

RICHARD PARNCUTT, KARL-FRANZENS-UNIVERSITÄT GRAZ

Interdisciplinary balance, international collaboration, and the future of (German) (historical) musicology

Published as: Parncutt, R. (2002). Interdisciplinary balance, international collaboration, and the future of (German) (historical) musicology. In A. Edler und S. Meine (Eds.), *Musik, Wissenschaft und Ihre Vermittlung: Bericht zur Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung* (Hannover, D, 2001) (pp. 42-51). Augsburg: Wissner.

Not only German historical musicology, but also the humanities and universities generally, are threatened by closure and merging of departments, suspension of professorships, and other funding cuts. In facing this challenge, we need to reconsider the aims and *raison d'être* of musicology in relation to other disciplines and (inter)national traditions. My contribution aims to explore and develop concrete, constructive strategies for the future *Gestaltung* of (German) (historical) musicology, drawing on my international experience (Canada 1991-94, Britain 1994-98, Austria since 1998) across musicological subdisciplines (undergraduate music and physics, graduate music psychology and theory). My limited integration into (German) (historical) musicology helps me to compare it with other disciplines and contexts.

I have written in English to enable English- and (bilingual) German-speaking colleagues to comment (see *Acknowledgments*); readers of this draft are invited to send ideas for a future, German-language version to parncutt@uni-graz.at. I occasionally include German terms (in italics) in the text, because some ideas are better expressed in German than English (and vice-versa), and there is currently a greater tendency for English terms to be adopted into German (than vice-versa); this practice could be useful in other English-language accounts of German scholarship.

Interdisciplinary balance and collaboration

How many musicologies?

Musicology is intrinsically interdisciplinary: most musicologists identify with a discipline outside musicology. Adler's (1885) division of musicology into

historical (hereafter HM) and *systematic* (SM) still holds after a century of sweeping change in both fields. In the following, HM refers primarily to western repertory, its written sources and analysis, and its historical and social context. The term SM is famously problematic: any discipline (including HM) can be systematic, and SM is less unified than HM. A possible solution is to regard SM as *scientific* (*naturwissenschaftlich*) musicology: the acoustics, physiology, and psychology of music perception and performance. Music psychology (www.icmpc.org) applies all aspects of psychology (neuroscience, perception, cognition, ability, development, motivation, emotion, personality...) to all aspects of musical behavior (listening, performance, improvisation, composition...). Music acoustics (www.cini.ve.cnr.it/isma2001) and computer music (www.computermusic.org) are equally active and diverse.

Adler located *comparative musicology* (later *ethnomusicology*, Kunst 1950; hereafter EM) within SM. Since the 1950s, EM – the (historical and systematic) study of (non-western, folk, and multiethnic) musics in their social, cultural and anthropological context (cf. Merriam, 1977) – has been (notionally) as important as HM and SM, creating the well-known tripartite subdivision of musicology (Blume, 1954; Haydon, 1941; Seeger, 1977). But the term *Ethnie* still recalls "primitive" "*Naturvölker*", and seems discriminatory unless applied to *all* music.

Draeger (1955) advocated a *five-fold* classification of musicology into HM, SM, EM, music sociology, and applied musicology. Music sociology may now be expanded to *cultural musicology* (CM; cf. Cook, 1998; Kerman, 1985; Kramer, 2000). As the "new musicology" of the 1990s, CM is opposed to musical elitism and positivistic music analysis; it broadly includes social and cultural studies, popular music and culture, jazz, gender/sexuality, feminist theory, psychoanalytic approaches, postmodernism, poststructuralism, ideology, mentality, politics, philology, and semiotics. It thus overlaps with HM, SM, and EM.

Draeger regarded music education, criticism, and instrument design as *applied musicology* (AM); historical performance practice may be regarded as *applied historical musicology*. AM has considerable potential for collaboration (and cross-appointments) between universities and *Musikhochschulen* in areas like the psychology of performance, including anxiety, stress, and injuries (Hinrichsen, 2000; Kreutz & Bastian, in press; Parncutt & McPherson, 2002), music theory (Holtmeier, 1999) as applied to the composition and analysis of *any* music (e.g., Tagg, 1987), and acoustics as applied to instrument design (e.g., www.bias.at/smart). As universities increasingly come under financial pressure, the professional and social application of their research and teaching is becoming increasingly important.

Music theory is traditionally historical. A modern, multidisciplinary music theory, here called *theoretic musicology* (TM), is split across all other subdisciplines. As in North America, TM has a place in European university research and teaching.

Examples of interdisciplinary musicology include:

	historical HM	scientific SM	ethnological EM	cultural CM	theoretical TM
scientific SM	history of m. perception				
ethnological EM	non-western m. histories	non-western m. psychol.			
cultural CM	sociocultural history of m.	social psych. of m.	non-western popular m.		
theoretical TM	history of m. theory	cognitive m. theories	non-western m. theories	semiotics of m.	
applied AM	performance practice	performanc e anxiety	non-western <i>Kulturpolitik</i>	cultural education	compositional algorithms

If modernism creates a diversity of styles, postmodernism self-consciously juxtaposes them (Flotzinger, 1998). By analogy, postmodern musicologists (cf. Babich, 2001) may combine the methods and approaches of different subdisciplines to answer questions such as "How was music perceived in the middle ages?" (Walter, 1994), blurring the borderlines between subdisciplines (Cook & Everest, 1999) and provoking a reconsideration of labels, content, and overlap.

Academic imperialism

Both in Germany and elsewhere, musicology is traditionally dominated by HM, suggesting that HM is academically or socially superior. Closer examination reveals no *sachlich-inhaltlich* argument for this imbalance. Regarding SM, the humanities are not intrinsically more or less important than the sciences, either generally or in regard to music (Elschek, 1993; Feder, 1980; Motte-Haber, 1980). Regarding EM, western culture is not superior to others (Becker, 1986); the apparent "Einzigartigkeit unserer traditionellen Musikkultur" (Finscher, 2000, p. 14) reflects our culture-specific way of appreciating music and persistent cultural isolation. But should a national school first study its own culture? Not necessarily:

- Most countries have few resources to devote to the study of their own music and to international musicological discourse; musicology is seen as a luxury.
- Western music is already studied throughout and outside the west.
- Most musical styles and cultures are represented in modern Germany.
- In a globalized world, "other" cultures are as relevant as "our" culture.
- EM can help prevent international conflicts by raising cultural awareness.

Both political and scholarly forces have contributed to the *Entstehung* and maintenance of an imbalance in favor of HM:

Interdisciplinarity. Riemann (1908) regarded HM as central due to its historical connections – archeology, paleography, philology. His uncertain logic has become quite untenable after a century of multidisciplinary musicological diversification.

Faculty structure. Despite the ancient relationship between music and the sciences, musicology is usually located in the humanities, putting SM and EM at a constant disadvantage. Professorial selection committees mainly comprise historians and philologists, and lack musically competent scientists and anthropologists.

National socialism. Interdisciplinary schools of comparative musicology flourished in Berlin and Vienna until the 1930s (Sweers, 2000). Subsequent political developments shifted world centers of SM and EM to the USA.

Communism. Musicology in the *DDR* (e.g., *Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft*) fostered SM and EM, but economic and ideological factors led to its neglect.

Empirical positivism. In postwar Germany, academic respectability was regained by marginalizing the ideologically dangerous social and cultural aspects of music – its perception and meaning, the role of society, the culture-boundedness of esthetics, and its popular, functional, and ethnic manifestations – and returning to manuscript sources (Walter, 2001). Those avoided areas are now central to SM, EM, and CM. Meanwhile, *Gesamtausgaben* still rank among German HM' s highest priorities.

Repertoire. Repertoire-based teaching / research used to be fundamental, because the canon was extensive and stable but research was constantly changing. Now, neither the musical nor the research literature is regarded as permanent, and both literatures are far too large to survey during a degree course. Instead, students learn to deal with new or

unfamiliar literature of both kinds. This has made *methods of* and *approaches to* research, and hence SM and EM, increasingly important.

Pace of change. In recent decades, SM, EM, and CM have changed more rapidly than HM, in both content and methods. Scholars in SM, EM, and CM thus need to be more flexible, innovative, and self-reliant. They must repeatedly create and defend new areas of research and teaching. This makes them more vulnerable.

Student demand. The current international expansion of CM (especially popular music) has largely been driven by student demand. But German musicology has been less responsive than Anglo-American to student needs (www.dvsm.de).

Terminology. Although most published definitions of musicology are interdisciplinary (Nettl, 1999), many still confuse "musicology" with HM. When Finscher (2000, abstract) lamented that "vast areas of research are no longer cultivated", he was referring only to HM. The solution is not to suppress SM and EM, but to allow scholars to compete for extra sabbatical leave and teaching replacement, and to periodically assess their research (as in Britain).

Power and knowledge. SM and EM are more international and interdisciplinary than HM, and so less xenophobic toward other disciplines. But HM has more power, and more often evaluates SM and EM than vice-versa. Thus, the success rate of grant and job applications is higher in HM than in SM and EM.

Professorships

Perhaps the most effective perpetuator of HM's dominance is the professorial selection committee. The amount of research and teaching in each area of musicology is primarily determined by the number of professorships, which is determined by predominantly historical selection committees. Even when an SM, EM, or CM position is to be filled, committee members (often puppets of powerful colleagues) tend to support candidates close to HM.

The ever-increasing diversity of international musicology should produce an ever-increasing *diversity of musicologists* – while maintaining departmental and national strengths and *Schwerpunkte*. If two job candidates cannot clearly be distinguished on the basis of qualification and suitability, the job should be offered to the candidate who increases diversity of *gender* (the woman), *research focus* (the non-historian), *culture* (the non-western applicant), or *language* (the foreign-language candidate who is, or can become, fluent in the local language).

Retiring professors in HM should be replaced where possible by professors in SM, EM, or CM – or by *professors in musicology specializing*

in SM, EM, and/or CM, since these fields are not mutually exclusive but complementary, and rigid boundaries can be problematic (Kartomi, 1993) – until an appropriate balance is reached. Similarly, affirmative action should continue until, say, a third to a half of all university professors are women. In reality, progress will be slowed by the traditional political power of HM (or the academic patriarchy). Just as *Frauenförderung* and gender mainstreaming in universities require national political support, a new interdisciplinary balance and fusion within musicology may require collaboration between politicians and scholars.

When selecting candidates for professorial positions, quality should never be compromised for the sake of fairness or morality. Only the person with the greatest potential to contribute to the discipline should be offered the job. The maintenance of a dynamic, productive, competitive, forward-looking academic environment, and of high-quality research and teaching, are paramount. I suggest:

- increasing the proportion of external experts on selection committees. Most committee members should be able to *directly* judge the candidates' specialist expertise. Avoid bias toward a particular school of thought.
- publishing (internet?) a detailed *rationale* of the committee's decision. List the main criteria applied and how well each short-listed candidate matched them.

Teaching

Since HM, SM, EM, CM, AM, and TM are *sachlich-inhaltlich* about equally important, they should be roughly equally represented in a given region or country, with some university curricula covering all of them and others specializing. This presupposes the availability of teaching staff with the required expertise. Even in the absence of a professorship in SM, EM, or CM, a department may design its curriculum to facilitate such expansion. In Graz, thanks to the foresight and political engagement of Rudolf Flotzinger, we now have not one but two professorships – in (general) musicology (effectively, HM) and in SM. This is allowing us to approach a balance between HM and SM in both teaching and research. Our new curriculum is entirely symmetrical: students receive a thorough grounding in both subdisciplines, and choose one or the other – with equal support – as their major. Due to staffing limitations, our curriculum currently includes little EM – only a general introduction plus fundamentals within other subjects. But our modular course structure will allow EM to be introduced into the *Studienordnung* at the same level as HM and SM. We plan soon to make this change in collaboration with the *Kunstuniversität Graz*.

Research

Specialist music researchers should be aware of the broader context of their specialism, and participate in inter- and sub-disciplinary work to refresh and legitimate their activities. The traditional focus on HM at the expense of EM and SM has largely confined interdisciplinary research within musicology to the *humanities* and to *western culture*: the 1970s expansion of German music sociology and ethnology had little effect on HM (Walter, 2001). But some of the most promising new research and teaching involves interactions between subdisciplines. Historians can now access computer databanks of music in different styles and periods (www.ccarh.org); collaboration between HM and SM is necessary to interpret the statistical analyses. Music psychologists are beginning to venture outside western culture (e.g., Balkwill & Thompson, 1999; Castellano, Bharucha, & Krumhansl, 1984; Kopiez, Langner & Steinhagen, 1999); in this difficult and sensitive area, SM and EM need to collaborate closely and interactively. HM can be applied to the history of non-western musical cultures and their interaction, and EM to the history of western music (e.g., Blum et al., 1991; Wiora, 1965); *historical ethnomusicology*, the interface of ethnographic and historical topics and method (Buckley, 2000), includes *music archeology*, which extends HM to include prehistory, and musicology to include archeological methods (Hickmann et al., 2000, 2002).

Internationally, HM professorships tend to be confined to departments of music(ology), whereas professorships in other subdisciplines gravitate toward other departments (Parncutt, 2000; Yi, 1999). In central Europe, there are positions in SM (as defined above) in Berlin (TU, HU), Cologne, Graz, Halle, Hamburg, Hannover, Magdeburg, Osnabrück, Würzburg, and Vienna; and in EM at Bamberg, Cologne, Berlin (FU, HU), Göttingen, Graz, Halle, Hamburg, Hannover, Mainz, Munich, Salzburg, and Vienna. German EM also includes an *Institut für Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft* (FU Berlin), an *Institut für Ethnologie und Afrika-Studien* with an African Music Archive (Mainz), an *Institut für Musikethnologie* (KU Graz), a *Phonogrammarchiv* (Berlin) and a *Deutsches Volksliedarchiv* (Freiburg). SM has an *Institut für Musikphysiologie und Musikermedizin* (Hannover), an *Institut für Begabungsforschung* (Paderborn) and a *Deutsches Zentrum für Musiktherapieforschung* (Heidelberg). Central Europe clearly has considerable potential to develop a characteristically interdisciplinary musicology. The survival of musicology may depend on its willingness and ability to integrate its subdisciplines into *Institute für interdisziplinäre Musikwissenschaften*, synergizing their intellectual strengths and political connections. If this fails, HM may find itself being absorbed into new mega-departments of general and art history.

International balance and collaboration

Linguistic imperialism

Musicology entered the academy in late 19th-century Germany, and the discipline subsequently acquired a distinctly German character and identity (Nettl, 1999). The recent international trend toward the English language and away from an authoritative canon has forced German musicology into a phase of post-imperial decadence. The discipline' s resistance to change (CM is seen as a fashion) recalls the persistent class structure of post-imperial Britain: HM sees itself as musicology' s upper class and ultimate authority, and the limited interdisciplinary dialogue within musicology is analogous to the sorry state of Britain' s public transport.

The increasing dominance of the English language in almost every international area has facilitated communication but sadly reduced the international importance of other languages. Despite the increasing sophistication of translation software (allowing us to understand the gist of internet pages in foreign languages), the trend toward English as academic *lingua franca* seems unstoppable and irreversible. As the amount of literature in English grows, the willingness of English-speaking academics to read German diminishes – regrettable for both German and English speakers. American musicologists interested in *non-western* music now learn Spanish, French, Japanese, Chinese, or Arabic rather than German or Italian. German is still important in Eastern Europe, but even there English is taking over.

A new journal?

These changing political-linguistic relationships favor international English-language journals and highlight the need for an *English*-language journal for the musicology of *German*-speaking scholars. Such a journal (called e.g. *German Musicology* or *Interdisciplinary Musicology*) might be jointly subsidized by the EU and the USA; financial support could extend to professional linguistic assistance for contributors. The journal would mix original articles with reviews (mainly of books in German) and strive for both balance and interaction between subdisciplines. Some of the best German SM and EM is already published in English; the new journal would encourage HM to follow suit. The journal would be welcomed by innumerable non-German-speaking musicologists who are uncomfortable with their ignorance of German-language musicology – giving the discipline a new international presence.

On the basis of my experience as member of the editorial boards of *Contemporary Music Review*, *Jahrbuch Musikpsychologie*, *Journal of New Music Research*, *Music Perception*, *Musicae Scientiae*, *Psychology of Music*, and *Research Studies in Music Education*, I recommend that each submission to the proposed journal be anonymously peer-reviewed by one German-speaking and one non-German-speaking musicologist. The peer-review process should be organized by a subeditor who, on the basis of the reviews, decides whether and how a paper should be published, and sends a rationale to reviewers, editor, and author(s). German-speaking scholars would be motivated to publish in the journal as long as it was highly rated in research evaluation exercises. Contributions from non-German-speaking scholars would address current issues in German musicology.

Other strategies

Books. The main criteria for publishing an academic book are market demand and scholarly quality. German musicology should continue to move toward the free market and away from subsidies; books should only be published if there is a reasonable demand. A book's scholarship is best evaluated and improved on the basis of anonymous peer reviews by both German-speaking and non-German, German-reading scholars. Editors should rely primarily on the opinions of reviewers. Because the public presence of an academic discipline is increasingly important for the maintenance of professorships and budgets, popular texts should be encouraged in parallel with serious academic texts.

Conferences. A modern academic conference is not an exclusive club but a dynamic *Tummelplatz* of developing ideas. Originality and standards are best maintained by a public call for papers followed by blind abstract review. Speakers should be selected on the basis of their submission (not academic status) and encouraged to respect reviewers' comments when preparing their presentations. German musicology would also benefit from more foreign-language participation at international conferences. While there is already a clear trend in this direction (www.ims-online.ch), German-speaking participants could benefit from more English language support.

Dissertations. German students of musicology need more undergraduate courses in English. Dissertations should more often be written in English, or be accompanied by a non-German abstract or submission to a foreign-language journal. Doctoral examination committees should include an international expert who reads German but sends written comments to the chair in another language. The thesis defence should be held in English if requested by the candidate. Ph.D. programs in musicology should also be open to students with interdisciplinary

backgrounds that do not directly include musicology but are relevant to their chosen topic.

Careers. Employers in fast-developing areas like media and management are not always aware of parallel changes in musicology and the employability of musicology graduates. Public relations work could address this. Given the shortage of school teachers, musicology should promote the introduction of a general postgraduate teaching diploma available to musicology graduates. This would lead to an improvement in the quality of secondary education in musicology, and hence of incoming university students.

Finance

The proposed developments would be expensive; finance is the key. Currently, HM is better funded than SM and EM (Sweers, 2000). New positions in EM and SM might either be converted from HM or gained by jointly approaching new, external financial sources. A loss of HM professorships could be accommodated by sharpening the distinction between repertoire-based teaching (contract staff, lecturers) and advanced conceptual teaching (professors). Redistribution of other resources available to (H)M could help HM-scholars visit conferences in other subdisciplines and collaborate across disciplines. It could also finance linguistic assistance: native speakers of English, who read German and understand musicology, could be employed to improve not only the *intelligibility* of texts but also their linguistic *style* (particularly important in the humanities).

Conclusion

My main suggestion is to adapt the structure and content of (German) musicology courses and departments to reflect modern developments in international music(ology) (Konrad, 2001). Further strategies that could help prevent the disappearance of further musicological professorships and departments include: stressing that music is as important as ever to human societies; highlighting the value of transferable skills acquired through humanities education (critical thinking, clear argumentation); and emphasizing the cultural relevance of the humanities – or sidestepping their decline by stressing the role of science in musicology.

German musicology should not necessarily imitate other countries. For example, the American distinction between AMS (history) and SMT (theory) would not improve interdisciplinary balance, since both are primarily oriented toward HM. Instead, Germany should draw on international experience to initiate reforms that maintain its own continuity

and heritage (Finscher, 2000). It was German speakers who established the first truly interdisciplinary, international musicology. Germany should now aim to resume that leading international position.

Acknowledgments. I thank William Caplin, Nicholas Cook, Nicola Dibben, Arnfried Edler, Jan Hemming, Ellen Hickmann, Reinhard Kopiez, Gunter Kreutz, Andreas Lehmann, Sabine Meine, Robert Pascal, Rüdiger Schumacher, Jonathan Stock, and Britta Sweers for their critical comments.

References

- Adler, G. (1885). Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft. *Vierteljahresschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 1, 5-20.
- Babich, B. E. (2001). Postmodern musicology. In V. E. Taylor & C. Winquist (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.
- Balkwill, L. & Thompson, W. F. (1999). A cross-cultural investigation of the perception of emotion in music. *Music Perception*, 17, 43-64.
- Becker, J. (1986). Is Western art music superior? *Musical Quarterly*, 72, 341-359.
- Blum, S., Bohlman, P. V., & Neuman, D. M. (Eds.) (1991). *Ethnomusicology and modern music history*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.
- Blume, F. (1954). Musikforschung und Musikleben. *Kongressbericht der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung* (Bamberg, 1953) (pp. 7-23). Kassel.
- Buckley, A. (Ed.) (2000). *Hearing the past: Essays in historical ethnomusicology and the archaeology of sound*. U. Liège: Études et Recherches Archéologiques.
- Castellano, M. A., Bharucha, J. J., & Krumhansl, C. L. (1984). Tonal hierarchies in the music of north India. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 113, 394-412.
- Cook, N. (1998). *Music: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Cook, N., & Everest, M. (1999). *Rethinking music* (Preface). Oxford.
- Draeger, H.-H. (1955). Musikwissenschaft. In W. Schuder (Ed.), *Universitas litterarum* (pp. 635-652). Berlin: de Gruyter. Cited in *MGG*, 6 (1997), 1808.
- Elschek, O. (Ed.) (1993). *Systematische Musikwissenschaft*, 1/2 (Special issue on "Stand der systematischen Musikforschung heute").
- Feder, G. (1980). Empirisch-experimentelle Methoden in der Musikforschung. *Musikforschung*, 33, 409-431.
- Finscher, L. (2000). "Diversi diversa orant": Bemerkungen zur Lage der deutschen Musikwissenschaft. *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, 57, 9-17.

- Flotzinger, R. (1998). Postmodernism in music. *European Review*, 6 (1), 45-51.
- Haydon, G. (1941). *Introduction to musicology*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Hickmann, E. et al. (Eds.) (2000, 2002). *Studien zur Musikarchäologie I, II, III*. Rahden, Westfalen: Marie Leidorf.
- Hinrichsen, H.-J. (2000). Musikwissenschaft: Musik – Interpretation – Wissenschaft. *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, 57, 78-90.
- Holtmeier, L. (1999). Music theory between art and science. *Tijdschrift voor Muziektheorie*, 4/3, 222-226.
- Kartomi, M. (1993). Comparative musicology and music aesthetics. *Systematische Musikwissenschaft*, 1/2, 257-282.
- Kerman, J. (1985). *Contemplating music*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Konrad, U. (2001). ars-musica-scientia: Musikwissenschaft als Geisteswissenschaft im Orchestra der Wissenschaften. *Forschung & Lehre*, 11, 577-580.
- Kopiez, R., Langner, J., & Steinhagen, P. (1999). Afrikanische Trommler (Ghana) bewerten und spielen europäische Rhythmen. *Musicae Scientiae*, 3, 139-160.
- Kramer, L. (2000). Ein Phantasiestück zur Jahrtausendwende. *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, 62, 101-107.
- Kreutz, G., & Bastian, H. G. (in press). Musikwissenschaft an der Musikhochschule. *Diskussion Musikpädagogik*.
- Kunst, J. (1950). *Musicologica, a study of the nature of ethno-musicology*. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Vereeniging Indisch Instituut.
- Merriam, A. P. (1977). Definitions of "comparative musicology" and "ethnomusicology". *Ethnomusicology*, 21, 189-204.
- Motte-Haber, H. de la (1980). Stellung der Systematischen Musikwissenschaft innerhalb der Musikwissenschaft. *Musikforschung*, 33, 431-440.
- Nettl, B. (1999). The institutionalization of musicology. In N. Cook & M. Everest (Eds.), *Rethinking music* (pp. 287-310). Oxford University Press.
- Parncutt, R. (2000). Implications for mainstream musicology of recent research in music cognition. In D. Greer (Ed.), *Musicology and sister disciplines* (pp. 538-541). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Parncutt, R., & McPherson, G. E. (Eds.) (2002). *The science and psychology of music performance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Riemann, H. (1908). *Grundriß der Musikwissenschaft*. Leipzig: Quelle&Meyer.
- Seeger, C. (1977). *Studies in musicology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sweers, B. (2000). Ethnomusicology in Germany. *Society for Ethnomusicology Newsletter*, 34/3.

- Tagg, P. (1987). Musicology and the semiotics of popular music. *Semiotica*, 66-1/3, 279-298.
- Walter, M. (1994). *Grundlagen der Musik des Mittelalters*. Stuttgart, Weimar.
- Walter, M. (2001). Thesen zur Auswirkung der dreißiger Jahre auf die bundesdeutsche Nachkriegs-Musikwissenschaft. In Foerster et al. (Eds.), *Musikforschung–Nationalsozialismus–Faschismus* (pp. 489-509). Mainz: Are.
- Wiora, W. (1965). Ethnomusicology and the history of music. *Studia Musicologica*, 7, 187-193.
- Yi, S. W. (Ed.) (1999). *Music, mind and science* (Introduction, pp. 1-7). Seoul National University Press.