

Introduction and Overview

Léonie Rosenstiel, Project Editor

In 1968, at an informal gathering of musicologists and performers, a casual discussion revealed to me that there were serious misunderstandings and, in some instances, tensions between the two groups. There was neither a consensus of opinion on the functions and interrelationships of musicology¹ and performance, nor a clear conception of the functions and interrelationships of composition, criticism, and pedagogy. Previously, while I had been studying violin and chamber music with Louis Persinger,² he had used some of the concepts of musicology (though not under that name) as an integral part of his pedagogical method. He had, therefore, been giving me a simultaneous exposure to both musicology and performance. In fact, these two branches of music were so closely interwoven in his teaching that I did not even realize they were considered separate fields. When I entered graduate school, however, the term “musicology” began to be applied to a certain aspect of my work, and I found that many performers were skeptical of its value and meaning. Conversely, many musicologists tended to harbor negative stereotypes of performers.

Further discussions on this subject convinced me that a genuine need existed for open and honest communication among specialists in all aspects of music. Some experts actually believed that they had nothing to say to those in other branches of the discipline! I felt that this situation was impeding the free interchange of ideas so necessary to the health and growth of music as a whole, and that, if it were to continue unchecked, it could lead to the isolation of each specialty and would ultimately be detrimental to all. The need to develop a more effective means of improved mutual comprehension was urgent.

When, early in 1971, the editorial board of *Current Musicology* began to consider proposals for special projects for the 1972 and 1973 issues, I submitted a plan to provide a forum for composers, performers, musicologists, critics, and pedagogues. The main goal was to discover how, in each contributor's opinion, based on his own experience and training, the various specialties are interrelated. I hoped that those who contributed articles to this project would discuss the functions of these specialties and the ideal balance among them.³ The suggestion was approved by the board, members of the staff were asked to submit the names of those they felt would make meaningful contributions, and efforts were made to contact a representative cross-section of the musical community in the United States, Europe, and Latin America. The response to our invitations to contribute articles was so overwhelming that the project itself, originally planned for this issue alone, has had to be expanded to include the following issue as well. Our editorial policy in this symposium has been not to include any previously published material.

All such offers, whether they were of articles or excerpts from books, were, therefore, declined.

In attempting to give our contributors freedom to express their thoughts, we have tried to impose as few restrictions as possible, of either format or content. Some authors chose to discuss one specific problem or question in depth, others to survey the general musical scene. Still others requested and were given a list of questions, and were invited to discuss any or all of them in their articles. The staff felt that this diversity of approach would, ultimately, reveal what each contributor considered most important, and that one article might pose a problem to which another might suggest a solution. This is, indeed, what has happened. Some articles illuminate, comment, and expand upon subjects that others have treated in a more summary fashion. Thus this collection has become an intricate mosaic which must be considered as a whole rather than a series of independent parts.

Concern for the present state of music, the history of communication (or lack of it) among specialists in different areas of music and related fields, and the assessment of the effects of such communication today occupied every author in this project. Not all approached these subjects from the same point of view, nor did they necessarily arrive at the same conclusions. Nevertheless, such an emphasis on these topics is, in itself, significant.

Another major trend which manifested itself was a deep concern for the scope and quality of music education, not only as it affects the specialized musician, but also as it helps to form the attitudes and tastes of the general public. Over two-thirds of the authors who contributed articles to this issue chose to discuss one or more aspects of the problem (Anderson, Arlt, Cazeaux, Doris, Hedges, Koston, Lesure, Little, Loeb, Rabin, Stevens, and Tureck).

Performance practice was another area treated by composers as well as musicologists and performers. Although more authors discussed the place of musicology in preparing performances of early music (Arlt, Cazeaux, Doris, Fuchs, Hedges, Little, Menuhin, Stevens, and Tureck), its uses in later repertoire were also mentioned (Fuchs, Hedges, Landau, Loeb, Menuhin, and Rabin). Even its potential misuses were not ignored (Fuchs, Landau, Menuhin, Rabin, and Stevens).

The philosophy and psychology of various aspects of music and the assumptions of their practitioners were also scrutinized. Some articles examined the philosophical and psychological components of more than one branch of the discipline and the different psyches and general philosophies of musicians of the past as well as the present (Anderson, Arlt, Cazeaux, Fuchs, González, Hedges, Landau, Lesure, Little, Menuhin, Newman, Rabin, Stevens, and Tureck).

Many of the contributors to this issue have included in their articles predictions of the direction which their particular specialty (or specialties) may take in the future. Some have also singled out various current and potential problems and made specific suggestions for their resolution

(Anderson, Cazeaux, Hedges, Koston, Lesure, Little, Loeb, Menuhin, Rabin, Stevens, and Tureck). Three authors also chose to discuss music criticism (Cazeaux, Landau, and Rabin).

Based on this evidence, it would appear that musicians in all aspects of the discipline, as well as in different parts of the world, share common concerns. An interest in communication, the present and future of music as both art and science, education, performance practice, philosophy and psychology, and a self-critical approach are apparent throughout the entire collection. This is certainly a hopeful sign.

In our age of specialization, it has become increasingly difficult even for those working in different branches of the same discipline to communicate with each other. When people cannot communicate, or when they simply *believe* that they have nothing to say to one another, each group is likely to develop derogatory stereotypes of the others. This situation, in turn, creates artificial, psychological barriers which impede communication. In this respect, music has been no exception. The first step toward reestablishing and improving lines of communication is to reassess the entire field. Once the groups directly involved (or, in this case, a representative sample thereof) have considered their interrelationships and decided what they now expect from themselves and from each other, they can consider what their ideal relationships should be. In this process existing prejudices may be unearthed and examined, so that any unwarranted negative feelings can be eliminated, while at the same time any legitimate grievances may also be aired. It is my hope that this symposium will help to pinpoint the problems and open the way for further meaningful communication among members of the music world.

NOTES

¹ It has been the policy of *Current Musicology* to consider as musicology "all serious speech communications about music of high and low cultures, of the East or of the West, whether their bias is historical, esthetical, ethnomusicological, meta-theoretical, psycho-acoustical, or interdisciplinary in other possible ways." See *Current Musicology* (Spring 1965), 1: 42-43.

² Louis Persinger (1887-1966), from 1930 until his death Master Teacher of violin and chamber music at the Juilliard Graduate School of Music, was, in addition, a concert violinist and pianist as well as an arranger and conductor.

³ *Current Musicology* had already prepared for publication a short report on an English regional conference devoted to a consideration of some aspects of this problem. See Anthony Hedges, "Report from Sheffield," *Current Musicology* (1971) 11: 65-66.