

Aims and ethos of CIMo4

The following account of aims and ethos (or spirit) of the conference has two functions. The first function was to explain the aims of the conference to potential participants before they submitted their abstracts. The second is to provide a foundation for the plenary discussion of problems and prospects of musicological interdisciplinarity that is scheduled for the last day of the conference. The text has been expanded considerably since the first call for papers – inspired by the content of submitted abstracts and by various suggestions received from committee members (especially from the abstract review committee). The text will be revised again after the conference in response to statements made during the final plenary session and other suggestions received during the conference. Responsibility for the content of this document lies entirely with the conference director, Richard Parncutt.

DEFINITIONS

Interdisciplinarity may be defined as an interaction between or among academic disciplines. The definition is problematic because neither "interaction" nor "discipline" is clearly defined. There are many different levels of interaction between disciplines, ranging from superficial reference to relevant work done by another discipline without incorporating its findings (weak or pseudo interdisciplinarity) to the far-reaching review of the fundamental assumptions and methods of one discipline on the basis of a thorough examination of the assumptions and methods of another (sometimes regarded as *transdisciplinarity*). Moreover, some disciplines, like for example physics and history, are old and well-established, while others, like cultural studies, are still so new that some scholars do not acknowledge their identity or their autonomy. A further problem is the fuzziness of the boundaries of disciplines. Is music analysis a separate discipline from music history – because if it is, research involving both is interdisciplinary! Does psychoacoustics belong to acoustics or to psychology, or is it independent of both? If it is independent, when did it become so, and is "truly" interdisciplinary research between it and its "mother" disciplines (acoustics or psychology) possible?

CIMo4 avoids trying to offer clear yes/no answers to such questions – although sometimes such decisions cannot be avoided, for example when drawing up a table of relevant disciplines (see below). Instead, CIMo4 regards interdisciplinarity as a continuously variable parameter. The interesting question is not *whether* a given research project is interdisciplinary or not, but the *extent* to which it is interdisciplinary. The answer to both questions is subjective and depends on a number of criteria, such as the extent to which the interaction crosses larger interdisciplinary borders such as those between sciences and humanities and between theory and practice (another possible meaning of the term *transdisciplinarity*), and the degree to which the interaction is new, unusual, creative, or otherwise especially promising. CIMo4's solution to this problem was to ask expert reviewers to rate the degree of interdisciplinarity of each abstract submission on the basis of a list of such criteria. This rating was an important part of the conference's review procedure and has prevented CIMo4 from falling into the trap of claiming interdisciplinarity when it is not warranted.

Musicology is musical scholarship. It is the academic study of any and all musical phenomena. It addresses the physical, psychological, aesthetic, social, cultural, political, and historical concomitants of music, musical creation, musical perception, and musical discourse. It incorporates a blend of sciences and humanities, and is grounded in musical practice

(performance, composition, improvisation, analysis, criticism, consumption, etc.). It involves a wide range of non-musical disciplines and corresponding research methods.

It follows from this widely accepted approach to defining or describing musicology that any academic who is qualified (e.g. with a doctorate degree) in any important area of musical research is a musicologist. Ethnomusicologists are, or should be, both musicologists and anthropologists or ethnologists. Music acousticians are, or should be, both musicologists and acousticians. Music psychologists (or psychomusicologists) are, or should be, both musicologists and psychologists. Music historians (or historical musicologists) are, or should be, both musicologists and historians. Music sociologists are, or should be, both musicologists and sociologists.

What, then, is a musicologist? These examples suggest that a musicologist is a scholar with a deep knowledge of one of the central areas of musicology, a broad acquaintance with other areas, and an awareness of the complex internal structure of the discipline.

HISTORY OF MUSICOLOGICAL MULTI- AND INTERDISCIPLINARITY

Musicology has always been both multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary. For the ancient Greeks, music was not only an art but also a matter for scientific and philosophical investigation; it involved number theory and ratios, musical intervals and their consonance, tetrachords and scales, musical emotion and ethos, and music's supposedly cosmic foundation (harmony of the spheres). In spite of this early flowering of theoretical discourse around music, musicology was not recognized an independent field of knowledge and research until the mid 19th century (e.g., Chrysander, 1863).

Adler (1885) divided musicology into two subdisciplines: historical and systematic. In response to a growing interest in non-western musics, Haydon (1941) separated ethnomusicology from systematic musicology to create the well-known tripartite division of musicology: historical, ethnological and systematic. Developments of recent decades have tended to erode the tripartite model. Systematic musicology comprises several independent and essentially unrelated subdisciplines, including a USA-led music theory founded on, and now diverging from, pitch-class theory and Schenkerian analysis; music psychology, whose international revival in the 1970s and 1980s was triggered by the emergence of cognitive science in the 1960s; and music acoustics, which maintained a strong autonomous identity throughout the 20th century. At the same time, other fields of musical research such as music education have become as important as the traditional three, and a range of smaller interdisciplinary fields within and around musicology have asserted their independent identity, for example jazz research (which happens to be one of Graz's more famous specialities). Perhaps the straw that finally broke the tripartite-musicological camel's back was the 1990s emergence of "new musicology" with its focus on culture, gender, and subjectivity and strong links to all three "old" musicologies.

Today, there may be little point grouping together research in such diverse areas as theory/analysis, psychology, acoustics, psychoacoustics, sociology, aesthetics, philosophy, physiology, computer science, mathematics, statistics, linguistics, popular music, jazz, media, technology, and related areas and calling it all "systematic musicology", for the following reasons:

- The word "systematic" is misleading in this context, because these various

(sub-) disciplines are no more "systematic" (in the everyday sense) than music history or ethnomusicology - or they should not be, since a systematic approach is, or should be, a feature of any academic discipline.

- The long list suggests that "systematic musicology" has become a repository for anything that does not fit neatly into the traditional confines of historical and ethnological musicology.
- The walls of this unmanageably large container tend to isolate music historians and ethnomusicologists from other aspects of musical scholarship. One of the aims of CIMo4 is to remove artificial shields of this kind and to challenge all musically oriented scholars to engage with *all* disciplines that could be relevant to their research.
- The various subdisciplines of "systematic musicology" are more diverse and less clearly related to each other than the various subdisciplines of historical musicology and of ethnomusicology.
- There is considerable disagreement among musicologists, both "systematic" and otherwise, as to the exact definition of "systematic musicology". Which subdisciplines belong to it, and which do not? Where is the boundary of the discipline, that is, at which point does it stop being "musicology"? Such discussions tend to go around in circles and divert attention from the content. Instead of talking about the program, it is usually more productive to go ahead and implement it.

For these reasons, CIMo4 attempts – as far as possible – to avoid the category "systematic musicology". It also attempts to avoid hierarchical concepts of "sub-", "sister", and "mother" disciplines of musicology and associated value judgments. While these terms and approaches can still be useful, it is important to be aware of their weaknesses.

The above examples and arguments suggest that musicology is *inherently* multi- and interdisciplinary. Nicholas Cook (FBA Research Professor of Music, University of Southampton) put it like this in an email to CIMo4: "... I've never seen musicology/music theory as a discipline. Departments of history consist of different sorts of historians, but departments of music consist of historians, anthropologists, popular culture theorists, aestheticians, and psychologists (as well as composers and performers, of course)—it's just that they all happen to work on music. In other words, a department of music doesn't represent a discipline, rather it is an interdisciplinary (or at least multidisciplinary) research centre—or to put it another way, musicology is inherently multidisciplinary!"

The internal structure of musicology is in a constant state of flux – at least as much as other academic disciplines:

- Interdisciplinarity may be best regarded as a temporary state. As soon as a new interdisciplinary combination becomes routine, it is time to speak of a new discipline and to stop regarding the research as interdisciplinary. For example, semiotics may be regarded as a combination of music theory and cultural studies. In its early days, semiotics was clearly interdisciplinary; now, it may better be regarded as an established subdiscipline of musicology. The establishment of a new discipline opens up new interdisciplinary opportunities between the new discipline and its older "sisters" (e.g. between semiotics and psychology). The transition from an interdisciplinary combination to a new discipline is always a gradual process; the exact point in time when it is

complete is a matter of opinion. CIMo4 does not, therefore, support specific interdisciplinary combinations. Instead, it supports the *process of*€interdisciplinarity.

- A hundred years ago, historical musicology was the biggest branch of musicology, as reflected by the number of good research articles published in that area by comparison to other, "systematic" areas. In the past few decades, the tables have turned: although historical musicology is flourishing more than ever before, global research productivity may now be greater in "systematic musicology", if it is defined to include theory/analysis, psychology, acoustics, psychoacoustics, sociology, aesthetics, philosophy, physiology, computer science, mathematics, popular music, jazz, media, and technology – and especially if recent research in cultural and gender studies ("new musicology") is regarded as a new direction that is not easily subsumed under historical, ethnological or systematic musicology. While there is hardly any need to test such a claim, it would certainly be interesting to investigate the relative sizes of the various more-or-less clearly defined research areas in modern musicology. A possible approach might be to search a large database of abstracts from all areas of research for the word "music", and then to attempt to classify the abstracts into different areas of musicology. As an example of the growth of systematic musicology in recent decades, consider the case of music psychology. The main international scholarly journals in this area are considerably younger than corresponding journals in the area of historical musicology, and more often subject to a strict peer review procedure (which has well-known advantages and disadvantages). The growth of modern, international "systematic musicology" does not mean that it has become more "important" or "central" than historical musicology (whatever that might mean); rather, it reinforces the argument presented above that the tripartite model of musicology is not as valid, appropriate or useful as it used to be. Nor is it true that systematic musicology has "overtaken" historical musicology in all countries. It appears not to have happened in Germany, with good reason: history is more important for German culture than, for example, American culture. In addition, the predominance of historical musicology in Germany is maintained by a hierarchical structure within musicology in which historical musicologists tend to have more political power than ethnomusicologists and "systematic" musicologists. CIMo4 challenges such structures and traditions, and asks whether and to what extent they promote good scholarship. CIMo4 also calls for a closer look at power relationships within musicology, which are not always as clearcut as they may first appear: on another level, the science faculties have been more resilient to recent funding cuts than the faculties of humanities – favoring the scientists, and hence, directly or indirectly, "systematic" musicologists. A possible solution is to move (central European) musicology departments into faculties, academies or universities of music, art, or cultural studies, as is normal in many countries of the world. But this just exchanges one power relationship for another: musicology then becomes dependent on the requirements of other groups such as performers, which can again affect its internal structure. For example, a music academy may be more interested than a faculty of humanities in research on the psychology of music performance.

The constantly changing relationships between musicologically relevant disciplines (including international variations in these relationships) need to be monitored and adequately responded to. That is one of the aims of CIMo4. Another aim is encourage discussion of difficult or (real or potential) taboo topics such as those mentioned in the previous paragraph. If such discussion is not actively promoted, it tends to be suppressed: no ambitious, creative scholar wants to acquire a reputation as a trouble-maker, that can all too easily lead to mysterious career setbacks such as the rejection of good articles and the failure of good job applications. While some musicologists may feel unjustly attacked by some of the observations and remarks of the previous paragraph, such reactions are unavoidable within a dynamic discipline whose scholars are constantly pushing back boundaries, exploring new terrain, and questioning old assumptions. It is in the best long-term interests of any discipline that difficult topics are openly discussed in an atmosphere of mutual respect. The first aim of such a discussion should be simply to establish the so-called facts, that is, to arrive at a description of the situation that acknowledges the different viewpoints of all involved and helps them to see the situation from different standpoints. Once a reasonably objective account has been achieved, the implications of that account can be explored and converted into concrete policies that are realistic enough to be implemented. The extent to which such policies address the problems they are intended to solve can then be monitored by ongoing observation and analysis. An interdisciplinary conference such as CIMo4, that aims not only to span the entire discipline of musicology but also to promote communication between its subdisciplines, is an appropriate forum for global constructive self-criticism of this kind.

MUSICOLOGICAL INTERDISCIPLINARITY AT CIMO4

CIMo4 attempts to bring together all disciplines that can be relevant to musical questions. Any serious, musically relevant academic discipline with its own international community, societies, conferences, and respected journals is, or can be, included in the conference.

The structure of the conference program is determined by the specific combinations of disciplines represented among the contributions of conference participants. This structure is clarified by tentatively identifying the most important musically relevant disciplines, and considering the various possible relationships between them and the larger disciplinary categories to which they belong.

The following table classifies musically relevant disciplines into sciences, humanities, mixtures, and practically oriented disciplines. This classification is as arbitrary as any other, and is driven primarily by the typical backgrounds and ways of thinking of the researchers in each disciplinary category.

MIXTURES OF HUMANITIES AND SCIENCES

Discipline	Definition, explanation, or examples
Ethnomusicology	the (historical and systematic) study of (non-western, folk, and multiethnic) musics in their social, cultural and anthropological context
Linguistics	the nature and structure of human languages; language as a cultural, social, and cognitive-psychological phenomenon; music as language
Prehistory and archeology (of music)	the study of prehistoric musical cultures by excavation and description of their remains; chronology; role and function of ancient music instruments
Sociology (of music)	the role of music in: the identity of individuals and groups; relationships and family; gender stereotypes; institutions, national states, politics, war and peace; the origin, development, organisation and functions of human society
Music theory, analysis and composition	approaches to the understanding of musical structure, including compositional theory and semiotics

PRACTICALLY ORIENTED DISCIPLINES

Discipline	Definition, explanation, or examples
(Music) Education	individual and classroom teaching and learning both within and outside schools: theory, approaches, and systematic investigations of their validity and effectiveness
(Music) Medicine and Therapy	performance injuries, physiology, music therapy, performance anxiety, stress
Music performance	history of performance practice; advanced performance techniques and pedagogy

While CIM avoids evaluating disciplines relative to each other, the table suggests that two of the listed disciplines do have a special status. Music theory/analysis/composition and music performance are the only disciplines in the list that have no "mother disciplines" outside music or musicology. In that sense, they may be regarded as core disciplines of musicology.

Another criterion that has been applied in an attempt to nail down the boundaries of musicology is the degree to which a (sub-) discipline directly addresses music or musical phenomena. The problem with that criterion is the lack of a widely accepted definition of music. If music is tentatively regarded as an acoustic signal that evokes recognizable pitch-time patterns, implies physical movement, influences (emotion or mood) states, is intended to evoke such patterns, movements and emotions, is socially acceptable and deeply embedded within a cultural tradition, and is an important feature of all known cultures, the disciplines relevant to this attempt at a definition – acoustics, psychology, sociology, cultural studies, history, anthropology – may all be regarded as central to musicology.

These considerations suggest the following alternative structure:

- core disciplines (theory/analysis/composition, performance – across cultures, periods and styles)
- central disciplines (ethnology/anthropology, history, psychology, sociology, cultural studies, acoustics)
- peripheral disciplines (computing, psychoacoustics, philosophy, physiology, prehistory – topics peripheral to the central disciplines)
- neighboring disciplines (art, literature, linguistics – disciplines addressing other forms of human communication and culture)
- practical disciplines (education, therapy, medicine – specific applications of the above disciplines)

This classification is just as arbitrary as the one presented in the previous table. Neither of the two classifications is intended to find its way into the bureaucratic structures of musicology, or to supplant the tripartite model - which could merely create new barriers to interdisciplinary research.

CIMo4 is not primarily about the detailed internal structure of musicology. The main focus is on the openness of musically oriented scholars for constructive interdisciplinary engagement. A prerequisite for such engagement is the interdisciplinary recognition of and respect for each individual discipline, regardless of the category in which it may be placed or perceived. All the disciplines listed above - and presumably several others besides - can play an important role in interdisciplinary studies of musical phenomena. So all qualify for inclusion in the academic catchment area of "interdisciplinary musicology".

Submissions to CIMo4 could involve ANY discipline that is relevant to music and musicology. All submissions were considered in the same way and against the same criteria, regardless of whether the disciplines addressed were included in the above table and regardless of the size of the corresponding international scholarly community.

AIMS OF CIMO4

Against the above historical and conceptual background, CIMo4 aims:

- to promote forms of musicological interdisciplinarity that might otherwise be suppressed by bureaucratic hurdles, inflexible research structures, or the force of habit (e.g. lack of communication between scholars in different subdisciplines, resulting in an inability of subdisciplines to evaluate each others' research contributions; imbalances between different subdisciplines in terms of numbers of academic positions or membership of selection committees).
- to counter irrational fears of other disciplines (based, for example, on the fear of being shown to be incompetent in another field, which can in turn be based on shaming childhood experiences at school or at home) simply by direct exposure to them (related to the concept of *systematic desensitization*).
- to help scholars from disciplines that usually operate independently of one another to pool their expertise, combine their methodologies, and to compare and contrast the relevant convergent evidence that can be obtained from different sources. All papers at CIM should have at least two authors with complementary backgrounds; that way, no-one is expected to be an expert in more than one major discipline.
- to generate solutions to problems arising from the study of music through interdisciplinary synergy – as opposed to a mere multidisciplinary accumulation of knowledge. In other words, the aim is not primarily to make researchers more aware of research in related disciplines (although of course this is an interesting side-effect), but to generate new knowledge through deep, detailed, thorough, creative interaction between and among the various disciplines that are relevant to a given question.
- to promote new and promising interdisciplinary interactions, especially interactions between the sciences and the humanities. For example, we will not promote semiotics as such – even though it evidently involves both cultural studies and theory/analysis – because this particular combination is not new (cf. the above discussion of the temporary nature of interdisciplinarity). But we will promote promising contributions in areas like semiotics and education, or semiotics and ethnomusicology, and we will especially promote interactions between semiotics and the scientific disciplines of psychology, acoustics, and computing.
- to discuss specific problems that arise from interdisciplinary interaction. For example, different disciplines have different vocabularies, and different definitions of important words and concepts. In such cases, which terms and definitions should one adopt, and why?
- to promote the unity of musicology as an academic discipline. Communication between the traditional subdisciplines of musicology (historical, ethnological, "systematic"...) is surprisingly weak. Specialization within each of these areas, and within the subareas of "systematic musicology", causes musicology to fragment. CIMo4 aims to bring the diverse subdisciplines of musicology closer together. Caveat: while interdisciplinary work can bring about the gradual fusion of specific pairs of (sub-) disciplines, it can also cause new (sub-) disciplines to emerge. These new (sub-) disciplinary identities tend in turn to diversify or fragment the overall discipline. Paradoxically, then, the aim of unifying musicology can never be achieved, and cannot be separated from CIMo4's aim of monitoring, recognizing and supporting musicological diversity and the dynamic evolution of its internal structure.

WHY A CONFERENCE ON INTERDISCIPLINARY MUSICOLOGY?

Musicology has always been interdisciplinary. But there has never been a conference devoted to "interdisciplinary musicology" as such. Smaller interdisciplinary conferences on musicology have tended to restrict their attention to a specific area within the humanities. The larger ones (e.g., International Musicological Society, Musical Intersections) presented an overwhelming amount and diversity of information, and were primarily multi- rather than interdisciplinary. Scholars from different disciplines became more aware of each other's existence, but – with some promising exceptions, such as the Joint Sessions at Musical Intersections – effective, creative communication across disciplines remained limited.

Interdisciplinarity is necessary...

- to answer research questions that involve more than one discipline. Of course, many musicological questions do not require an interdisciplinary approach; if a unidisciplinary approach yields an adequate answer to a question, there is no need to look further. But unidisciplinary approaches often neglect important aspects of a problem. For example, it may be of little use to a pianist to understand the physical workings of the piano if this knowledge is not integrated into other knowledge about piano performance, interpretation, literature, teaching, and so on. That is one reason why piano teachers find much research on the acoustics of the piano irrelevant for their purposes. An intensification of interdisciplinary collaboration between the fields of piano acoustics and piano pedagogy could contribute to a solution to this problem. Whilst it may be possible for a single author to achieve this kind of interdisciplinarity, an innovative and promising approach is more likely to emerge from a new collaboration between two or more different scholars or practitioners of complementary expertise. This is an example of an interdisciplinary interaction between theory and practice - a major focus of CIMo4.
- due to the general expansion and specialization of scholarship over recent decades. As the volume of published research in each field (e.g., in each musicologically relevant discipline) increases, it becomes increasingly difficult for individuals to keep abreast of developments in more than one field. So individual scholars become increasingly specialized. The greater the degree of specialization, the greater the need for interdisciplinary collaboration – if questions that simultaneously touch different specializations are to be plausibly and usefully answered.

BACKGROUND AND PRECEDENTS

CIMo4 grew out papers and sessions at previous conferences:

- a session entitled Art Meets Science at Musical Intersections, Toronto, Canada, in 2000.
- a session entitled Art Meets Science at the International Conference on Music Perception and Cognition (ICMPC) held in Sydney, Australia in 2002.
- an invitation from the Gesellschaft für Musikforschung to Richard Parncutt to consider the current situation and future prospects of (German) (historical) musicology from the point of view of systematic musicology; his talk and proceedings paper emphasized the importance of interdisciplinary and international collaboration within musicology. An interview focussing on the situation in the German-speaking world of musicology was published by the Swiss online magazine Codex flores.

CIMo4 was also inspired by the following book:

R. Parncutt, & G. E. McPherson (Eds., 2002). *The science and psychology of music performance: Creative strategies for teaching and learning*. New York: Oxford University Press.

This book is an example of the combination education, psychology, and acoustics. Each chapter is co-authored by a music scientist (usually a psychologist, sometimes an acoustician) and a music practitioner (usually an educator).

CIM04 AND POSTMODERNISM

During the 20th century, the disciplines listed in the above tables developed largely independently of each other – reminiscent of the range of artistic styles that co-exist within modernism. Postmodern art (including music) may include more than one style in a single piece or sound event, thereby abandoning the unified subjectivity that was previously taken for granted. Similarly, a postmodern musicology may be regarded as a musicology that is multidisciplinary: a discipline made up of numerous, partially independent subdisciplines. CIMo4 aims to transform (postmodern?) multidisciplinary musicology into (post-postmodern?) interdisciplinary musicology. Unlike postmodern art and music, in which different styles may be starkly juxtaposed but remain essentially independent of each other, the aim of interdisciplinary musicology is to interact and thereby to produce a new synthesis. This approach is no news to those artists who regularly experience creative synergy in their collaborations with other artists of different but still relevant (i.e. complementary) skills and backgrounds; famous musical examples include Mozart and da Ponte, Verdi and Boito, and Strauss and Hofmannsthal – interpersonal synergies that produced some of the most important milestones in operatic history. Interdisciplinary musicology works in much the same way – not as art itself, but as scholarship about art. New answers to interesting, relevant and applicable research questions emerge from a melting pot of related disciplines that creatively dialogue and engage with each other.

WILL CIM BECOME A SERIES?

The following two observations suggest that the answer to this question may be "yes":

- The 122 submitted abstracts suggest that the ideas underlying CIM have long-term significance and resonance for the future development of musicology.
- During the months preceding the abstract submission deadline, we received several reports of scholars who were interested in CIM but who did not have time to develop a meaningful collaboration before the deadline.

A second CIM could be held in about three years. This would give potential participants time to develop new collaborations. It would also ensure that there is enough momentum left after the second CIM for further conferences, and avoid unnecessarily augmenting the already very large number of (musicological) conferences. There is a clear need to focus on quality rather than quantity. To promote the key elements of international and interdisciplinary balance, we further suggest that a second CIM be held on another continent (i.e., not in Europe) and be organized by representatives of another musically relevant discipline (i.e., not music psychology; see the disciplines listed under aims). We do not feel that CIM should found its own society, because the aim of CIM is to function as a link between societies together and to promote innovation – not to create a new establishment.

Readers who are considering the possibility of hosting a second CIM along these or similar lines are asked to contact the conference director.

REFERENCES

- Adler, G. (1885). *Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft*. Vierteljahresschrift für Musikwissenschaft, 1, 5-20.
- Chrysander, F. (1863). *Preface and introduction to Jahrbuch für musikalische Wissenschaft*, 1, 9-16. Cited in New Grove (2001) under "Musicology", vol. 17, p. 526.
- Haydon, G. (1941). *Introduction to musicology*. New York: Prentice-Hall.