1980), s.v. "Ludwig, Friedrich" by David Hiley). No doubt. But to a twenty-one-year old entering graduate school when Kennedy was president, the mandatory year of medieval paleography was a wall to be scaled for no reason that I could discern. The wall would fall, though not soon enough for my generation.

6. My enlightenment about the paleography requirement and much else in my graduate education came from Joseph Kerman in the chapter "Musicology and Positivism: the Postwar Years" (1985:37–49). "Dropping the notation course from the required list," I read with special pleasure, "was a first step in the liberation of musicology" (1985:46). He added "some of us felt" before the main clause, but that was surely an unnecessary caution.

7. The other four immigrants among the founders were Jean Beck, Carl Engel, Joseph Schillinger, and Joseph Yasser.

8. Hornbostel had spent time in the United States in 1906 recording the music of the Pawnee people in the Midwest and of black school children in Virginia; Leichtentritt had earned the BA at Harvard in 1904.

9. Hornbostel's appointment was reported in "10 Named to Staff of Exiles' College," *New York Times,* September 2, 1933, 13; his arrival on September 13 on the French liner Champlain with his wife and son was reported in "3 Professors Here for Exile College," *New York Times,* September 14, 1933, 10.

10. Cowell had stayed with Hornbostel while studying in Berlin in 1930–31.

11. See the anonymous article "To Teach Music at Harvard," *New York Times,* September 26, 1933, 22.

12. Following his retirement from Carnegie Mellon in 1975, Dorian (born Friedrich Deutsch) spent two years at the Curtis Institute of Music in Philadelphia and one year at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He also taught at the Marlboro Music School in Vermont during the summers of 1973–77.

13. Pisk's father, a lawyer, drew up the statutes of the Society. See Smith (1986:82).

14. Pisk wrote his dissertation on Jacobus Handl's Masses under Adler at Vienna University, edited six of them for the *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich,* and wrote the chapter on modern German composers for Adler (1924).

15. On Engel's advice, Pisk turned down offers from Kansas State College at Fort Hays and the University of Saskatchewan ("Ten months winter, you will freeze to death") before accepting the offer from Redlands where he moved after spending the summer of 1937 as music director at a summer camp in upstate New York. He found Redlands "primitive" and later regretted that he had "stayed too long there."

16. See the Festschrift on the occasion of Pisk's seventieth birthday (Glowacki 1966).

17. See Farrar (1966). He served the AMS only once, as a Member-at-Large in 1955.

18. The quotations of Pisk come from a series of taped interviews Pisk gave to Clare Rayner and William Weber in Hollywood in 1975–77. See Rayner and Weber (1975–77) under *Interviews* in the *References* section.

19. After two years of graduate study, he left Berlin for Zurich, but after earning his PhD in 1934 he returned to his native Düsseldorf to review concerts of the local chapter of the Jüdische Kulturbund for the Jewish weekly there. Unable to earn a living, he left Germany a second time, now for Florence, where he eked out an existence as correspondent for the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and the Berlin *Jüdische Rundschau*. After the Italian invasion of Abyssinia in 1935 he returned to Germany yet again, but passage of the Nuremberg Laws forced him to finally set his sights on America.

20. For a biographical outline and bibliography of Herz's work, see his Festschrift (Weaver 1981:1–7).

21. See Schwarz ([1972] 1983; 1983). A year after his death a Festschrift was published in his honor (M. Brown 1984).

22. David's 1938 catalogue was reprinted by the American Musicological Society (David [1938] 1970). For David's articles on the Moravian community, see *New Grove* (1980), s.v. "David, Hans" (by Athur Mendel).

23. See Nathan (1962) and Billings (1961; 1977). Also setting Nathan apart from his peers was a project in which he collected hundreds of postcards with texts and melodies of Zionist songs, had them arranged with piano accompaniment by Jewish composers in America (many of them fellow émigrés), and published them as the series, "Folk Songs of the New Palestine." They were later reprinted (Nathan 1994).

24. Sachs wrote the "Hornbostel" entry in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. See *MGG* (1966), s.v. "Hornbostel" (by Curt Sachs).

25. Geiringer recalled that Hornbostel's classes at the University of Berlin "were so popular that one had to arrive very early to secure a seat," and declared him "my real inspiration and the greatest influence on my further intellectual development" (Geiringer 1993:36–37).

26. See "Gets N.Y.U. Music Post; Dr. Curt Sachs Is Appointed to a Visiting Professorship." *New York Times*, June 27, 1937, sec. 2, 5.

27. The other 1937 arrival whose name would figure significantly in American musicology was Reinhard Pauly, then sixteen years of age.

28. See "Haydn Symphonies in Rehearsal Here; Dr. Alfred Einstein Brings Five Works Never Yet Heard in This Country; Fritz Stiedry to Direct Orchestra of New Friends of Music to Play Scores at Sunday Concert Series." *New York Times*, February 4, 1939, sec. 11, 4.

29. In an article in the *New York Times* of September 8, 1940, David Ewen introduced readers to nine émigrés who, he asserted, would guide the development of a generation of American musicologists (Ewen 1940). Whatever their mother tongue, they were beginning to write in English, and through their work, he predicted correctly, English would become "the favored tongue of musicology." For these and other reports in the *Times* regarding the émigré musicians, see Josephson (1999).

30. Those giving papers were Bukofzer, Ferand, Gombosi, Hertzmann, Meyer-Baer, Sachs, and Schrade. See Crawford (1984:15).

31. As Kerman has noted, the only two exceptions to the dominance of the European diaspora at the major universities were Gustave Reese at New York University and Oliver Strunk at Princeton (Kerman 1985:26).

32. The impact of the *Historical Anthology of Music* cannot be overstated, for it established the repertory of music before the eighteenth century for American musicians and music scholars, from Stravinsky to the undergraduate music major, for years to come.

33. The émigré composer Ernst Toch's *The Shaping Forces in Music* (1948), a fascinating work of musical scholarship, is excluded from this essay only because Toch was a composer, not a music historian.

34. The three volumes Ambros finished were published in Leipzig in 1862, 1864, and 1868. All three were published in revised editions later in the century, and the whole was reprinted in 1968 (Ambros [1862, 1864, 1868] 1968). For a brief history of the two volumes added following his death in 1876, see Slonimsky (1992:33).

35. The relationship between the Bücken *Handbuch* and the Norton series is seen directly in Sachs's *Rise of Music in the Ancient World, East and West*, for its original German-language version, "Musik der Antike," was one of the thirteen volumes in the *Handbuch*.

36. Hans Tischler, a forced émigré, was another of his students.

37. Bach's music, Taruskin reminded us, "cannot be prettified in performance without essential loss. For with Bach–the essential Bach–there is no 'music itself.' His concept of music derived from and inevitably contained The Word, and the word was Luther's" ([1991] 1995:310). Philip Spitta, in the Preface to the English edition of his 1880 Bach biography, identified Bach as "a man who forms, as it were, the focal point towards which all the music of Germany has tended during the last three centuries . . . The deeper and more ramified the roots by which he cluing to the soil of German life and nature, the wider was the extent of ground to be dug over in order to lay them bare." But this was a German Bach to be shared with the world. He ended his Preface, "I send [the English edition] forth with a sincere desire that it may contribute over an ever-widening circle to the knowledge and comprehension of one of the grandest spirits of any time or nation" ([1883–85] 1951:i, xiv).

38. From Lehrer (1965). Lehrer's text spells the name "Wernher von Braun."

39. Austin's coverage of jazz amounted to two chapters out of twenty-seven, or less than seven per cent of the text (36 pages out of 537).

40. I remember sitting in the music library in Dodge Hall on the Columbia campus on a warm spring day in 1968 during the student strike that had brought the University to its knees, trying in vain to study while a rock band made an unholy racket outside. Giving up, I left Dodge and made my way to the terrace of the student union where the band played. Someone told me that they were the Grateful Dead. I had never heard of them. Neither had most of my peers. Like our teachers, we were a conservative bunch.

41. Some idea of how lonely Tyson's work must have been at the beginning, and how radical was the change it effected, is seen by reading the following passage from Blume's paper "Musical Scholarship Today," given in the Inaugural Lectures Series of the PhD Program in Music at the City University of New York in 1968–69: "But questions of method should not be overrated. To edit old music is a necessity; *how* it is to be edited is a minor problem—a question of second rank . . . To inquire into the subsidiary details of the sources—the watermarks and the writing tools, the copyists and the handwritings—in order to restore the music to its precise shape is a useful objective, but it should not become an end in itself." (Blume 1972:27–28)

42. Brett gave his paper at the annual meeting of the AMS in Washington in November 1976. It was subsequently published (Brett 1977; 1983:180–89).

43. Thus, in the early years of its publication, we find James Haar (1979), Leo Treitler (1979), Anthony Newcomb (1981), and Joshua Rifkin (1982). The four men cited had entered the field as scholars of medieval and Renaissance music. "Crossover" articles by erstwhile medieval and Renaissance historians occasionally appeared in other journals, a significant one being Lockwood (1981). But while the subjects were new, the positivist nature of the work in these articles was not.

44. See *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (1980), s.v. "Schenker" (by Allen Forte).

45. Subotnik's paper on our ideology of non-ideology, read to a largely hostile audience at the annual meeting of the AMS in Boston in 1981, was published in revised form (Subotnik 1982) and reprinted (Subotnik 1991:87–97). In noting the conservative state of American historical musicology at the time, it helps to recall the fact that when Subotnik read a paper on "The Role of Ideology in the Study of Western Music" at the annual meeting of the Society for Ethnomusicology in Bloomington a year earlier, on November 20, 1980, she had received a far friendlier reception. A revised version of that paper was later published (Subotnik 1983) and reprinted (Subotnik 1991:3–14).

46. See, for instance, the relevant sections in the following entries in the 1980 edition of *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*: "Prague" (by J. Buzga and Adrienne Simpson), "Czechoslovakia, Art Music, Bohemia and Moravia, Since 1945" (by Oldrich Pukl), and "Warsaw, 1918–45, From 1945" (by Zofia Lissa and Elzbieta Gluszcz-Zwolinska). On the other hand, Boguslaw Schäffer was silent on German-occupied Poland. See "Poland, Art Music, Since 1850."

47. See *New Grove* (1980), s.vv. "German, Art Music, 1918–45 (by Josef Häusler).

48. The sentence remains intact in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians,* 2nd ed. (2001). See *New Grove* (2001), s.vv. "Berlin, Secular Music" (by Heinz Becker and Richard D. Green).

49. See *New Grove* (1980), s.vv. "Musicology: National Traditions—Germany and Austria" (by Vincent Duckles, et al.). Pamela Potter has provided a fresh entry for this section in the second edition of the *New Grove* that confronts the issues head on. See *New Grove* (2001), s.vv. "National Traditions of Musicology—Germany and Austria").

50. See *New Grove* (1980), s.v. "Karajan, Herbert von" (by Gerhard Brunner).

51. See *New Grove* (1980), s.v. "Moser, Hans Joachim" (by Anton Würz).

52. See *New Grove* (1980), s.v. "Ney, Elly" (by Ronald Kinloch Anderson).

53. See the following entries in the 1980 edition: "Boetticher, Wolfgang" (by Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht), "Böhm, Karl" (by Gerhard Brunner), "Krauss, Clemens" (by Ronald Crichton), "Müller-Blattau, Joseph" (by M. E. C. Bartlet), "Schenk, Erich" (by Rudolf Klein), and "Valentin, Erich" (by Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht). Potter has made good on *Grove*'s responsibility in trenchant new and revised entries in *New Grove*, second edition (2001) for "Boetticher, Wolfgang," "Moser, Hans Joachim," and "Schenk, Erich." The Valentin entry (by Eggebrecht), however, continues the cover-up, while the entry for Müller-Blattau has disappeared entirely.

54. See *New Grove* (1980), s.vv. "France, Art Music, After 1940" (by Martin Cooper).

55. See *New Grove* (1980), s.vv. "Paris, 1914–45" (anonymous author). In the second edition (2001), the entry on France remains silent ("France, Art Music After 1945" by François

Lesure), while that on "Paris, 1918–45" has gained a brief but useful paragraph on the subject (by Jann Pasler).

56. Revised and expanded. See Subotnik (1996) and Abbate (1991).

57. See especially 1987a:51–55. Another essay in the collection epitomizes much of the political tone of the volume, and of the political left in musicology at the time, in one lofty assertion: "The vast majority of music consumed in the Western world is concerned with articulating, in a variety of different ways, male hegemonic processes" (Shepherd 1987:171).

58. It was reprinted, absent the language in a passage on Beethoven's Ninth Symphony that had assured her notoriety. See chapter 5 of McClary (1991). The distance American musicology has traveled since 1987 can be gauged by comparing McClary's "Introduction" in the 1991 edition to her "New Introduction, *Feminine Endings* in Retrospect," in the 2002 reprint. Two other measures of where our field stands today are Robert Fink's essay on McClary's reading of the symphony (Fink 2004) and Rose Rosengard Subotnik's "Afterword" to the volume in which that essay appears (Subotnik 2004).

59. Those papers at the "Text and Narrative" session were David Schwarz, "A Study in Music Perception: Metaphor and Metonymy in the Piano Music of Chopin" (the printed abstract found it necessary to define both literary terms); Vera Micznik, "Intertext vs. Narrative in Mahler's Music"; and Fred Maus, "Story and Discourse in Music."

60. The conference, "Feminist Theory and Music: Toward a Common language," was held at the School of Music in Minneapolis on June 27–30, 1991. It included twenty-two sessions, two concerts, and a keynote speech by McClary.

61. The title of the session was originally to have been "Critical Musicology and Cultural Theory." The language at the session was peppered with such newly-borrowed nouns as essentialism, reductionism, reification, and discussivity. For all the titillation the anticipated song aroused, Queen Latifah's "Ladies First" turned out to be a sassy romp, its language clean, its mood affirmative. Although we also learned about the latest rage, West Coast gangsta rap, its squalid lyrics would not have sat well with the overwhelmingly white, liberal, middle-class, law-abiding, feminist audience that afternoon.

62. The reader learns in footnote 7 (1993:414–15) that Bohlman borrowed his definition of "crisis" as "a condition that requires a 'critical response'" from Brantlinger (1990); and his definition of "moral panic" as a crisis that arises when "a condition, episode, person or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests" from Cohen (1972), cited in Baker (1993).

63. Her analysis pertains to ethnomusicology as well. "Ethnomusicologists," she writes on the same page, "are already bending themselves into pretzels in order to deny that the cultures that they write about are an object of study for them. Without question, this heightened self-consciousness is needed as an antidote to Western arrogance and obtuseness. But if ethnomusicological studies become journals written by visiting friends—if books called *Music of the Rainforest* are entirely replaced by books called *My Rainforest Diary*—what need will a university serve that cannot be met by journalism?" (Subotnik 2003:25).

References

Abbate, Carolyn. 1987. What the Sorcerer Said. In *AMS/CBMR/CMS New Orleans '87, October 15–18, Abstracts.* 61–62.

———. 1991. What the Sorcerer Said. In *Unsung Voices: Opera and Musical Narrative in the Nineteenth Century,* 30–60. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Adler, Guido. 1885. Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft. *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 1: 5–20.

———. 1919. *Methode der Musikgeschichte.* Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.

———. 1924. *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte.* Frankfurt: Frankfurter Verlags-Anstalt.

Agawu, V. Kofi. 1987. Playing with Signs: Prolegomena to a Semiotics of Classic Music. In *AMS/CBMR/CMS New Orleans '87, October 15–18, Abstracts*: 34.

Ambros, August Wilhelm. [1862, 1864, 1868] 1968. *Geschichte der Musik*, 5 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Apel, Willi. 1936. Accidentals and the Modes in Fifteenth and Sixteenth Century Sources. Listed in *A Report on Publication and Research in Musicology and Allied Fields in the United States, 1932–1938*, 51. Washington, DC: The American Council of Learned Societies.

———. 1937. Early German Keyboard Music. *Musical Quarterly* 23: 210–37.

———. 1942. *The Notation of Polyphonic Music, 900–1600.* The Mediaeval Academy of America, Publication no. 38. Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America.

———. 1944. *The Harvard Dictionary of Music.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Apel, Willi and Archibald T. Davison. 1946. *The Historical Anthology of Music*, vol. 1, Oriental, Medieval and Renaissance Music. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 1950. *The Historical Anthology of Music*, vol. 2, Baroque, Rococo, and Pre-Classical Music. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Austin, William W. 1966. *Music in the 20th Century, from Debussy through Stravinsky.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Baker, Houston A. 1993. *Black Studies, Rap, and the Academy.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Bekker, Paul. 1936a. *The Story of the Orchestra.* New York: W. W. Norton.

———. 1936b. Liszt and His Critics. *Musical Quarterly* 22: 277–83.

Bent, Margaret. 1986. Fact and Value in Contemporary Scholarship. *Musical Times* 127: 85–88.

Bergeron, Katherine and Philip Bohlman. 1987. Introduction to the Session. In *AMS/CBMR/CMS New Orleans '87, October 15–18, Abstracts*: 17.

Billings, William. 1961. *The Continental Harmony,* edited by Hans Nathan. The John Harvard Library. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

———. 1977. *The Complete Works of William Billings,* vol. 2, *The Singing Master's Assistant* (1778), *Music in Miniature* (1779), edited by Hans Nathan. Boston: AMS & The Colonial Society of Massachusetts.

Blume, Friedrich. 1950. *Two Centuries of Bach, an Account of Changing Taste,* translated from the 1947 German edition by Stanley Godman. London and New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 1972. Musical Scholarship Today. In *Perspectives in Musicology: The Inaugural Lectures of the PhD Program in Music at the City University of New York*, edited by Barry S. Brook, Edward O. D. Downes and Sherman Van Solkema, 15–31. New York: W. W. Norton.

Bohlman, Philip V. 1993. Musicology as a Political Act. *Journal of Musicology* 11: 411–36.

Bologna, Jacopo da. 1954. *The Music of Jacopo da Bologna*, edited by Thomas Marrocco. University of California Publications in Music, vol. 5. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Brantlinger, Patrick. 1990. *Crusoe's Footprints: Cultural Studies in Britain and America.* New York and London: Routledge.

Brett, Philip. 1977. Britten and Grimes. *Musical Times* 118: 955–1000.

———. 1983. *Benjamin Britten: Peter Grimes.* Cambridge Opera Handbooks. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brett, Philip, Gary C. Thomas, and Elizabeth Wood, eds. 1994. *Queering the Pitch: The New Gay and Lesbian Musicology*. New York and London: Routledge.

Brook, Barry S., Edward O. D. Downes, and Sherman Van Solkema, eds. 1972. *Perspectives in Musicology: The Inaugural Lectures of the PhD Program in Music at the City University of New York*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Brown, Howard. 1986. Obituary of Edward Lowinsky. *AMS Newsletter* 16 (1): 2.

Brown, Malcolm Hambrick, ed. 1984. *Russian and Soviet Music: Essays for Boris Schwarz*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press.

———. 1988. Obituary of Willi Apel. *AMS Newsletter* 18 (2): 8.

Bücken, Ernst, ed. 1928–34. *Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft*, 13 vols. Wildpark-Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion.

Bukofzer, Manfred. 1947. *Music in the Baroque Era, From Monteverdi to Bach*. New York: W. W. Norton.

———. 1950. *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Music*. New York: W. W. Norton.

———. 1957. *The Place of Musicology in American Institutions of Higher Learning*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Chrysander, Friedrich. 1863, 1867. *Jahrbücher für musikalische Wissenschaft*.

Cohen, Stanley. 1972. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*. Sociology and the Modern World. London: MacGibbon and Kee.

Crawford, Richard. 1984. *The American Musicological Society, 1934–1984: An Anniversary Essay*. Philadelphia: AMS.

Crawford Seeger, Ruth. 1993. *Music for Small Orchestra (1926), Suite No. 2 for Four Strings and Piano (1929)*, edited by Judith Tick and Wayne Schneider. Music of the United States of America, vol. 1. Madison: A-R Editions.

D'Accone, Frank and Colin Slim. 1993. Obituary of Howard Brown. *American Musicological Society Newsletter* 23 (2): 9.

David, Hans T. 1937. Bach's "Musical Offering." *Musical Quarterly* 23: 314–22.

David, Hans T. and A. T. Rau. [1938] 1970. *A Catalog of Music by American Moravians, 1742–1842, from the Archives of the Moravian Church at Bethlehem, Pa*. New York: American Musicological Society Press.

Dorian, Frederick. 1942. *The History of Music in Performance: The Art of Musical Interpretation from the Renaissance to Our Day*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Einstein, Alfred. 1945. *Mozart: His Character, His Work*, translated by Arthur Mendel and Nathan Broder. New York and London: Oxford University Press.

———. 1947. *Music in the Romantic Era*. New York: W. W. Norton.

———. 1949. *The Italian Madrigal*, translated by Alexander H. Krappe, Roger H. Sessions and Oliver Strunk. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ewen, David. 1940. Musicologists in U.S.; Eminent Scholars of Europe Working and Writing in America Now. *New York Times* (September 8): 9.

Farrar, Lloyd Phillip. 1966. Bibliography of Paul Amadeus Pisk's Works. In *Paul A. Pisk, Essays in his Honor*, edited by John Glowacki, 279–94. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Fink, Robert. 2004. Beethoven Antihero: Sex, Violence, and the Aesthetics of Failure, or Listening to the Ninth Symphony as Postmodern Sublime. In *Beyond Structural Listening? Postmodern Modes of Hearing*, edited by Andrew Dell'Antonio, 109–53. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Freeman, Robert. 1989. Obituary of Karl Geiringer. *AMS Newsletter* 19 (2): 8.

Geiringer, Karl. 1947. *Brahms, His Life and Work*, translated by H. B. Weiner and Bernard Miall. New York and London: Oxford University Press.

Geiringer, Karl (with Bernice Geiringer). 1993. *This I Remember*. Santa Barbara, CA: Fithian Press.

Glowacki, John, ed. 1966. *Paul A. Pisk, Essays in his Honor.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Grout, Donald Jay. 1960. *A History of Western Music.* New York: W. W. Norton.

———. 1973. *A History of Western Music,* 2nd edition. New York: W. W. Norton.

———. 1980. *A History of Western Music,* 3rd edition. New York: W. W. Norton.

Grout, Donald Jay and Claude V. Palisca. 1988. *A History of Western Music,* 4th edition. New York: W. W. Norton.

Grout, Donald Jay, J. Peter Burkholder, and Claude V. Palisca. 2006. *A History of Western Music,* 7th edition. New York: W. W. Norton.

Haar, James. 1979. Berlioz and the "First Opera." *19th-Century Music* 3: 32–41.

Haines, John. 2003. Friedrich Ludwig's "Musicology of the Future": A Commentary and Translation. *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 12: 129–64.

Harrison, Frank L. 1963. American Musicology and the European Tradition. In *Musicology,* by Frank Harrison, Mantle Hood and Claude V. Palisca, 1–85. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Harrison, Frank L., Mantle Hood, and Claude V. Palisca. 1963. *Musicology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Haydon, Glen. 1941. *Introduction to Musicology: A Survey of the Fields, Systematic and Historical, of Musical Knowledge and Research.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

Hertzmann, Erich. 1958. Curt Sachs (1881–1959): A Memorial Address. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 11: 1–5.

Herz, Gerhard. 1938. Certain Aspects of the Bach Movement. *Musical Quarterly* 24: 501–11.

Hewitt, Helen. 1946. *Ottaviano Petrucci: Harmonice Musices Odhecaton A.* Mediaeval Academy of America, Publication no. 42. Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America.

Isaac, Heinrich. 1950. *Choralis Constantinus Book III, Transcribed from the Formschneider first edition (Nürnberg, 1555) by Louise Cuyler.* University of Michigan Publications, Fine Arts, vol. 2. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

———. 1956. *Five Polyphonic Masses by Heinrich Isaac, Transcribed from the Formschneider first edition (Nürnberg, 1555) by Louise Cuyler.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Josephson, David. 1999. The Exile of European Music: Documentation of Upheaval and Immigration in *The New York Times.* In *Driven into Paradise: The Musical Migration from Nazi Germany to the United States,* edited by Reinhold Brinkmann and Christoph Wolff, 92–152. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Justin, Richard. 1987. Time, Space, and Structure: An Essay on Phenomenological Analysis. In *AMS/CBMR/CMS New Orleans '87, October 15–18, Abstracts*: 35.

Kellman, Herbert. 1984. Obituary of Dragan Plamenac. *AMS Newsletter* 14 (1): 2.

Kerman, Joseph. 1965. Profile for American Musicology. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 18: 61–69.

———. 1985. *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 1991. American Musicology in the 1990s. *Journal of Musicology* 9: 131–44.

———. 1996. Musicology in Transition. *Irish Musical Studies* (The Maynooth International Musicological Conference 1995, Selected Proceedings: Part One) 4: 19–33.

Köchel, Ludwig Ritter von. [1862] 1937. *Chronologisch-thematisches Verzeichnis sämtlicher Tonwerke Wolfgang Amadé Mozarts,* edited by Alfred Einstein. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.

Kramer, Lawrence. 1990. *Music as Cultural Practice, 1800–1900.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Landini, Francesco. 1939. *The Works of Francesco Landini*, edited by Leonard Ellinwood. The Mediaeval Academy of America, Publication no. 36. Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America.

Lang, Paul Henry. 1941. *Music in Western Civilization.* New York: W. W. Norton.

———. 1945. Musical Scholarship at the Crossroads. *Musical Quarterly* 31: 371–80.

———. [1941] 1997. *Music in Western Civilization.* Foreword by Leon Botstein. New York: W. W. Norton.

Leichtentritt, Hugo. 1936. The Problem of Reconstruction in Monteverdi. Listed in *A Report on Publication and Research in Musicology and Allied Fields in the United States, 1932–1938*, 51. Washington, DC: The American Council of Learned Societies.

Lessem, Alan P. 1987. Teaching Americans Music: Viewpoints of the Émigré Composer, ca. 1935–1955. In *AMS/CBMR/CMS New Orleans '87, October 15–18, Abstracts*: 8–9.

Lockwood, Lewis. 1981. Beethoven's Earliest Sketches for the *Eroica* Symphony. *Musical Quarterly* 67: 457–77.

Lowinsky, Edward. 1946. *Secret Chromatic Art in the Netherlands Motet*, translated by Carl Buchman. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. 1965. Character and Purposes of American Musicology: A Reply to Joseph Kerman. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 18: 222–34.

Ludwig, Friedrich. 1910. *Catalogue Raisonné der Quellen, Handschriften in Quadrat-Notation.* Vol. I, Part 1 of *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili.* Halle: Niemayer.

———. 1961. *Summa Musicae Medii Aevi,* vol. 7, *Handschriften in Mensural-Notation*, edited by Friedrich Gennrich. Vol. I, Part 2 of *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili.* Langen bei Frankfurt.

———. 1962. *Summa Musicae Medii Aevi,* vol. 8, *Musikalisches Anfangs-Verzeichnis der nach Tenores geordneten Repertorium*, edited by Friedrich Gennrich. Vol. II, Part 1 of *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili.* Langen bei Frankfurt.

Marrocco, W. Thomas, ed. [1942] 1961. *Fourteenth Century Italian Cacce.* Mediaeval Academy of America, Publication no. 39. Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America.

McClary, Susan. 1987a. The Blasphemy of Talking Politics During Bach Year. In *Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception*, edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary, 13–62. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1987b. Getting Down Off the Beanstalk: The Presence of a Woman's Voice in Janika Vandervelde's *Genesis II. Minnesota Composers Forum Newsletter* (January). Reprinted in McClary (1991).

———. 1991. *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. [1991] 2002. *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality.* Reprint edition with new preface. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Nathan, Hans. 1962. *Dan Emmett and the Rise of Early Negro Minstrelsy.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Nathan, Hans, ed. 1994. *Israeli Folk Music: Songs of the Early Pioneers.* With a Foreword and Afterword by Philip V. Bohlman. Recent Researches in the Oral Traditions of Music, no. 4. Madison, WI: A-R Editions.

New York Times. 1933. 10 Named to Staff of Exiles' College. (September 2): 13.

———. 1933. 3 Professors Here for Exile College. (September 14): 10.

———. 1933. To Teach Music at Harvard. (September 26): 22.

———. 1937. Gets N.Y.U. Music Post; Dr. Curt Sachs Is Appointed to a Visiting Professorship. (June 27): sec. 2, 5.

———. 1939. Haydn Symphonies in Rehearsal Here; Dr. Alfred Einstein Brings Five Works Never Yet Heard in This Country; Fritz Stiedry to Direct Orchestra of New Friends of Music to Play Scores at Sunday Concert Series. (February 4): sec. 11, 4.

Newcomb, Anthony. 1981. The Birth of Music out of the Spirit of Drama. *19th-Century Music* 5: 38–66.

Palisca, Claude V. 1963. American Scholarship in Western Music. In *Musicology*, by Frank Harrison, Mantle Hood and Claude V. Palisca, 87–213. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Pisk, Paul A. 1938. Ernst Toch. *Musical Quarterly* 24: 438–50.

Pisk, Paul A. and Homer Ulrich. 1963. *A History of Music and Musical Style.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Potter, Pamela. 1987. The Nazi Seizure of the Berlin Philharmonic: A Reassessment. In *AMS/CBMR/CMS New Orleans '87, October 15–18, Abstracts*: 8.

Pratt, Waldo Selden. 1915. On Behalf of Musicology. *Musical Quarterly* 1: 1–16.

Randel, Don, ed. 1986. *The New Harvard Dictionary of Music.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Randel, Don. 1987. The Canons in the Musicological Toolkit. In *AMS/CBMR/CMS New Orleans '87, October 15–18, Abstracts*: 17–18.

Reese, Gustave. 1940. *Music in the Middle Ages, with an Introduction on the Music of Ancient Times.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Rehding, Alexander. 2003. *Hugo Riemann and the Birth of Modern Musical Thought.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Riemann, Hugo. [1908] 1919. *Grundriss der Musikwissenschaft.* Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer.

Rifkin, Joshua. 1982. A Note on Schubert's Great C-Major Symphony. *19th-Century Music* 6: 13–16.

Sachs, Curt. 1937. Towards a Pre-history of Occidental Music. Listed in *A Report on Publication and Research in Musicology and Allied Fields in the United States, 1932–1938,* 50. Washington, DC: American Council of Learned Societies.

———. 1940a. *The History of Musical Instruments.* New York: W. W. Norton.

———. 1940b. Musicology—The Two Sides of the Coin. *Music Teachers National Association Proceedings* 35: 60–66.

———. 1943. *The Rise of Music in the Ancient World, East and West.* New York: W. W. Norton.

———. 1948. *Our Musical Heritage: A Short History of Music.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

———. 1949. An Editorial. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 2: 3–6.

Sadie, Stanley, ed. 1980. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 20 vols. London: Macmillan.

Sadie, Stanley. 2000. *The New Grove,* Second Edition. *Notes* 57: 11–20.

———, ed. 2001. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd edition, 29 vols. John Tyrrel, executive editor. New York: Grove.

Schenker, Heinrich. 1935. *Der freie Satz.* Vienna: Universal Edition.

———. [1935] 1956. *Der freie Satz,* edited by Oswald Jonas. Vienna: Universal Edition.

———. [1935] 1979. *Free Composition (Der freie Satz): Volume III of New Musical Theories and Fantasies,* translated and edited by Ernst Oster. Longman Music Series. New York: Longman.

Schering, Arnold. 1931. *Geschichte der Musik in Beispielen.* Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.

Schlatter, Richard. 1963. Foreword. In *Musicology*, by Frank Harrison, Mantle Hood and Claude V. Palisca, vii–x. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schrade, Leo. 1950. *Monteverdi: Creator of Modern Music.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Schwarz, Boris. [1972] 1983. *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia, 1917–1970,* 2nd revised edition. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

———. 1983. *Great Masters of the Violin: From Corelli and Vivaldi to Stern, Zukerman, and Perlman.* New York: Simon and Schuster.
Seeger, Charles. 1924. On the Principles of Musicology. *Musical Quarterly* 10: 244–50.
Shepherd, John. 1987. Music and Male Hegemony. In *Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception*, edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary, 151–72. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
Slim, H. Colin. 1990. Presidential Message. *AMS Newsletter* 20 (11): 3.
Slonimsky, Nicholas, ed. 1992. *Baker's Biographical Dictionary of Music*, 8th edition. New York: Schirmer Books.
Smith, Joan Allen. 1986. *Schoenberg and His Circle: A Viennese Portrait.* New York: Schirmer Books.
Spitta, Philip. [1883–85] 1951. *Johann Sebastian Bach*, translated by Clara Bell and J. A. Fuller-Maitland. New York: Dover.
Strunk, W. Oliver. 1932. *State and Resources of Musicology in the United States.* American Council of Learned Societies Bulletin, no. 19. Washington, DC: American Council of Learned Societies.
———. 1936. The Historical Aspect of Musicology. *Music Teachers National Association Proceedings* 31: 218–20.
———, ed. 1950. *Source Readings in Music History from Classical Antiquity Through the Romantic Era.* New York: W. W. Norton.
Subotnik, Rose Rosengard. 1976. Adorno's Diagnosis of Beethoven's Late Style: Early Symptom of a Fatal Condition. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 29: 242–75.
———. 1982. Musicology and Criticism. In *Musicology in the 1980s*, edited by D. Kern Holoman and Claude Palisca, 145–60. New York: Da Capo Press.
———. 1983. The Role of Ideology in the Study of Western Music. *Journal of Musicology* 2: 1–12.
———. 1987. How Can Chopin's A-Major Prelude be Deconstructed? In *AMS/CBMR/CMS New Orleans '87, October 15–18, Abstracts*: 61.
———. 1991. *Developing Variations: Style and Ideology in Western Music.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
———. 1996. How Could Chopin's A-Major Prelude be Deconstructed? In *Deconstructive Variations: Music and Reason in Western Society*, 139–47. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
———. 2003. Foundationalist vs. Aesthetic: A Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Changing Musicological Paradigm. *Orbis Musicae* 13: 15–24.
———. 2004. Afterword. Toward the Next Paradigm of Musical Scholarship. In *Beyond Structural Listening? Postmodern Modes of Hearing*, edited by Andrew Dell'Antonio, 279–302. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Taruskin, Richard. 1993. *Musorgsky: Eight Essays and an Epilogue.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
———. [1991] 1995. Facing Up, Finally, to Bach's Dark Vision. In *Text and Act: Essays on Music and Performance*, 307–15. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press (originally published in the *Sunday New York Times*, January 27).
———. 1995. *Text and Act: Essays on Music and Performance.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
———. 1996. *Stravinsky and the Russian Traditions: A Biography of the Works Through* Mavra. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
———. 1997. *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
———. 2005. *The Oxford History of Western Music*, 6 vols. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Toch, Ernst. 1948. *The Shaping Forces in Music: An Inquiry into Harmony, Melody, Counterpoint, Form.* New York: Criterion Music.

Treitler, Leo. 1967. On Historical Criticism. *Musical Quarterly* 53: 188–205.

———. 1979. History, Criticism, and Beethoven's Ninth Symphony. *19th-Century Music* 3: 193–210.

Weaver, Robert L., ed. 1981. *Essays on the Music of J. S. Bach and Other Diverse Subjects: A Tribute to Gerhard Herz.* Louisville, KY: University of Louisville Press.

Whelan, Thomas. 1987. Intentions, Sketch Studies, and Literary Theory. In *AMS/CBMR/CMS New Orleans '87, October 15–18, Abstracts*: 34–35.

Wolf, Johannes. [1913–19] 1963. *Handbuch der Notationskunde,* 2 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Wuorinen, Charles. 1966. Review: *Music in the 20th Century* by William W. Austin. *Perspectives of New Music* 5: 142–47.

Interviews

Rayner, Clare and William Weber. 1975–77. Interviews with Paul A. Pisk. Oral History of the Arts Archive, Special Collections and Archives, California State University, Long Beach.

Discography

Lehrer, Tom. 1965. *That Was the Year That Was.* Burbank, CA: Reprise Records.