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GREETINGS! It is with great pleasure that I introduce this booklet celebrating the seventy-fifth anniversary of the American Musicological Society. Plans for a memento of our anniversary began several years ago, when the Committee on the History of the Society, chaired by Elizabeth Aubrey, proposed to the AMS Board the creation of a commemorative DVD. As our anniversary grew closer and time grew shorter, the Board decided that we should publish a booklet similar to the one issued during our fiftieth anniversary. At that time, Richard Crawford, then President of the AMS, wrote the superb essay “American Musicology Comes of Age: The Founding of the AMS,” which traces the history of the Society up to 1950. James Haar, who played an instrumental role in that publication, was invited to write the essay for this occasion. The present booklet was to be distributed at our Philadelphia meeting, but in light of the historic nature of our celebration, all agreed that we expand its scope and significance to include a commemoration of the meeting itself.

The seventy-fifth anniversary meeting was, by all accounts, a magnificent affair. Philadelphia, the site of our first and fiftieth anniversary meetings, offered the perfect setting for our grand fête. No fewer than 1,600 people were in attendance, representing all ages of the Society from undergraduate students, some of whom were there under the auspices of the Eileen Southern Cultural Diversity Fund, to long-term members of over sixty years. The program reflected the eclecticism of our discipline as did memorable evening musical events ranging from the Philadelphia Orchestra, Thomas Hampson’s “Song of America” recital, and the contemporary music group, Orchestra 2001, to Jazz at the Painted Bride, and the early music group, Piffaro. Two new features of the meeting, “prime time” panel sessions by various AMS study groups and committees, and five mid-day concerts (three in a venue outside the hotel) proved to be a huge success.

The theme of past, present, and future permeated the meeting, not only with the amalgamation of new and old on the program, but also in the special events. A fascinating poster display of memorabilia in the book exhibit area, prepared by AMS Archivist Marjorie Hassen, celebrated the early years of our Society. Documents on display included nomination letters for membership of several illustrious musicologists, and Gustave Reese’s 1936 letter to Otto Kinkeldey informing him about the newly constituted American Musicological Society. The pièce de résistance

was a souvenir program from the first International Congress hosted by the AMS in 1939 (see pp. 76–80). Held to coincide with the New York World’s Fair, the congress featured the best American musicology had to offer, with sessions on Primitive and Folk Music in North America, Mediaeval and Renaissance Music, Music and Science, and Hispanic Music. Interestingly, the program of that early conference mirrored in many ways our present seventy-fifth anniversary meeting in its breadth and scope.

Paying homage to our history also dominated the Presidential Forum at the Philadelphia meeting, where we honored past presidents, honorary and corresponding members, and those who have held long-term membership in our Society of fifty years or more. The number of our esteemed members, many of whom made a special effort to attend, was extraordinary. Almost all our living past presidents, eighteen honorary members, and five corresponding members attended, as did over thirty of the nearly one hundred people who have been members for more than fifty years. Four of them—Edmund Bowles, Isabelle Cazeaux, Joseph Kerman, and Hans Tischler (who celebrated his ninety-fifth birthday in 2010)—were singled out in recognition of more than sixty years as AMS members.
From recollections of the past, our thoughts shifted to the present at our Business Meeting and Awards Ceremony, where the OPUS Campaign took pride of place. The idea for this ambitious five-year capital campaign emerged at the March 2002 retreat of the Board in Columbus during Jessie Ann Owens’s presidency. Elaine Sisman, then vice president, coined the campaign’s acronym OPUS: Opening Paths to Unlimited Scholarship. The campaign was officially launched at a gala benefit dinner held at the 2004 AMS meeting in Seattle during Peter Burkholder’s presidential administration. Jessie Ann Owens chaired OPUS during its initial phase until November 2005, when D. Kern Holoman and Anne Walters Robertson took over as co-chairs. By February 2006, the campaign was approaching its first million. During the past four years, OPUS has garnered major grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and the Gladys Delmas Foundation as well as contributions from nearly half of our membership. We can be proud that at the close of the campaign the amount raised totaled over $2 million.

At this culmination of our five-year fund-raising efforts, we can now reflect on what we have accomplished. Through the generosity of so many friends and members of our Society, we now have over twenty different publication awards, subventions, and travel grants. Two of the funds were established through major gifts by Thomas Hampson and Margarita Hanson. Many pay tribute to current esteemed members of our Society: Claire Brook, Lewis Lockwood, Joseph Kerman, H. Colin Slim, Ruth Solie, and Robert Stevenson. Others honor the memory of cherished colleagues—James Anthony, Elizabeth Bartlet, Barry Brook, Lenore
Coral, John Daverio, H. Wiley Hitchcock, Donna Cardamone Jackson, Jan LaRue, Janet Levy, Claude Palisca, Martin Picker, Harold Powers, Eileen Southern, and Eugene Wolf—who will live on for generations through these funds and through the great achievement of the OPUS Campaign.

If the Business Meeting and Awards Ceremony highlighted the present, our last special event, the Saturday night Joint Alumni Reception, celebrated the future of our Society. Twenty-seven universities participated in the event. At 11 pm we marked the conclusion of the OPUS Campaign by holding the last raffle drawings, which included a volume from the Mozart Operas in Facsimile contributed by the Packard Humanities Institute, two sets contributed by Oxford University Press: Richard Taruskin’s Oxford History of Western Music, the Encyclopedia of Popular Music, and the magnificent AMS quilt handcrafted by Mary Natvig, Annegret Fauser, Lydia Hamessley, and Honey Meconi. Our celebrations ended with the singing of “Happy Birthday” to our Society (see the photos, pp. 40–42).

The present volume commemorates this historic occasion by offering essays by Lewis Lockwood, Suzanne Cusick, and Charles Hiroshi Garrett delivered at the 13 November 2009 Presidential Forum, photographs taken at the event (pp. 38–39, 60–63), and selections from the AMS Archives displayed at the meeting. It also presents the anniversary essay by James Haar originally commissioned for the booklet as well as appendices containing complete listings of past boards of directors, honorary and corresponding members, editors-in-chiefs of the Journal of the American Musicological Society, annual meetings, Society award winners, fellowship recipients, and books published by the AMS.

I should like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to Charles Atkinson, past-president, who initiated the booklet. John Roberts, chair of the Committee on the History of the Society, was there from start to finish, generously overseeing compilation of the lists and providing editorial assistance. I am grateful to Craig A. Monson, who assisted in the editing. Thanks also go to Robert Judd for his expertise with the production of the volume. We hope that you will enjoy this booklet and find it a fitting tribute and meaningful memento of our seventy-fifth anniversary.

Jane A. Bernstein
President
Presidential Forum

Philadelphia, November 2009
AS I BEGAN to think about this forum and its charge to celebrate the seventy-fifth anniversary of our Society, the emblem of my alma mater the City College of New York came to mind. It portrays an allegorical female figure, the three “Provinces of Scholarship,” whose three faces look in different directions; one turns left, another right, and the third gazes straight at us. The inscription *Respice, Adspice, Prospice* that frames her three aspects roughly translates: Regard the past, examine the present, and look toward the future. I believe that commemorating our Society’s anniversary is a fitting time to contemplate this motto.
Over the past three-quarters of a century our Society has witnessed many remarkable changes. From its founding fifty-one members, the AMS has grown to 3,500 strong. Our membership has not only increased in size but also in diversity. Two years after its creation, our Society included twenty women within a membership of 145; women now make up about fifty percent of the AMS. During the last decade, we have also witnessed a growth in the ethnic diversity of our membership, and in the coming years, our Society’s multiculturalism will certainly continue to broaden. Our scholarly interests have also become more wide-ranging over the past twenty-five years. As we continue to draw on our discipline’s past traditions, we have branched out and opened up to an astounding array of new subjects and discourses in the study of music. Musicology, like the musical experience itself, is a dynamic ongoing process, very much in the present, yet indebted to the past, and continually moving towards the future. These are exciting times indeed!

Now I am pleased to introduce essays by Lewis Lockwood, Suzanne Cusick, and Charles Hiroshi Garrett, who, in addressing the themes of past, present, and future, will offer their personal views of our Society, its history, and their place within it.
The AMS at Seventy-five: Some Personal Reflections

Lewis Lockwood

The past is never dead. It isn’t even past.

—William Faulkner, Requiem for a Nun

IN 1984 RICHARD CRAWFORD wrote a fiftieth-anniversary essay on the founding of the society. In closing Crawford summarized what he took to be the founders’ legacy:

internationalism, probity, seriousness of purpose, and a dedication to a standard of quality that, if not explicitly defined, is nevertheless presumed self-evident to qualified practitioners of the craft . . .

Crawford detected in the Society “a tone of formality that . . . together with a preoccupation with the past, has encouraged those who do not share it to look elsewhere for scholarly companionship.” Of course he was referring to the formation of the societies for ethnomusicology and for music theory in the 1950s and 1970s, by scholars whose interests lay outside Western music history, the traditional main province of the AMS.

Twenty-five years later, what has become of that “tone of formality” and what has happened since 1984 to color and transform the landscape? How did the Society come to be what it is today, and what will its future be like? Since my crystal ball is


2. Ibid.
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in the repair shop, since I’m one of three contributors today, and since I’m speaking as a senior citizen with a long memory, I’ll take the liberty of focusing more on the past than the future and I will mingle personal reflections with as much historical objectivity as I can muster.

I belong to the generation whose teachers founded this Society or were among its earliest members. They left an indelible stamp on it and on us. As an undergraduate at Queens College New York in the early 1950s I was swept into the field by Edward Lowinsky, who had escaped Nazi Germany, had come to Queens from Black Mountain College, and had recently published his celebrated book, *Secret Chromatic Art in the Netherlands Motet* (1946). However controversial its central thesis about secret chromaticism, this book was a passionate and brilliant portrayal of double meaning in music and in the cultural history of the Renaissance. Lowinsky was a formidable presence. In his music history course he played motets by Gombert and Clemens non Papa at the piano, moving into and out of his favorite passages with unwritten chromatic modulations. More broadly, he was an excellent pianist and a superb musician, whose course on analysis had us writing weekly papers on the Well-Tempered Clavier and on Beethoven piano sonatas.

From Queens I went on to Princeton for graduate work, there encountering scholars of the stature of Oliver Strunk, Arthur Mendel, and as a visitor, Nino Pirrotta. Differently gifted as they all were, Strunk made the deepest impression. In part for his magisterial command of the vast territories and byways of every field of music history, modestly and quietly communicated in seminars and in his only book, his *Source Readings in Music History* of 1950, which many of you probably know from the revised edition edited by Leo Treitler in 1998. What Strunk conveyed as a teacher stemmed from his reserved character, his restraint and patience in dealing with issues, with people, and with controversies. Strunk published very little. His insights were revealed in his teaching and kept in his meticulously written notebooks (which are now at the American Academy in Rome). It was in Rome that a number of his former students convened a conference in his memory in 2002. The papers were later published in the little volume, *Remembering Oliver Strunk: Teacher and Scholar,* and I’m drawing on my own paper for that meeting in some of these remarks today. As Joe Kerman put it in his essay for Strunk, “Oliver always got at the really important question in anything he was dealing with . . . he would deconstruct the most tangled situations into a bundle of points that seem so simply and inevitably germane . . . that one hardly noticed the creative analysis behind them.”

As a founding member of the AMS in 1934, Strunk was then a mainstay within a small community of like-minded scholars, and it is no surprise that he was tapped

---


to be Editor-in-chief of the first issue of *JAMS* in 1948. After the hibernation imposed by World War II, the Society was ready to re-establish itself in a stronger and more optimistic way than before, and the *Journal* was to be the primary carrier of this new spirit. That spirit is still embodied in its By-Laws, which tell us that “the object of the Society shall be the advancement of research in the various fields of music as a branch of learning and scholarship.” I need not say that every element in this statement is freighted with meanings and connotations that are likely to resonate differently now than they did three generations ago, but for me they continue to carry weight in changing times—or maybe I should say, even in our changing times. One connotation, so clear then and perhaps still needing emphasis, was that the very idea of a scholarly discipline for music was for many outside intellectuals a questionable proposition. For most people in the general culture, music was—and is—immediate experience pure and simple; music was what one played, or sang, or heard in concerts or recordings. To many people the idea of knowing music in its inner dimensions, thinking about its structural or historical perspectives, even its poetics, seemed a far-off or imaginary activity. Perhaps for this reason, as Crawford put it, there was a tacit understanding in the beginning that musicology in America should have a large measure of seriousness of purpose. And as it turned out, this small band of serious scholars quietly, and without the slightest touch of sensationalism, changed the American culture. They made it possible for musicology to become an accepted scholarly discipline.

In retrospect it is clear that in 1948 Strunk designed the first issue of *JAMS* to embody as broad a program as anyone could imagine in those years. As he put it in his editorial preface, the appearance of a formal Journal “marks a turning point in the history of the Society and gives concrete expression to the Society’s confidence in its own stability and sense of purpose.” The opening article was a tribute by Otto Kinkeldey to Johannes Wolf, a pioneering medievalist who had died in Germany a year earlier, in 1947. In 1935 the Nazis had driven Wolf into retirement from his post at the Berlin State Library, and he had lived since then on a barely adequate pension. Strunk was personally close to both men. As a student Strunk had dropped out of Cornell and played the piano in silent movies in Buffalo and Rochester, had come back to Cornell in the 1920s to take a course in musicology there with Kinkeldey, and then went off to Germany to study with this same Johannes Wolf, who had also been Kinkeldey’s doctor-father in Berlin back in 1909.

So the first article in the first *JAMS* had a personal and a professional agenda. It was written by Strunk’s American father-figure about his German one, and it was also a tribute by the first AMS President, Otto Kinkeldey, to an eminent German scholar. In both ways it signals the indebtedness of American musicology to German scholarship, to *Musikwissenschaft* as a discipline, a field of dreams that aspired to knowledge of and about music over a wide range of intellectual domains but with Western music history as its core enterprise.

---

5. Some of what follows is based on my “Oliver Strunk, the *L’homme armé* and American Musicology,” in *Remembering Oliver Strunk, Teacher and Scholar*, 81–88.
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The rest of the first issue tells a further story about breadth and scope. Its other articles are by Alfred Einstein on Mozart manuscripts; by Edward Lowinsky on sixteenth-century scores; and by Richard Waterman, on “‘Hot’ Rhythm in Negro Music.” Waterman’s title is symptomatic of the era, but what is interesting is that his material ranged from music of West Africa and Trinidad to Tin Pan Alley, including three examples from the song “It’s Always You” by Johnny Burke and Jimmy Van Huesen, quoting arrangements by Jack Mason and Benny Goodman. Waterman, by the way, was among the founders of the Society for Ethnomusicology a few years later.

Accordingly, the first issue of JAMS was a lot more ecumenical than most people might think, and it also offered a set of book reviews by M. D. Herter Norton; Donald Grout; Kathi Meyer-Baer; Paul Nettl; Glen Haydon; and John Gutman. If anyone is wondering about freedom of speech or editorial control, a reading of Grout’s review of Einstein’s Music in the Romantic Era should settle it. Grout recognized Einstein’s brilliance and eminence in many fields, but he found this book disappointing, said it showed signs of “exhaustion”; and indicted it for what seemed to be “a constant, and apparently intentional avoidance of any coming to real grips with the substance of the music itself.”

So the little world of American musicology in 1948 showed a clear impulse towards substantial breadth, and JAMS revealed that it was open to opposing viewpoints among professional practitioners. To say that the former tendency continued in JAMS over the next decades would be unfortunately untrue. Instead, the rise of a parallel American journal for ethnomusicology soon began to absorb the energies of scholars in non-Western and vernacular musics. And although the seminal reviews by Milton Babbitt in JAMS in the early 1950s signaled that analysis and analytical thinking could find a home in the AMS, this field too was about to grow exponentially and its proponents would soon create other publishing outlets that gave them more scope.

Quite obviously I’m offering nothing more than a tiny telescopic view of the early past, the AMS of the early decades. By now, more than half a century later, cultural and political changes have shaken the world around us, and how could they not have a powerful effect on this field of scholarship as they have on all others? I’m thinking of the political upheavals of the post-World War II era; of the cold war and its aftermath; of Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan, of globalization and the volatile economy of our times. I’m thinking of the changes in communication that have come with the digital revolution and all its consequences; of the avalanches of information that fall upon us now at the mere touch of a computer key, of Google, Facebook, and Twitter. How long will it be before all our books and articles are transmitted electronically, before students, already working away at their laptops and iPhones, read everything on e-books just as they read older articles on JSTOR?

Beyond all this there are deeper issues in American political and social history that impinge on what members of this Society do and how they do it. I’m referring
to the civil rights movement that brought race relations to the forefront of our collective consciousness and laid the basis for the political transformations that have led to the election of Barack Obama. I’m referring to the new awareness of class, gender, and multi-culturalism that have swept the American intellectual and social landscape, with powerful consequences for our educational institutions and thus for what teachers and scholars do. I’m thinking of the intellectual turmoil surrounding the rise of post-modernism, with its challenges to traditional modes of knowledge and credibility in all intellectual fields. In our domain this has clearly been reflected in recent times by the proponents of a critical musicology that centers on the political, ideological, and contextual dimensions of music, largely though not exclusively under the banner of the “New Musicology.” As Treitler pointed out, there are obvious parallels with the “New Historicism” in literary studies, and comparable developments in history and in art history.7 Reactions to these shock waves have been evident in volumes with familiar titles: “Musicology and Difference,” “Women Making Music,” “Rethinking Music,” “Beyond Structural Listening,” and many more. New questions are being asked about the ontology of music, about works and contexts both historical and diachronic, about the cultural and social meanings of music, and many more related topics. All you have to do is to look at the programs of recent major musicological meetings (including this one) to see that multiplicity is the order of the day. I have no doubt that this spreading will persist, now and into the foreseeable future.

And so our Society at seventy-five has changed from being what it once was—a small and reasonably coherent fraternity of like-minded scholars—to become an umbrella organization, a structure for the annual ingathering of many independent subgroups, small communities of scholars or critics (or, if some people refuse the dichotomy, scholar/critics). As if in an annual replay of the California gold rush—and not without Chaplinesque moments—each group comes back to our national meetings to stake or renew its claim, carve out time and space, reinforce allegiances and create new ones, give papers or recitals and pursue discussions, draw up plans and ponder possibilities, launch newsletters and hang on for dear life to whatever financial support it can find. The term “interest group” can equally apply to those musicologists whose aim is to question the very nature of musicological discourse, thus of specialization itself as a condition of our intellectual and musical life.

Are we now witnessing an enlargement of what was, or a paradigm shift in the nature of the field and, accordingly, its principal American society? It depends on your point of view. Rose Rosengard Subotnik in a recent essay proposes what she calls a “Next Paradigm” for musicology, which she sees as “being shaped, in part, by doubts, and even a pervasive anxiety, about the status and future of writing.”8 On one level the question being raised is this: “in writing about music, what can


one say that is valuable and true?” She has much more to say about this than I can mention here, but the question is a profoundly important one.

In a time of intellectual ferment such as we have been living through for twenty-five years or more, there is a manifest tendency for dualistic thinking to dominate the discussion, in what I think is a misguided effort to express deeply complex tendencies and proclivities in simple ways: “Old” vs. “New;” “Historicist” vs. “Structuralist”—once upon a time, “History vs. Theory”—these are merely slogans of opposition that do little or nothing to reveal the subtle ways in which scholars actually think and work—and like all slogans they belong to parties that are designed to win followers. They make it uncomfortable for students to cross boundaries despite a wish to regain that sense of the wholeness of experience that they have been feeling about music since childhood. I can only voice my personal belief that no scholar I have ever known, however devoted to the deep pursuit of a special territory in a special field, has ever lost that underlying yearning to regain and express that sense of wholeness that makes the entire enterprise possible.

But I also want to raise a specter from the grave, namely old-fashioned specialization—which for me is not a limitation but a necessary condition for producing work that can have a chance to stand the test of time. In fact the claim for the value of specialization is as old as the serious study of scholarship itself. A classic statement of this view, if I may dredge it up from the deep, was Max Weber’s essay of 1918, “Wissenschaft als Beruf,” normally translated as “Science as a Vocation” even though the great sociologist meant by “Wissenschaft” not only the hard sciences but also the humanities, or humane sciences, as they are called in France. Weber was writing at a time of enormous historical change, his Germany having just collapsed at the end of World War I. In framing this essay he was well aware of the revolutions brought on by Einstein and by Freud, yet he also included the more traditional-minded humanities as part of his subject. Weber’s primary plea was that anyone aspiring to scholarship accept the inevitable role of the specialist and have the unremitting intellectual curiosity that to Weber made true scholarship possible. Thus “whoever lacks the capacity to put on blinders, so to speak, and to come up to the idea that the fate of his soul depends on whether or not he makes the correct conjecture at this passage of this manuscript may as well stay away from science. He will never have what one may call the ‘personal experience’ of science.”

Now, so much has changed in the contours of intellectual life since Weber’s time that we can hardly imagine that his concept of “science” or better, “Wissenschaft” can be simply transported into our time and milieu. For, although for many scholars of Western music history the fundamental importance of studying sources needs no underlining, we have to recognize that in many cultures in the world we live in, and in some dimensions of our own culture, “sources” are not only, or even mainly, written ones, but have to include unwritten forms of musical experience created by practitioners—composers, performers, musicians of every

kind. However differently realized, they form a matrix of material we cannot ever afford to ignore.10

At this point I want to reflect on two personal experiences. I have been working in Western music all my professional life—first as a young cellist, then in the Renaissance with which Lowinsky dazzled me a long time ago; more recently in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, above all on Beethoven. The close study of Beethoven’s life, work, and significance was a field to which I introduced myself, almost with a feeling of necessity, though not without guidance from earlier teachers such as Elliot Forbes and Milton Babbitt. At Princeton in the 1950s I had a seminar with Forbes on his revision of Thayer’s classic biography; and it was from Babbitt, who then taught an astonishing survey of the history of theory, that I first heard the name of Gustav Nottebohm, the pioneering scholar of Beethoven’s sketchbooks, whose work is still essential.

Two years ago I had occasion for the first time in my life to visit Bali, that extraordinary island now part of Indonesia, formerly a kingdom with a long and remarkable history. Bali is an island with about three million people and twenty thousand Hindu-Animist temples (within predominantly Muslim Indonesia it maintains a highly independent religious orientation.) I learned that in each temple and each service a group of men in temple garb play the gamelan, the famous ensemble of tuned gongs and other indigenous instruments. Since in each village in the country a religious service is practiced somewhere every day of the year, the sound of gamelan playing is everywhere. What I’m describing is obviously not a seasoned experience, it is just my limited impression as a novice visitor, a tourist, but it was enough to make me realize how true it is that such beautiful traditional music—whose “sources” are the people themselves who practice it—is entirely embedded in the fabric of social and religious life that has dominated this island for centuries.11 Of course I have tried to find out more about this remarkable tradition, and I have learned a great deal from the writings of Colin McPhee and Michael Tenzer, who have devoted their lives to the elucidation of this music and this culture.

And this experience made me think about “embeddedness” in the Western music that I have been involved with for so many years. When I worked with the Juilliard String Quartet on a recent book about selected Beethoven quartets, I was deeply aware at every moment that both they and I were totally immersed in these works, though with different yet overlapping, angles of vision. I was as deeply interested in their ideas on these quartets, as they painstakingly prepared their performances and annotated scores—as they were in finding out about what biography and source studies can show us, even in bare outline, about the origins

10. Again, this viewpoint was richly elaborated by Nino Pirrotta in his work on late medieval music, and more broadly as well as eloquently by Leo Treitler in many of his essays on music, history, and methodology.

11. My reading on the subject has led me to the work of Colin McPhee and to Michael Tenzer’s Balinese Music (North Clarendon, VT: Charles Tuttle Co., 1998) and his other books on Balinese music, based on years of experience living in Bali and interacting with local musicians.
of these works. For example, about Beethoven’s revision of Opus 18 No. 1, for which we have two complete versions; or about the drastic compositional changes he made as he was writing out the final version of Opus 59 No. 1.

Nobody doubts that to play as well as the Juilliard Quartet requires, to put it mildly, “specialization”—and yet all of us who are non-professional chamber music performers can aspire to such a level, whether we reach it or not. Still, we also know that no one can do everything equally well. So do they when it comes to what musicologists know about the works we have studied for a lifetime—these performers regard such experience with the respect and pleasure that comes with gaining new perspectives on something you love. Above all there was a feeling of mutual engagement, and of humility in the face of our joint responsibility in dealing with works of the highest caliber, whose mysteries we were exploring.

This experience resonates with what Richard Rorty called “the inspirational value of great works of literature.”12 I’m not suggesting that such works cannot be, and should not be, studied in many other ways, including their wide ranges of possible meanings and contexts—but it does mean that in our field such wider dimensions take on greater significance the more they grow out of the deep engagement with musical substance that performing musicians take for granted. And if musicians like these are not clients for musicology, who is?

In the study of Western music history there is an undeniable focus not only on contexts but on individual composers from Perotin to Golijov and what they have tried to achieve, about the nature of popular and high art music through the ages, about musical experience, about style and substance, about organizing principles such as modality and tonality, about the origins and development of the music that is part and parcel of our history and culture—that is, we or some of us as Americans who stem from European roots. Some of the questions we ask can also resonate with those of other cultures, and even subcultures within our own larger framework—but when we study works of high art music created by master composers of the past, by Josquin, Mozart, or Wagner—quite obviously a host of issues will arise that do not normally appear in the study of cultures far removed from our own. I’m well aware that every element in what I have just said is the subject of ongoing cultural and historiographic critique by various scholars, and in the few brush-strokes of this brief contribution I can hardly get deeply into them. But what it reflects is the plurality of musics, therefore of musicologies, and of the importance of keeping a healthy respect alive for what other people do that is different from what you do.

In closing I’ll just invoke an ancient and homely parable, that of the ship of Theseus. According to Plutarch, the hero Theseus had a ship that was preserved in Athens long after his time. The legend is that the Athenians gradually removed the planks of the ship as they decayed, one by one, and put in new ones. So philosophers from then on asked this enduring question: since eventually none

of the planks were the original ones, was the later ship the same one that formerly belonged to Theseus?

This society is our ship but we are also its ship-builders. We have a collective obligation to keep it in as good repair as we can, both while we sail on it and when we replace its planks, which I believe we should do as carefully and judiciously as we can. It is a collectivity bound loosely together by common interests, yet without some effort to hold it together it could be torn apart by sectarian oppositions. What then will we do about difference?

If there is a message in all this, it comes down to a call for both passion and restraint, the qualities I ascribed earlier to my two most formative teachers, Lowinsky and Strunk. Passion and imagination in the pursuit of difficult questions; restraint and tolerance for diversity. It means reading and hearing papers in fields you know nothing about, written from angles of insight utterly unlike your own, to get the feel of what is going on in someone else's territory. It means a recognition that the tracks in the forest may well have been trodden by predecessors who have to be given their due; that knowledge is cumulative, not entirely invented anew with every discovery; that our ancestors are our colleagues, right now.

We live amid much controversy about methods, modes of discourse, about the nature of musicology and its objects of study. But at the end of the day what is going to hold the field together is some distant sense of shared purpose and a combination of passion and restraint that are both worthy of emulation. My hope for the future of the AMS is the same as my hopes for the field, that a latent sense of common purpose can keep this society flourishing even as its communities and interest groups multiply and expand and as it moves forward in changing times.
Let’s Face the Music and Dance  
(or, Challenges to Contemporary Musicology)

Suzanne Cusick

There may be trouble ahead  
But while there’s moonlight and music  
And love and romance  
Let’s face the music and dance. 

Steeped as I am in the tradition of musicology that values the long-term implications of origins, and that, as a result, inhabits a temporality in which past, present, and future are mysteriously intertwined, I begin by remembering that the American Musicological Society was born in a time of crisis. The United States’ financial system was in ruins. Intellectuals of all political stripes struggled both to identify a “usable past” for the renewal of our country and to identify ways the arts could influence public life. Unemployment peaked in 1934, the year of our founding, at a staggering 21.7%. Yet troubled as it was, the time of our society’s origin was also a time of great creativity and wit—a time when Irving Berlin, through the bodies of Ginger Rogers and Fred Astaire, taught the country to think of music, love, and romance, and then face the music and dance.

I. Music. Love. Romance. I cannot think of these notions in relation to the society’s origins without remembering the name of Ruth Crawford Seeger. As Judith Tick, Ellie Hisama and others have ensured we know, Ruth Crawford was in Blanche Walton’s apartment on West 4th Street in New York when her future husband, Charles Seeger and other founding members of the parent organization of the

1. Irving Berlin, “Let’s Face The Music And Dance,” Copyright © 1935, 1936 by Irving Berlin; Copyright renewed. International copyright secured. All rights reserved. Reprinted by permission.
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AMS, the New York Musicological Society, held their second meeting on February 22, 1930. As she wrote in her diary:

The musicologists meet. It is decided that I may sit in the next room and hear [Joseph] Yasser about his new supra scale. Then when I come out for this purpose, I find someone has closed the doors . . . I walk past the closed door to my room, and when I pass I turn my head toward the closed door and quietly but forcibly say, “Damn you,” then go on to my room and read Yasser’s article. Later, my chair close to the door, I hear some of the discussion.²

Later still, in 1972, Charles Seeger would remember that he had excluded Crawford “to avoid the incipient criticism that musicology was ‘women’s work’.”³ Crawford’s exclusion at that meeting, I think, predicted the long-vaunted relationship of our society to gender (that is, to masculinity, femininity, women, people of non-normative sexualities), to difference more generally, and to musical creativity. Yet today we celebrate our diamond jubilee under the leadership of a woman president, Jane Bernstein—and she is far from the first. Indeed, since Janet Knapp’s election in 1975, and including Jane’s successor, Anne Walters Robertson, the society will have had nine women presidents (out of thirty-eight, so just under twenty-five percent of the total). I might add that it was a woman musicologist, Eileen Southern, who squarely addressed our profession’s legacy of racial exclusions by writing the first survey text of African American music.⁴ And although its first, 1970s wave dissipated all too soon—partly under pressure from a terrible job market—the second wave of feminist work in musicology has had significant effects on our society and our discipline, garnering one of our field’s few MacArthur Fellowships for Susan McClary’s brave, pioneering work; almost completely washing away our mid-twentieth century fetishizing of “the music itself,” and leaving in its wake the effort to balance critical, historical, and analytical approaches that was dubbed, now twenty years ago, a “new musicology.” Further, feminist musicologists succeeded in “changing the subject” (in Ruth Solie’s memorable phrase) to allow musicological knowledge claims to be made from many subject positions that our founders excluded.⁵ The profound queerness—the non-normativity, even the intrinsic, campy fabulousness and fun—of which


³. Hisama, 291.


musicology is capable has been not only acknowledged but, in many quarters, embraced. Increasingly, we think, talk, and write as if music were not a thing, not an autonomous entity, but a relationship; or, as if it were, to paraphrase Guthrie P. Ramsey, the audible circulation of social energy.6

And yet, when I think of our present and our future, Ruth Crawford’s and Eileen Southern’s ghosts haunt me with questions. Are we really so much more comfortable than our grandparents with the gender liminality Anglophone cultures associate with musicality? Do we, now, let women, queers, “others” into our rooms, and on what terms? Tamara Levitz, the chair of this year’s program committee, has noted the “distinct patriarchal frame” that persists in our own, collective submission of proposals for this epochal meeting, as she has noted our own lingering inclination to think of women as performers, not creators, and our lingering collective reluctance to submit to the Society’s review our scholarly work on gender, sexuality, race and class.7

Do we, now, let active composers into the room, and, if so, on what terms? This very evening, we will have been able to hear Susan McClary interview a living composer, David Del Tredici. That special session, created and paid for by members of the society’s LGBTQ Study Group, eerily re-split the roles of woman and creator that Ruth Crawford felt she had to straddle so long ago. At the same time, by staging the collegial exchange between a scholar and a creator that same session can seem to heal the 1930 exclusion of Crawford from the musicologists’ room. Yet the multiply vexed relationships to alterity and creativity predicted by her exclusion may have been healed less ambivalently even earlier in the day, when scholar composers George Lewis and Nina Eidsheim addressed a special session on the musical aesthetics of race and ethnicity sponsored by the Committee on Cultural Diversity. In a jam-packed room, both spoke to the extent to which new music can constitute audible, somatically-enacted theorizing of the world—a kind of theorizing that illuminates the relationships it animates every bit as much as our mostly historical, sometimes interpretive or critical work.

*Before the fiddlers have fled*
*Before they ask us to pay the bill*
*And while we still have the chance*
*Let’s face the music and dance.*

I cannot think of our Society’s present and future without seeing the pressing challenge that we engage anew the question of a usable past that so preoccupied


intellectuals in the decade of our origin. Many of us work as teachers, one way or another, and therefore we are daily involved in identifying and sustaining “usable musical pasts.” Like our grandparents, we might do well to ask ourselves “usable by whom, and for what interests?”

Our colleague Gary A. Tomlinson has suggested that all modern musicologies (including ethnomusicology) are entangled in a tradition of European culture that, sometime in the eighteenth century, arrogated to its own acoustical practices and mythologies the word “music,” consigning the rest of the world’s acoustical practices to such less transcendent notions as “song,” “dance,” “ritual.” He further suggests that this notion of “music” helped to distinguish “the West” from “the rest” in the European imaginary. Sustaining this distinction became the mostly unwitting work of our musicologies. Our music histories have done their part. In about fifty of this Society’s seventy-five years, our music histories have provided the United States with a usable musical past that has sustained our nation’s role as “leader of the free world” or, as people elsewhere might see it, as the successor and synthesizer of several European empires.

In the long decline of modernity that was the twentieth century, “music” thus defined has been gradually replaced as the de facto master discourse, in spite of (or perhaps because of) musicology’s emergence as its main discursive support. Doesn’t the use of music (or “sound design”) to torture those who resist the United States’ effort to sustain modernity’s arrogation of world resources to the West represent the logical conclusion of the decay process? That is, doesn’t the practice (so rooted in “modern” ideas of music’s effect on the psyche) reveal starkly the violence embedded in this notion of “music” all along? At the same time, don’t the prisoners’ accounts of their bodies being battered by sound expose the utter non-ineffability of this “music” (and therefore, in a way, the utter non-transcendence of the culture that invented the construct)? And, doesn’t it expose “the West” as having actually long acknowledged music as the opposite of ineffable, but as instead an almost irresistibly powerful medium of relationship that can all too easily turn into a real (not metaphorical or symbolic) weapon?

If the definition of “music” that our musicologies have sustained is in the last stages of its decay, then it seems likely that musicology may soon face a crisis more profound than either the minor revolution wrought by feminism and its offspring or the apparent employment crisis wrought by the current Great Recession. It will be more profound, too, than the need many of us recognize to reconfigure our

methodological and ideological relationships with ethnomusicology, music theory, “classical” new music, and that very new thing, “sound studies” (acoustemology).

With the collapse of modernity—through the last stages of which many of us will live—I think that what will be required of us is nothing less than a complete rethinking of what intellectual inquiry and speculation about music (and with music) might be, and of what kind of musical past might be usable in the new world taking shape. What purposes do we think music might, or should, serve? What should the generations that follow us know about the musical pasts to which we lay claim?

Do they need to learn that Francesca Caccini’s musical career prospered because of her usefulness to a de facto regent? That Beethoven constructed a public image as a genius that stuck with his emerging bourgeois public to such an extent that the ideologies of heroism attached to that image would come to seem inscribed in the very notes of his scores, and in the sounds (ineffable or not) those notes imply?

What do they need to know about chant, or about sound and vocalization as dynamic forces in performing a relation to the sacred in twelfth-century Europe? What do they need to know about the influences of Arabic and Persian musical systems on European ones, or the mutual influence of indigenous and colonizing musics in the Americas, in Africa, in Asia? What do they need to know about the transformation of “music” in our time into something that might better be called “audible media?” What do we think people who aspire to lead marching bands or church choirs, or to play in classical orchestras, need to know? And what do we think the population at large needs to know about the acoustic as a register of human sensory/cognitive experience, so as to enable our fellow citizens to make informed decisions about acoustic manipulations in malls, by vendors of iPods and mp3 players, in hospitals, airports, and film theatres, and in our prisons? How can we best prepare future generations of musical creators, scholars, teachers, and citizens to respond to the educational, musical, and ethical needs of the United States’ post-imperial moment, a moment we know is coming as surely as we know that global warming and the end of the world’s petroleum reserves are.

There may be teardrops to shed.

3.

We cannot think well about the construction of a musical past usable for the challenges of this century without also acknowledging how shifts in our intellectual and educational missions will interact with shifts in the thing we loosely call “the job market.” I was moved to do so some months ago. Reading the agony, disillusionment, anger, and despair on the AMS-list and the musicology wiki, expressed by young people who rightly feared for their economic and professional futures, I thought some one of us on this panel ought to respond. I thought it might as well be me, because I still remember what it felt like to lose a tenure-track job in 1982, when the Reagan recession drove the college where I worked into bankruptcy, and what it felt like to live for ten years the grindingly hard life of ad
hoc, marginal and marginalizing labor as a journeyman adjunct faculty member, what it felt like to teach at three institutions in a single day, preparing lectures in my head as I drove from place to place.

But I do not want to patronize you, my un- and under-employed colleagues, nor do I want to slip into some patronizing, falsely empathetic stance, some version of “I feel your pain” or “just hang on!” I remember too well how similar remarks would fill me with rage when I was young. Rage, despair, envy; three of the seven deadly sins came close to choking me alive; only luck and the immense generosity of some senior scholars in this room saved me. What I do want to say to you is this: the seven deadly sins are called that because they kill your soul. If left unchallenged in your consciousness, they will destroy the best part of you, destroy the very gifts you have to share with the world. Nothing, not even music or musicology, is worth that. So I urge you to adopt whatever spiritual practice it might take to transform the energy of rage, despair, and envy into energy for good work that is part of a good life.

What I most want to say, however, is addressed to my tenure-track colleagues, especially those who are tenured and secure. Dear colleagues, our un- and under-employed colleagues are immensely gifted people who need our help. They need us to understand that they suffer not only from the economic contraction of the Great Recession, but also from a profound restructuring of the way people work in a new capitalism. This restructuring has been underway for thirty years.

As sociologist Richard Sennett and media scholar Marc Bousquet have elaborated at length, the paradigmatic enterprise of the new capitalism is designed to be flexible, responsive to market changes, rather than to be stable. Responsiveness requires that an enterprise’s workforce consist, as much as possible, of casual labor, easily hired and fired in response to economic change. Workers who value long-term relationships, long-practiced skills, long-developed depth of knowledge, the craft of doing a job well for its own sake are discredited if not dismissed. They are replaced by new workers, who seem endlessly flexible in their knowledges and skills, who operate best as independent contractors rather than as a members of a team, and who can reinvent or re-engineer themselves as circumstances demand. Both kinds of workers labor in environments that increasingly discourage institutional or interpersonal loyalty, trust among co-workers, and the kind of informal mentoring that develops from long-lived social relations with colleagues.

I suspect that many of us who are older hear in Sennett’s description of the casualized workplace an explanation for what feels weird (or shallow, cold, presentist, unwelcoming) when we go to work. And I daresay all of us can hear, in the new capitalism’s devaluing of depth and craft, a profound challenge to our foundational beliefs as musicians, teachers, and scholars (a challenge about which many of us feel increasingly threatened and uneasy). Yet, immersed as we are in ever-more frenetic lives of teaching, mentoring, research, and publishing that are,

nonetheless, lives of great privilege, many of us can forget that the forces that make us feel weird—about the jobs we are lucky enough to have, or about the changes and challenges in musicology and this society—are as much economic as they are substantively intellectual. Economic, and often in extremely distressing interaction with the traditions of exclusion based on alterity we thought we had, or could, overcome. Economic forces, that is, greatly exacerbate our anxieties about our discipline’s inevitable shifts of style, substance, and subject, even as they lead us to wonder why we who have disciplinary privilege cannot effect more positive change.

We who work in academe, or aspire to do so, are all but locked into the system Sennett and Bousquet describe. The most obvious structural symptom of the new capitalism in our departments, and in our colleagues’ lives, is the long-lived trend toward ever more opportunities for TAs, adjuncts, “visiting artists,” post-doctoral fellows and non-tenure-track faculty on renewable contracts, and ever fewer entry-level tenure-track jobs, with ever higher standards for being hired, ever higher ones for tenure. These very changes, I think, militate against our abilities to reinvent ourselves and our profession in response to new concerns (or in preparation for the new, post-imperial America that will surely come). Both the casualization of academic labor and the anxiety it produces put pressure on academic departments to maintain a curricular status quo. We who have found our way into the system have to produce published work to stay there, so we teach within pre-existing parameters (if often very innovatively) more than we might like to, “until the book is done.” “The book” looms over us every day, discouraging us from the long lunches or relaxed drinks with colleagues in which the exchange of ideas and the team spirit to invent new curricula could be born. And, when we lose lines because of retirements or budget cuts, and must staff our core courses with adjuncts, we think, rightly, that it is irresponsible to put the burden of real curricular reform on our adjunct, temporary, post-docs, or three-year colleagues, many of them dismally paid and lacking benefits, or even on our tenure-track colleagues. How could we ask them to do other than step into the pre-ordained slots of the curricula they have inherited? The result is economically-based pressure to retain curricula that are structurally conservative, able only imperfectly to accommodate the hard-won new knowledge that have enabled our collective scholarly life to address (if not entirely resolve) the anxieties about alterity and creativity that vexed our society’s origins, and utterly unable to accommodate the profound rethinking of our usable past that would prepare us and our fellow citizens for the trouble ahead.

This is a trap from which we must escape for the sake of our intellectual integrity, our respect for the best that has been part of our society’s now-long tradition, and our commitment to the importance of scholarship about human acoustical

10. One of Bousquet’s most valuable, if troubling, insights is his demonstration that those of us who form the increasingly small percentage of the academic labor force who are tenured faculty derive our privilege by producing this army of casual academic workers. They are our graduate students, our graduate programs’ recent Ph.D.s. See Bousquet, 23, and Chapter Four, “Students Are Already Workers,” 125–56.
experiences, human interventions in the acoustical environment. Although it is true that this Society cannot, as an institution, have any more impact on the labor practices of the new capitalism than it can on the acoustical practices of our government’s dark prison at Kabul, we who are members of the Society can. I feel sure that we who are enmeshed in the academic part of the new capitalism can find ways to resist and evade the casualization of academic labor, the resulting exploitation of graduate students’, adjuncts’ and independent scholars’ labor and erudition, and the resulting economic and social pressures on our discipline’s capacity to change. We can do it even as we think about the relationship of our institutional and departmental labor practices to the political work our curricula contribute to sustaining an increasingly complex “American” identity (imperial or not) that engages its old anxieties about the relationship of gender, class, race, ethnicity, class, and culture to musical creativity.

We can do it because we come here—all of us—in love. Whether our notion of music is the one Tomlinson has identified or not, we are here to talk, think, make, write, be in the glorious presence of a medium and a relation and sometimes even, yes, a thing that we call “music” and that we just love, often with embarrassing and unaccountable passion. That passion is what circulates among us when we meet annually as a whole society, circulating most powerfully when it moves as social energy made audible—that is, as music. For many of us, it is a passion that has the force of the erotic, a force defined by the late Audre Lorde as the very medium of power. As she reminds us, “recognizing the power of the erotic within our lives can give us the energy to pursue genuine change within our world.”

“So,” as Irving Berlin put it,

\[
\text{while there's moonlight and music} \\
\text{And love and romance} \\
\text{Let's face the music and dance.}
\]

Enterprising Students and the Future of the American Musicological Society

Charles Hiroshi Garrett

When I began preparing to talk about the past, present, and future of the AMS, I started down a familiar path. I went to the archives—reading publications about the Society and paging through the AMS newsletters stored on our Society’s website. Some discoveries surprised me. For instance, in 1957, the AMS business meeting attracted a total of forty-eight members. At this year’s conference we may have that many attendees from the Philadelphia metropolitan area alone. Here’s another sign of change: in the first six decades of this Society, a total of three women were elected AMS President. In contrast, over the past decade six women have been elected to the same position. There is no doubt that AMS has grown and evolved. Strong leadership and generous members mean that we now bestow many fellowships, awards, and subventions, most of which did not exist at our last meeting in Philadelphia in 1984. The Society also continues to challenge members to do more, whether by volunteering to help meet our goals, by reaching out to the public, or by improving the experiences of various AMS constituencies. With an eye toward the future, my remarks will address that last task, by focusing on one of our largest and most significant constituencies, our student members. I believe that we all need to be actively involved in finding creative solutions to the major challenges today’s students face. As part of this effort, I also encourage all of our student members to make the most of the AMS by seeking greater involvement and ownership in the Society.

Students comprised more than twenty-five percent of our Society last year, accounting for around nine hundred individual memberships. Our rate of student participation is at the high end of the spectrum compared to other scholarly societies in music, art, history, and literature. With these nine hundred students in mind (as well as their many colleagues who have yet to join the AMS), I would like to read a few comments made by a former AMS President:
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There are problems ahead. The job market has been tight in recent years, just at a time when students are completing graduate work in musicology in record numbers, and there are predictions that the situation will not improve in the immediate future. This is a matter of concern for all of us, a matter I think we cannot afford to ignore. . . [Let’s] take time to discuss critical matters affecting the professional lives of our members and the future of our discipline.

This message, published in the *AMS Newsletter* by Charles Hamm in January 1973, has a familiar ring—by now AMS audiences have grown accustomed to hearing these sorts of remarks. We are, after all, a society founded during the Great Depression. As AMS President in 1994, Ellen Rosand expressed similar concerns about “the welfare of our student members, many of whom are gradually (and justifiably) becoming disillusioned by the dismal state of the job market.” If the scholarly exchanges that have taken place in print and online over the past year are representative of our Society, then such issues remain vivid for many in attendance today. Opinions vary on whether we are experiencing a temporary downturn or have entered into a permanent condition. Whatever the case, last year’s job market certainly felt harsh; some observers estimated a total of sixty-five available tenure-track jobs in the fields of musicology and ethnomusicology in 2008–09. Even fewer jobs have been announced this year. Although the present situation may not be unprecedented, it is fair to say that we are in the midst of an employment crisis that affects an enormous percentage of AMS members, and the type of crisis many other members have experienced before.

Unfortunately, these challenges may be with us for the foreseeable future, considering the state of the economy, the shifting nature of higher education, and the decrease in full-time music-related jobs both in and out of academia. It is therefore not surprising to encounter anger or frustration in private conversations and on blogs, web sites, the AMS-list, and various scholarly forums. You may have read the *New York Times* op-ed piece by Melody Rod-Ari, an art history graduate student who, after glimmers of hope, concluded: “Almost finished with my degree, I am faced with the reality that there may be no place for me.” I believe the present situation deserves not only our empathy but also a stronger dose of ingenuity from our Society and its individual members.

During the past twenty-five years alone, the AMS has become an extraordinarily well-funded organization that offers extremely generous support to students in the form of fellowships, grants, and other opportunities. But is this enough at this moment? How else might we help students prepare for the future? What do our students need most and how can we work toward achieving these goals? Let me begin to address these questions by outlining my own set of possible strategies to assist and empower our student members. I hope to stimulate discussion and lead in productive directions.


My initial suggestion recalls what took shape in 1973 in response to Charles Hamm’s comments. With support of Neal Zaslaw, then chair of the Program Committee, the AMS devoted a full session to issues surrounding the job crisis. Barry Brook led a panel titled “Musicology as a Profession” that dealt with the crisis in higher education and training, jobs, and prospects. I suggest we consider scheduling a similar panel during one of our new daytime program slots in Indianapolis. This could serve as a forum in which we can gauge how present conditions have affected student needs, garner suggestions from AMS members who have faced similar challenges, and learn how our colleagues across the nation are thinking about this issue and acting on it. For this kind of event, I believe it is especially critical to involve student members as panel participants or organizers, in order to gain their input and hear their perspectives.

I also encourage all of our student members to become even more actively engaged with the AMS by seeking further representation within the Society. Some students participate on the AMS council; others are members of selected AMS committees; many more present papers at local or national meetings. But students might emulate their cohorts in other scholarly societies, such as the American Studies Association, the Society for Ethnomusicology, and the Society for American Music, where student committees play an integral role. Such student committees, typically run by six to ten student volunteers, often with input from a faculty advisor, make all kinds of contributions. These may include managing student e-mail lists, circulating information about opportunities for students, recruiting new student members, or bringing student concerns to the attention of the Society’s Board of Directors. For annual conferences student committees usually stage student-friendly social events and activities, design panels about topics of particular interest to students, and organize student-only forums. In addition to building community and improving communication within a scholarly society, these groups stay in contact with their colleagues in other organizations to exchange information and collect fresh ideas. Student committees could prove helpful for our Society. There are many types of questions I believe these student groups could help to answer. Would it be productive to hold an open forum at the AMS meeting devoted to student issues? Would students find it useful for AMS to offer additional mentoring assistance, such as putting them in touch with faculty members outside their home institution? What programs or services offered by other scholarly societies would appeal to AMS student members?

Student committees often generate their own events, but they can also work productively in conjunction with other committees. I imagine that an AMS student committee would share common ground with our Committee on Career-Related Issues, an extremely active group that stages conference events about teaching, publishing, grant writing, alternative careers, and more. Together, the two groups might consider organizing a joint session that would tap into the experience of our membership to confront wider institutional challenges. What about a panel that explores how faculty and students can best interface with university administrators? (Let’s call it “Managing Your Dean.”) Because we are fortunate to have many AMS members who have served as administrators, perhaps we can convince one of them
to be a panelist, and learn from his or her experience. The panel could address questions such as:

- What successful approaches have faculty and students used to save or expand music curricula?
- What are useful strategies to preserve faculty lines, create new faculty positions, or convince administrators to fund joint interdisciplinary positions?
- Can AMS as an institution be helpful in this process?

I can imagine similar ties forming between a student committee and our current efforts in the areas of Cultural Diversity as well as Membership and Professional Development. My personal experience suggests that students treasure greater ownership in scholarly societies. Such an AMS student committee could help make all of us more aware of student concerns, and could give one quarter of our membership a greater voice.

Our talented and resourceful student members have taught us much over the years. Their intellectual creativity is of course on display at every conference, because the AMS is noteworthy for providing opportunities for so many students to present their work at our annual meetings—unlike conferences in some of our peer disciplines. We can also look to the long-standing success of student-run journals such as *Current Musicology*, *repercussions*, and the innovative online journal, *ECHO*. Formed a decade ago, *ECHO* took advantage of the multimedia possibilities offered by web publishing—a novel approach at the time, but one that has since spread to many other music journals. Acknowledging that members of younger generations often are the ones to turn first to new modes of publishing and communication, I wonder whether we are doing enough as a society, or in our roles as individual members in the field, to recognize the value of alternative modes of presentation and publishing, whether as part of graduate admissions, hiring procedures, or tenure dossiers. Today’s music students at every level use and value new forms of communication, and I hope that we will seek ways to reward anyone who can reach them effectively by any means. I am thinking in part of the many thoughtful blogs published by AMS members, which you can find linked on our Society’s web site. Someday down the road, I would not be surprised if there were an AMS award created to recognize musicological achievement through alternative publishing outlets.

I believe our Society can only profit by reaching out to its members and the general public using even more lines of communication. It is true that we employ a variety of means already: the list-serv, the web site, the newsletter, Bob Judd’s email reminders, an RSS feed, and even a twitter feed (yes, an AMS twitter feed is currently spreading the latest AMS news.) But is it possible to do more? Can selected highlights of conferences or forums like this one be made available as podcasts? Is an AMS member dreaming up an irresistible iPhone applet or developing an intensely musicological application with Google Maps? I imagine so. Is there more our Society wishes to do with Facebook or other forms of social networking? What
is the latest communication technology emerging just around the bend? I enjoy and appreciate everything we have in place today, but I know that each successive generation of students communicates using different means and with changing expectations. Perhaps some technologically savvy members, whether current or former students, would be interested in contributing ideas or lending a hand.

To underscore how valuable it can be for students to become involved in this society, I would like to conclude my talk by recalling an encounter during my first AMS conference. My goals were simple that year. I wanted to attend papers, to avoid saying anything really embarrassing, and to meet a few scholars whose work I admired (or perhaps just to see them from across a room). I noticed in the program that meetings were scheduled for a Committee on Cultural Diversity, and although I was not exactly sure what that meant, I was interested in learning more. The co-chair of the committee at that time was a professor named Guthrie Ramsey, whose work was familiar to me. What I didn’t know is just how tough it would be to corner him. Eventually I found an opportunity, and I asked him about the committee, hoping for a brief, courteous reply. What I got, however, was something very different. Professor Ramsey offered me an extraordinarily gracious invitation to attend the committee’s events and to observe its gatherings. Later that year, he invited me to join the committee as a student representative.

That meeting has always shaped how I view AMS—as a place where fruitful encounters can happen and where I could find like-minded colleagues in the midst of all the commotion. The experience of working with the Committee on Cultural Diversity, which seeks to increase the participation of underrepresented groups within AMS and also arranges thematic panels and forums, at first led to making new friends and working alongside prospective mentors. Because of my association with the committee, I have watched promising students attend the AMS conference—with support from the Eileen Southern Travel Fund—then apply and enroll in graduate school, write dissertations, and land jobs. There are dozens of people I look forward to seeing at AMS conferences as a result of these experiences.

I cannot claim that ours was a typical AMS encounter. I recognize that I was fortunate to talk to the right person about the right thing at the right moment. And because I know how many times I have barely managed a quick hello while rushing from one room to another, I would like to try to make up for that a little bit by inviting all student members, as well as all former students to contact me if you have suggestions for how AMS might better serve students. My experience on the Cultural Diversity Committee taught me that there was an identifiable need for student volunteers who could help the Society pursue its goals. And I learned that it is our responsibility as members to seek ways to improve the Society through our participation, volunteer work, service, feedback, and support. By definition, students are the future of this Society, but there is no time like the present to become involved. I hope that enterprising students and everyone else in the Society will work together to discover even more pathways by which we can pursue these goals.
Celebrating the American Musicological Society at Seventy-five

Joseph Kerman and Ellen Rosand

James Haar, Lewis Lockwood, Claire Brook
Judith Tick and Nancy Reich

Glenn Watkins, Edmund Bowles, and Richard Crawford
OPUS Campaign co-chairs Anne Walters Robertson and D. Kern Holoman play “Happy Birthday”

Richard Taruskin draws the winning raffle ticket (Bob Judd holds the bowl)
AMS Council Student Representatives prepare to sing “Happy Birthday”

The seventy-fifth-anniversary quilt, held by two of its creators, Mary Natvig and Honey Meconi
An Anniversary Essay
AMS 75: The American Musicological Society Celebrates a Birthday

James Haar

Inspiration for the title of this essay comes from AMS 50, the Society’s nobly conceived and successfully carried out campaign to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of its founding. As we now complete the OPUS campaign commemorating our seventy-fifth birthday, I wish to thank the current officers, particularly the outgoing and incoming presidents, Charles Atkinson and Jane Bernstein, and directors-at-large of the Society for their kind invitation to write this essay, a commission given either because of—or perhaps in spite of—the fact that I am older than the AMS. And as we look back at AMS 50, we should all unite in wishing every success to the current campaign. I can already see that naming names may be imprudent (though I hope not invidious). I would nevertheless like to offer thanks and congratulations to the OPUS campaign’s founder Jessie Ann Owens, and to its current co-chairs, Anne Walters Robertson and D. Kern Holoman, with a special note on the extraordinary service of the last-named figure: Kern played an active and important role in AMS 50 and now—scarcely seeming a day older—has shared the running of OPUS. Although I considered trying to cover the whole of the period from 1950, where Richard Crawford’s admirable essay on the early years of the Society stops, I soon realized that this was too big a task. I will leave to

1. I wish to thank Robert Judd for his cooperation in answering my queries, and John Roberts, who made a number of useful suggestions, read my text with sympathetic care, and used a light but skillful hand as its editor. Some readers found the first draft of this essay too personal in tone. Charles Atkinson, who commissioned me to write it, went through the text carefully and sympathetically, toning down this element and removing its more egregious manifestations. I am grateful to him for undertaking such an uncongenial task. This essay, although much altered from its original text, remains a personal statement; I do not presume to speak formally or even informally on behalf of the Society.
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others a project of writing a full history of the AMS in the years when it reached its half-century anniversary, 1950–1984. My comments, far short of a history, will range over the whole past of the Society, but with emphasis on more recent periods.

The AMS 50 campaign as I recall it was conducted in a buoyant, “can do” atmosphere, a spirit of fun that unified the membership and gave the Society a high-morale character that has lasted for years and is still with us today (the OPUS-related testimony volunteered by a number of members, in every age bracket, is heartening proof of its continuance). I remember campaign speeches that were cheered; I have a clear image of the august Reinhold Brinkmann dressed in an AMS 50 sweatshirt and vociferously hawking its duplicates. I’m sure that none of us who attended it has forgotten the members’ talent-show concert (Cleveland, 1986) with its memorable vocal, woodwind, and ‘cello solos, not to mention President Margaret Bent’s ceremonial benefit raffle drawing—of her own name.

The stated goal of raising money to fund dissertation fellowships for students nearing the end of their doctoral programs was something that all members of the Society could support, and a gratifyingly large number did so in tangible form. By 1986 a single AMS 50 Dissertation Fellowship could be awarded; in the next few years there were two, then three, and in 1990 the original goal of five awards was reached. The number of awards since then has varied, with some being of honorary nature because winning candidates received other sources of funding. In 2000 this fellowship was named for one of its most dedicated early supporters, our beloved long-time Treasurer and first Executive Director, Alvin H. Johnson (1914–2000). This fellowship has been and continues to be (it has been included in the current OPUS campaign) an important and highly valued feature of the Society, as well as a good indicator of members’ interests, increasingly varied but retaining traditional concerns more than one might think. I hope that as our seventy-fifth anniversary draws to a close some special recognition of the Alvin H. Johnson Dissertation Fellowship can be given.

Support for graduate students about to enter our field is obviously an important AMS activity; and we can hope that the Alvin H. Johnson AMS 50 Fellowship program will not only continue but expand in years to come. Several more recently established fellowship and research-funding awards should be mentioned here. These include the Howard Mayer Brown Fellowship (1995), which funds a year of graduate study by a minority student or a member of a group historically underrepresented in our discipline; and the Eileen Southern Travel Fund (1995), supporting minority students’ travel to and attendance at the Annual Meeting to learn about our field and about graduate programs in musicology. Travel prizes and funds that are a part of the OPUS campaign and which are named for distinguished
members of the Society, include the Eugene K. Wolf Travel Fund for European Research (2004), the Janet Levy Fund (2005) for Independent Scholars, the M. Elizabeth C. Bartlet Fund (2007) for Research in France, and the Harold Powers World Travel Fund (2007). New is the Jan LaRue Fund for Research Travel to Europe (2008). As I read over these names, all of them friends for many years, I am happy to think that they, along with those gracing a number of new, OPUS-related prizes for books, articles, and editions, will remain present in the minds of current and future members of our Society.

Another vital and increasingly varied activity of the AMS is our support of scholarly publications. First in chronological order is the Society’s Journal, known the world over as JAMS (Otto Albrecht, for years its Business Manager, once said that his assistants in the Philadelphia office of the Society referred to its other publications as “Jellies”), and internationally recognized since its founding sixty-one years ago as one of the leading scholarly periodicals in our field. At first the Journal, like its predecessors, the AMS Papers and Bulletin, was closely linked to the Society’s activities, chapter meetings and especially the Annual Meetings. That this was a concern to members is shown in the Report of the Secretary (Edward N. Waters), where we read the Executive Board’s decision that

“the Editor-in-Chief and the Editorial Board shall be under no obligation to any particular paper beyond that of publishing it by title.” Conversely no member who writes a paper is obligated to offer it to the Journal if he prefers another publishing medium. Obviously this provision is to leave the Editorial Board free to exercise its critical judgment with respect to contributions from members.3

In other words, the Society’s new journal aimed at professional independence from the comfortable, even clubby atmosphere of the early years of the AMS.

This independence, which we now value as essential to the Journal’s character and quality, could not be reached overnight. The business of the Society continued to appear in the Journal’s pages; for example, the program of the Annual Meeting continued to be printed, often appearing after the meeting had taken place, until 1969. As the Journal grew in size and reputation, the connection with the recorded activities of its sponsoring society became less inevitable—particularly to the many foreign subscribers.

A solution, not immediate and not cheap, was found, first with the appearance (1971) of the Newsletter (or re-appearance; there had been one in the Society’s early years—superseded by the Journal). Published twice yearly, the Newsletter contains not only the program of the Annual Meeting and various reports from officers and committees, but a wide variety of news about AMS members and activities, far more than the Journal could ever accommodate. Along with the Journal editors beginning with Oliver Strunk in 1948, the Newsletter editors starting in 1971 with Claude Palisca (who was at the same time President of the Society!) have deserved

3 JAMS 1 (1948): 52.
and continue to earn our thanks for the valuable service they have so consistently performed.

Another category of AMS information that was once published in the *Journal* was a membership list. The growth of the Society soon made this impractical, and only in comparatively recent times (1979) was the problem addressed with the annual publication of the AMS Directory, available in hard copy and online; this contains, in addition to a list of members and subscribers, much valuable information about the Society and its activities, publications included. One long-running series that deserves mention here is *Doctoral Dissertations in Musicology (DDM)*, begun in 1952 by Helen Hewitt, who produced four editions up to 1965, three of them in part sponsored by the AMS. From 1971 to the mid-1990s Cecil Adkins and Alis Dickinson continued to produce new editions, some with the collaboration of the International Musicological Society. *DDM* goes on, now in an easily accessible online version created by Thomas Mathiesen at the Center for the History of Music Theory and Literature at Indiana University, and maintained at the AMS office.

Early in its history the AMS aspired to publish volumes under its own imprint. As early as 1947 the second volume of Dragan Plamenac’s edition of the *Collected Works* of Johannes Ockeghem was published as the Society’s Studies and Documents no. 1. The first volume (Leipzig, 1927) was printed in a second edition by the AMS in 1959, as Studies and Documents no. 3. No. 2 is the Dunstable *Complete Works*, published in 1953 as part of Musica Britannica, with a revised edition in 1970. Of a projected series of published dissertations, Joseph Kerman, *The Elizabethan Madrigal: A Comparative Study* (1954) was published, in 1962, later followed by works by Ted Reilly and Edgar Sparks. Two final AMS publications should receive mention here. In 1990 the Society published *Essays in Musicology: A Tribute to Alvin Johnson*, a group of studies contributed (in 1988) by former presidents and officers of the Society and edited by Lewis Lockwood, President, and Edward Roesner, chairman of the Publications Committee; nothing for any of us was a greater labor of love than what we contributed to this volume. The long memory of the AMS showed itself in 1992 with the appearance of volume 3 of Ockeghem’s *Collected Works*, edited by Richard Wexler with [the late] Dragan Plamenac.

Thanks to bequests from early members of the AMS, including Manfred Bukofzer, Otto Kinkeldey, Gustave Reese, Dragan Plamenac, and Lloyd Hibberd, the Society formed an endowment fund (1971), which has continued to grow and for which continuing gifts are more than welcome. Publications supported by

4. Plamenac’s manuscript of this volume was prepared in Germany by 1930 but could not be published until after the Second World War, when he made an English edition for the AMS. A second edition of vol. 2 was published by the AMS in 1966.


AMS grants go back as far as 1965, when *The Commonwealth of Music*, a volume honoring Curt Sachs and edited by Gustave Reese and Rose Brandel, appeared; the same year saw the appearance of the first volume (of ten) of Albert Seay's edition of Arcadelt's *Opera omnia*, done in collaboration with the American Institute of Musicology.

In recent years the Publications Committee has turned its attention away from being itself a publisher and toward contributing funds in aid of members' projects accepted by a wide range of university and commercial presses. Since 1975 over a hundred volumes—mostly books, with some thematic catalogues, editions, and translations—have been helped along the road to publication in various ways, ranging from a lowered purchase price through addition of illustrations, useful appendices, accompanying compact discs, material made available online, and the like. No AMS volunteers work harder and more steadily than the Publications Committee; no group has, as I can testify from personal experience, derived greater satisfaction from service rendered. The range of subject matter in these titles, their methodology and indeed ideology—often embracing our sister disciplines of music theory and ethnomusicology and, a bit less often, fields such as social studies, literary criticism, gender studies and visual-arts criticism—is genuinely impressive, as the chronological listing of titles available on the AMS web site shows.\(^7\)

In 1992 the Society announced a new series: *AMS Monographs in Music*. The idea was for a periodic number of books, demonstrating openly the breadth of the members' interests, to be published by the Society in collaboration with the University of Nebraska Press. The first number in the series was Graeme Boone's *Patterns in Play: A Model for Text Setting in the Early Songs of Dufay*. When Nebraska ceased publishing the series in 1999, it was taken over by Oxford University Press under a new name, AMS Studies in Music. The first volume, Lawrence Zbikowski’s *Conceptualizing Music: Cognitive Structure, Theory, and Analysis*, appeared in 2002. Eight volumes have been published to date; and there are several more in the works (see pp. 123–25 for a complete listing of AMS publications).

From the first the Society has been determinedly internationalist in character, representing the interests of its founders and many of its members. This is true to some extent of other national musicological associations, notably the United Kingdom and Germany; others (Italy, Spain, Russia, most smaller nations) have tended to concentrate on study of their own musical culture.\(^8\) National societies have supported—though not often in a direct way—publication of volumes and series drawing on their musical heritage. The lack of such publications on the part of the AMS was for years deplored, and not only by Americanists; during my own tenure as President (1977–78) I issued an informal, and at the time unanswered, call for a “Musica Americana” series in emulation of our Britannic colleagues.

---


8. There are signs that this is at least partially changing in Italy; see the journal *Il Saggiatore musicale*.
The most persistent and best focused demands did of course come from Americanists, chief among them Richard Crawford, himself AMS president in 1983–84. Crawford’s frustration over what he perceived as the Society’s lack of interest can be seen on the concluding page of his anniversary essay, where he says “AMS members’ scholarly interest in the music of their own country had barely progressed beyond the level that Oliver Strunk had found ‘disappointing’ in 1932.” Crawford was of course far from limiting himself to complaints; he was already a distinguished Americanist as teacher and scholar, who was to become for the AMS as he was for the Sonneck Society (renamed the Society for American Music) a central figure in his field, a kind of “Mr. America” whose reports at our Annual Meetings, often accompanied by his waving hefty new volumes of the MUSA series (on this see below), have been heartily applauded.

In 1973 Crawford published an article on the eighteenth-century hymnist William Billings, followed in 1976 by William Billings of Boston (with D. P. McKay). He was the guiding spirit (officially the Editorial Consultant) of the four-volume Complete Works of William Billings (1977–90), edited by Hans Nathan (vol. 2) and Karl Kroeger (vols. 1, 3, and 4), published by the AMS together with the Colonial Society of Massachusetts. In 1988 the AMS established the series Music of the United States of America (MUSA), with Richard Crawford as its first Executive Editor and the University of Michigan its host institution. From 1993 to the present MUSA has issued twenty volumes (published by A-R Editions) containing “classical” and popular music, psalmody and jazz, Victorian choral music, Ives songs, a volume of Amy Beach following one of Irving Berlin, one of Dudley Buck preceding one of Earl “Fatha” Hines, two volumes of transcriptions of Native American music: this is a sampling of the stunning variety of the series, a wonderful spotlight on the “American” in our Society. It is fitting that in 2009 a new prize, the Music in American Culture Award, has joined the happily crowded ranks of the Society’s prizes for excellence of work in fields of importance to the organization and its membership.

The Society’s early and continuing support of publication by its members has been one of the most visible ways in which it has worked toward its goal of advancing research in the various fields of music as a branch of learning and scholarship. This has a personal dimension as well. We engage in research and publication not just for career advancement or vainglorious ends but for the love of it, sometimes mixed with a bit of competitive spirit. Do we publish too much? I don’t think so. Some of us publish more than others, some of us are beginning, or continuing, to hope that we will soon break into print. None of us reads everything that Society members publish, whether or not it is supported by the AMS. Many of us go through periods when we publish nothing or next to it. But when we greet one another at national or chapter meetings most of us go fairly quickly from social gossip to “what are you working on now?”—and expect an answer.

As I have said, this is not the place for a full study of the Society during the thirty-five-year period 1950–1984. What we might try to undertake here is a sketch of the discipline of musicology as represented by the AMS during this period. In its early years the Society was influenced by the ideas and methodology of German scholarship, particularly the work of Guido Adler. The International Congress of 1939 and the war years that followed added other elements to this orientation, but a mix of the old and the (then) new can be seen in the 1950 meeting’s inclusion of pedagogic papers such as “Principles of Greek Notation” (J. Murray Barbour), “The Importance of Symbols in the Evolution of Music” (Eric Werner), and especially “Scope, Method and Aims of Systematic Musicology” (Charles Seeger), along with “Caput Redivivum: A New Source for Dufay’s Missa Caput” (Manfred Bukofzer) and “The Original Titles of Bach’s Works” (Hans David). General and specific topics shared space, and Renaissance papers occupied as much space as, but not more than, the Bach family. Technology had its place: a plenary session, held jointly with the Music Teachers National Association (MTNA), the Music Library Association (MLA), and the College Music Association, later Society (now CMS) participating, on the subject of “LP Phonograph Records.”

The twenty-fifth anniversary meeting (Chicago) of 1959 showed a more modern appearance, with papers on Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque and eighteenth-century topics and a real surprise, George Perle on Berg’s Lulu. Even more surprising, perhaps—though also reminiscent of the Adlerian past—was a joint session with SEM (Society for Ethnomusicology) on “The Role of Oral Tradition in the History of Music.” As we might expect, the Society showed itself mindful of its history: at a dinner Gustave Reese chaired an anniversary observance with talks on “The First Twenty-five Years” by Honorary President Otto Kinkeldey and “The Prospect Before Us” by current President Oliver Strunk.
Mention of these two meetings brings up the names of other musical societies, with which the AMS met jointly. Some of these societies, such as the venerable Music Teachers National Association (MTNA), founded by Theodore Presser in 1876, and the Music Library Association (MLA), established in 1931, are older than the AMS; they have of course their own agenda and have met with our Society only rarely and for a specific purpose. Others, particularly the College Music Society (CMS), founded in 1958, share many of our educational concerns, if with slightly different foci. AMS and the Society for Ethnomusicology (SEM) began, in the Adlerian period, as twin daughters in the Musikwissenschaft family. Ethnomusicological topics appeared in the programs of early national and chapter meetings, and the discipline was slighted only with peril as long as Charles Seeger (1886–1979) was active. The Society for Ethnomusicology was founded in 1955, and the redoubtable Seeger, who had been President of the AMS in 1945–46, served as SEM President in 1960–61. Before 1955 ethnomusicologists, depending on their individual interests, had joined either the AMS or the American Anthropological Association. Their parting from both with the founding of the new society seems to have been amicable. In the AMS itself, ethnomusicologists continue to appear on programs, receive support for publications, and win prizes. AMS and SEM have met together from time to time, notably at the omnium gatherum of the Toronto meeting in 2000, and will do so again in 2012.

The other two societies with interests closest to those of the AMS, the Society for American Music (SAM) and the Society for Music Theory (SMT), have had, perhaps unsurprisingly, more complex relationships with their parental institution. In the Society’s early years American music was a side interest of a number of members but a central concern to a relative few. As more confirmed Americanists embarked on their scholarly careers, discontent over the perceived place given to American music, referred to above, became more acute, with signs of genuine bad feeling evident. The founding in 1973 of the Sonneck Society, later renamed the Society for American Music, relieved this, but some soreness remained, as could be seen in the first annual meeting of the new Society in 1975, where a group of papers said to have been rejected by the AMS was read with expressed approval. I believe that relationships improved with the establishment of MUSA, and that many SAM members continue to belong to the AMS.

The SMT, founded in 1977, presents a different picture, one of abrupt and decidedly hostile break from the AMS. This I remember well since I was AMS President at the time it happened. I was informed that at the forthcoming meeting (1976) of the Midwest Chapter of the Society in Chicago a group of theorists were going to announce a separation from the AMS and the formation of a new association, the Society for Music Theory. Not sure what to do but feeling I had to do something, I asked for permission to address a plenary session of the Chapter Meeting, and made the trip “east” (I was in Seattle at the time, visiting the University of Washington, from which I made several AMS-related trips). I did speak, trying to emphasize the traditional close ties between historians and theorists in our discipline and imploring the latter to rethink their position. After
I finished (politely but not sympathetically heard), Leonard Meyer made a strong and fervent appeal in support of the bond between music theory and history. It was welcome support from a figure of unimpeachable credit, and I was and remain grateful for it; I miss Leonard Meyer’s presence very much. The theorists, or more accurately a small group that had assumed a leadership role, were not persuaded. The split did take place, and the Society for Music Theory was founded. Since that time SMT has flourished, and if I may speak for the AMS, the Society has wished them well. We meet together quite frequently and both profit from the contact. As our Society has broadened in choice of subject and methods of approach, so has the SMT undergone change. I now see no sign of the edginess—needless from the start—of thirty years ago.

No one can predict the future, but it is my belief that the Society is now flexible and responsive enough so that it can accommodate a wide spectrum of special interests, making further splits unnecessary. What has happened in recent years is that new groups have been formed, united by specialization of subject either within the Society’s framework or in a close neighborly relationship with it. The first of these is represented by Study Groups affiliated with the AMS, coming together at the Society’s Annual Meetings as well as on occasions of their own selection. These include the Cold War and Music Study Group, the Ecocriticism Study Group, the Hispanic Study Group, the LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer) Study Group, and the Pedagogy Study Group. The second group, different from the first in that meetings are held separate from those of the AMS, includes the Society for Seventeenth-Century Music and the Society for Eighteenth-Century Music, both of whom continue a close relationship with the AMS.

Another area in which the Society has in part moved forward, in part returned to its roots, is performance. The Noah Greenberg Award has proved itself over a thirty-year period to be a valuable part of our activities, especially in the area of performance practice. In its early years the Society’s Annual Meetings mixed performance with paper sessions. As meetings grew bigger and papers more numerous concerts were moved entirely to evenings and were a mix of professional and amateur programs. This has worked well, with the Local Arrangements Committee doing a consistently fine job. In recent years a new trend has emerged, with the Performance Committee overseeing a fascinating mix of daytime or early evening recitals, interesting ensembles, lecture-recitals, with a genuinely interesting choice of repertory. The audiences for these are in a way impromptu study groups, very welcome additions to the Society’s ever-increasing breadth of response to the multifarious world of musical research.

* * *

The “sixties” were when I started my career. I got a degree, found a job, joined the AMS; by 1964 I had read a couple of papers, begun to publish, and was on my way without thinking much about what that way was to be. I had written a rather idiosyncratic dissertation but after finishing it settled into becoming a Renaissance
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A scholar pursuing study of the Italian madrigal, an attractive and roomy field. Aside from the usual qualms—was I “doing enough”?, was my work as good as that of my peers?, was I going to get tenure?—I was poking along fairly contentedly.

It thus came as a real shock to me, as it must have to many of my contemporaries, when at the Washington Annual Meeting in December, 1964, the opening plenary session, entitled *Musicology: Trends and Purposes*, was devoted to two papers: Donald M. McCorkle on “A Place for American Studies in American Musicology” and Joseph Kerman on “A Profile for American Musicology,” followed by a long discussion, at times turning into a shouting match, the likes of which I at least had never heard at an AMS gathering. McCorkle’s paper was unusual in that American music did not often get so much attention focused on it (see above); it certainly provided material for some discussion. Kerman’s address was a real bombshell. His later *Contemplating Music* (1985) may have engendered more lasting critical reaction, some of it bordering on the acrimonious; but the uproar in 1964 was unique. Many people spoke; but among them Edward Lowinsky, who evidently felt that he and his whole generation of expatriate scholars were under personal attack, was especially strong in responding, with a counter-attack—so much so that the whole occasion became known as the “Kerman-Lowinsky Flap.” Kerman published his paper in the first number of volume 18 (1965) of *JAMS*; Lowinsky’s considered response followed in the next number.10

It is not for me to say who won, or even to take sides in this debate; I do encourage readers to look them up and read them with care. To me the dispute is important enough to try to summarize here, as a kind of watershed in the history of our Society. It led to similar arguments on different topics but not unlike it in character, which ruffled the calm musicological sea some twenty years later.

Kerman begins his “Profile” by recognizing a volume dealing with the discipline of musicology in a general way, written by Frank Harrison, Mantle Hood, and Claude Palisca, and published in 1963.11 He starts by saying that Palisca considers the musicologist to be “first and foremost” a historian, that Harrison thinks the scholar should be more of a “sociologist,” by which we would probably mean a cultural historian, and that the ethnomusicologist Hood more or less agrees with Harrison. The more thoughtful music historians try to write cultural history, he says, thinking perhaps of Curt Sachs and especially of Paul Henry Lang.12 The less thoughtful ones collect a lot of information “in the vague expectation that someone—someone else—will find it useful” (p. 62). Kerman was speaking soon after the appearance of several large “period” volumes, all of them issued by the


Was he attacking them, or rather, as I believe, smaller studies and papers consisting largely of factual information, sometimes very dull when read aloud? In any event, he uses rather strong language.

What Kerman champions is criticism, which he views as the highest stage of musical scholarship, indeed one to which all other historical research and analytic theory are preparatory steps. Criticism is, at its best, an aesthetic field that can seriously inform all of us, inside and outside the normally defined field of musical studies, about human values in great works of musical art. These latter are for Kerman what students should be working on, not some unnamed *Kleinmeister* or obscure repertory (he does not say whether the musicologists whom he finds so dull would somehow be transformed into perceptive and articulate critics if they do so).

If this were to happen, American musicology would turn away from the German tradition which, carried on faithfully in American colleges and universities, has stood in the way of the development of a truly American musicology; it is time for new leadership to strike out new paths. The AMS has grown in size (to 1,800 members, he says) but is still in its infancy, compared to fields like art history and English. Only—apparently—through a turn to genuinely humanistic criticism can it grow to maturity.

That a speech like this would raise hackles can come as no surprise. Edward Lowinsky responded sharply to it as member of a panel in the lively discussion period. He doubtless knew that Kerman was planning to publish his speech in a forthcoming issue of *JAMS*, and so arranged to have an expanded version of his response appear in the following one.

Dividing his response into three sections, Lowinsky begins by coming to the defense of what Kerman regards as preparatory steps such as transcriptions and editions (mainly of pre-1600 music, though Kerman does not say so), archival work (also mainly concerned with old music), bibliography, etc. These all represent to Lowinsky special skills, worth pursuing for their own sake as well as, or even without, the “summit” of criticism. Lowinsky goes on to say something really prophetic about music criticism, namely that it does not stand at the top of a pyramid of other kinds of musicological research but that it must develop an entirely new set of questions, and along with them new methods and criteria of answering them. In the task of developing the right kind of questions and criteria, musical criticism is much closer to criticism in literature or the visual arts than it is to a whole number of musical sciences.

---


One should remember that this was written in a period when New Criticism was still *au courant*, affecting a number of fields as well as literature—though not, as yet, musicology.

In the second part of his response Lowinsky criticizes Kerman’s idea that the critic stands alone and above others as a kind of “lord of the manor.” In answer Lowinsky piles up examples of American and international musicological achievements of the past twenty years. Not all of these are completely relevant to his argument, though his citation of Alfred Einstein’s *The Italian Madrigal* is unanswerably appropriate.16 It is in the third section of his paper that the temperature, high to start with, rises close to feverish. Lowinsky attacks Kerman’s view of musicology as a discipline with a strong national character everywhere but in the U.S., where it remains subservient to the German tradition. Kerman had urged American musicologists to separate themselves “from an older alien tradition” (“Profile,” 67) and to find leadership in a native generation younger than that of German and German-trained scholars. Another scholar might have shrugged this off; Lowinsky clearly took it personally. Rather than defend himself and his fellow expatriate scholars he refers darkly to Kerman’s use of “alien” and “native” as hinting at Nazi and Communist attitudes toward scholarship. Lowinsky finishes his piece with a more positive note, an encomium to the peculiarly American nature of the “young generation” of musicologists (what we might term the Grout-Palisca generation).

The Kerman–Lowinsky clash changed the Society’s view of itself, beginning a process of self-examination that by degrees brought us from basically contented “infancy” (as Kerman would have it) through an intermittently stormy “adolescence” in the eighties and nineties to what in the decade just ending I shall cautiously but optimistically call a “young-adult” stage. By this I mean that beginning in the 1970s but gathering momentum in the next two decades musicologists, especially younger ones entering the profession after growing up in the era of Vietnam-war turbulence, were intellectually restless, looking for new subject matter, new methodologies, even new ideologies. As they did this they began to reach outside the boundaries of their own discipline as well as beyond the limits of the Western European musical tradition.

The fields indicated as promising by Kerman, English literature and art history, were of course natural places to turn, but concentrated study of single works of art were not all there was to look at. Ideological currents of a broader nature were affecting these fields and others, such as history—indeed almost all areas except for the natural sciences. One of these, gender studies, was rather slow to start in musicology, but was to become one of the most important new fields within the AMS.

Yet another area of study to gain currency in the seventies was that of popular music. Paralleling the rise of African-American studies and interwoven with them to some extent, popular music was not part of music curricula or the subject of many scholarly papers in the early years of the decade. The extent to which it was

to grow in both respects has pleased some of us and surprised almost all of us, but it should have been predictable. I well remember listening to the complaints and “non-negotiable demands” of undergraduate rebels in the late sixties and early seventies, wanting to know why “we” did not include “their” music, by which they meant post-Beatles pop and rock repertory, in the curriculum. Some of these undergraduates (at New York University, in my case) went on to graduate school and became musicologists; they and their students are now “we.” It should thus not be too surprising that popular music has become an important element in the increasingly mixed palette of musicological study and writing.

When I think of the current scene, what I have called our “young-adult” phase, I perceive not a backward swing of the pendulum but a gently resistant push of traditional (sometimes with reformist tendencies) musicology, including early-music studies, toward better representation at our meetings and in at least a few of our educational institutions. For a time the enemies of the so-called New Musicology were not so much positivist historians as they were hard-core theorists who held nothing—including popular song—immune from analytical scrutiny. A softening of edges is now evident among both historians and theorists, resulting in at least some betterment of relations.

I do not feel competent, or unbiased, enough to speak in any detail about the various new directions the Society and its members have embarked upon, most markedly in the last twenty-five years. Joseph Kerman has of course repeated and updated his views during this time, notably in Contemplating Music (1985). This book has been widely discussed, notably in a spirited rebuttal by Margaret Bent and a qualifiedly favorable review-essay, magisterial in tone, by Leo Treitler. Rather than Contemplating Music, though, I should like to turn to another of Kerman’s works, his article “American Musicology in the 1990s,” as a lens through which to view some of the most recent developments in the field.

Restricting himself to historical musicology, Kerman begins by talking about “fruitful grafts” from areas outside music, specifying structuralist and poststructuralist theory, anthropology, feminism, and “ideology critique”; he later singles out individual scholars who have made or are making moves into such areas. In general, he says

Musicologists have addressed themselves on various levels to problems of interpretation or hermeneutics. They have probed the relations between music, society, and politics in deeper ways than before. They have begun to investigate issues of gender and sexual orientation in music. Ricoeur, Adorno, Gadamer, Geertz, de Man, Cixous, and other pan-intellectuals have been making an appearance in


footnotes; and often enough their thought has surged up from the footnotes to activate the musicological text itself.

Adding names such as Lacan and Derrida to the list, musicologists heard the call, and what were initial probings and investigations in the eighties became more and more common in the nineties. In the present decade at least some, such as gender-sexuality studies, have established orthodoxies in much the same way as traditional orthodoxies had crystallized a couple of generations ago.

Looking specifically at publications in book form, Kerman singles out anthologies based on new musicological approaches, of which he names six published or begun in the late eighties. Of these I think the most influential are the Leppert-McClary *Music and Society*, partly for its message that musical art of every kind and at every level is highly politicized and that musical scholarship must follow, and partly from the near-brutalist vehemence of its language; and the Solie volume, *Musicology and Difference*, on feminist concerns, including sexual preference. Fifteen, perhaps even ten years ago, *Authenticity and Early Music* might have been of equal importance as affecting musicologists of every stripe. Since that time performance of early music has of course continued, but the question of “authenticity,” whether or not resolved in favor of a negative view (as unattainable or even a chimera), has curiously receded, at least in my experience, from the scene almost completely. Being new, it would seem, is no guarantee of long prominence. To conclude his essay Kerman names some newly published books he can recommend, and singles out four scholars as distinguished practitioners of new directions in musicology; they serve, in his words, to “go some way toward fleshing out the dry statistics which were presented earlier” (p. 141).

At least two presidents of the Society have to my knowledge spoken about the New Musicology—to employ an unhappy but commonly used (these days perhaps a bit less commonly) umbrella term—at Annual Meetings. Lewis Lockwood in 1987 (New Orleans) warned of “ephemeral and subjective verbal formulations to describe musical context” and of a danger in teaching or advocating new critical and ideological theories “to beginners and students who may lack all substantial and traditional musical experience and have little or no idea of the theoretical


and systematic bases of musical thought.”

21 Ellen Rosand’s “The Musicology of the Present,” an address delivered in 1994 (Minneapolis), has a good deal to say about the New Musicology, most of it favorable and expressed in a welcoming tone. Her warning is against exclusionary approaches, even attacks on traditional musicological work, made by over-committed or over-enthusiastic partisans of some recently introduced idea.

Of course we have all been, and will continue to be, affected by new ideologies, new methodologies, new ways of writing or even listening to papers. We have all, young and old, been changed in greater and smaller ways, through reading or listening or a kind of scholarly osmosis by the advent of so many new ideas and approaches in the study of our beloved discipline. For some of us the subject itself has been altered almost beyond recognition; but I hope that most of us accept, or will come to accept, even to admire the very mix of old and new interests and approaches that now characterize the scholarly study of music in the broadest sense. This is my birthday toast to the American Musicological Society on its seventy-fifth anniversary.


23. A view advanced (but not originated) by a colleague is that the Great Change in our discipline came with the abandonment of the deckle-edge cover of JAMS, which took place in vol. 50, no. 1 (Spring, 1997).
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Gustave Reese, letter of invitation to become a member of the newly-founded American Musicological Society (14 November 1934)
Approved membership application slips for Alfred Einstein and Arnold Schoenberg (1939)
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Letter from Gustave Reese to Joseph Yasser nominating Donald J. Grout, Edwin Hughes, and Margaret McNamara Mott, but not Rosalie Housman, to membership (9 December 1935)
Letter from Hugo Leichtentritt to Gustave Reese regarding Rosalie Housman (27 January 1936)
Report of the Publication Committee of
the American Musicological Association

It is proposed that the Association have a publication of its own to be known as the Bulletin of the American Musicological Association, said Bulletin to consist in the beginning of not more than 16 pages (without a stock cover), and to be published in quantities of 1000, two or more times a year. Sample mast-heads, in proof, are submitted herewith. It is estimated by G. Schirmer that 1,000 copies of such a Bulletin would cost the Association $110.00 per issue to manufacture. It is estimated that the cost of mailing 1,000 copies of the bulletin would be $30.00 per issue. The total estimated cost of manufacturing and mailing would be $140.00 per issue.

Since the Bulletin would necessarily be limited to brief articles, news, reviews, etc., The Musical Quarterly would open its pages to longer papers by members of the Association. The Quarterly would pay for these at its usual rates. It would assign 100 pages a year, or not more than two articles per issue, to papers submitted through the Publication Committee of the Association, the final selection of papers to be published to be subject to the approval of the Editor of The Musical Quarterly. In the captions of such articles there could be a notation, under the name of the contributor, designating him as a member of the Association.

August 29, 1934.

First report of the Society’s Publication Committee, outlining their proposals for the Bulletin and an assigned section of The Musical Quarterly (29 August 1934)
Letter from Paul Henry Lang to Gustave Reese regarding the publication of the Society's first Bulletin (14 July 1936)
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International Congress of the American Musicological Society

Held in New York, N.Y.

September 11-16, 1939

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11TH

BEETHOVEN ASSOCIATION CLUB-ROOMS,
30 WEST 56TH STREET, CONGRESS HEADQUARTERS

Founded in 1918 by Harold Bauer, this organization has as its object the bringing together of artists of established reputation to give concerts in a spirit of artistic fraternity. None of the member-artists receives any remuneration, and the net proceeds are donated for purposes of general musical interest determined by vote of the members.

9:30 Registration; Welcome to North and South American and European guests

11:00 Concert of American Chamber Music by the Roth String Quartet: J. K. Paine, Op. 5; Arthur Foote, Night Fever; Quincy Porter, Quartet No. 4; Roy Harris, Three Preludes and Fugues

12:45 Luncheon. Speech by the President of the American Musicological Society. Entertainment: Alan Lomax singing ballads to his guitar. Keynote of the Congress (Reservations must be made in advance with Assistant Secretary Angell or Chase)

2:30 Annual Business Meeting of the American Musicological Society
(Open to members only)

WORLD’S FAIR GROUNDS, FLUSHING
(Take Subway from Fifth Avenue & 13th Streets; admission to Fair Grounds, 50 cents)

5:15 Visit Fine Arts Building (admission, 40 cents). Make tour of grounds

7:00 Supper at Brazilian Pavilion (Reservations must be made in advance with Assistant Secretary Angell or Chase). Welcome by Grover Whalen

9:30 Fire-Fountain Display

10:30 Billy Rose’s ADAGIO OR THE HOOT MIKADO
(admission to either, 40 cents to 50 cents)
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12th
BEETHOVEN ASSOCIATION CLUB-ROOMS,
30 WEST 56th STREET

9:30 Opening General Session—
Carleton Sprague Smith, presiding
Dragan Plamenac (Yugoslavia)—16th- and 17th-Century Music in Dalmatia (Illustrations by The Madrigalists)
Edward J. Dent (England)—Cavalieri’s Rappresentazione di Anima e di Corpo
Knut Jeppesen (Denmark)—Venetian Folk-songs of the Renaissance (Illustration by The Madrigalists)
Curt Sachs (New York University)—The So-called Babylonian Notation
Ottor Gambosi (Hungary)—New Light on Ancient Greek Music
(Extra session at discretion of Chairman)

ROCKEFELLER CENTER, 50TH STREET &
5TH AVENUE
Begun in 1931, this group of 14 buildings covers 11 acres of ground (6 city blocks), replacing 256 buildings and increasing the population of the district from 2600 to 15,000 permanent residents. To the 2 miles of shops and 20 floors of offices come more than 100,000 visitors a day. Eleven foreign consulates are housed in these buildings, including those of Great Britain, Argentina and Chile.

12:30 Luncheon in the Rainbow Room Lounge
(At No. 30 Rockefeller Plaza; Completed in 1932; rises 850 feet in the air) (Reservations must be made in advance with Assistant Secretary Angell or Chase; capacity limited to 100)

2:15 Visit to Radio City: Demonstration of Electronic Orchestra. Welcome by official of National Broadcasting Corporation

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY,
FIFTH AVENUE & 42ND STREET
Formed in 1895 by the consolidation of The Lenox, Astor, and Tilden Libraries. The New York Public Library, second in the country with more than 5½ million volumes, now stands on the site of the former Croton reservoir; on lands granted to the city in 1860. This building, stretching two city blocks—500 feet long and 300 feet deep—was completed in 1905 from plans by Architects Carrere & Hastings.

5:00 Reception in the Lennon Gallery, followed by Short Instrumental Illustrations of Library Publications, conducted by Sydney Beck

FRAUNCE’S TAVERN, 54 PEARL STREET
(Take East Side L. R. T. Subway from Grand Central to Bowling Green; walk 1 block east and 1 block south)
Bowling Green—New York’s oldest existing Park; originally the open space before the Fort, “the Square” before the house of Burgomaster Martin Cregt, 1660. “The Parade” 1790, listed as a “Bowling Green”, 1773; Statue of George III erected 1790, pulled down, 1796.
Fraunces Tavern—Oldest existing structure on Manhattan Island; built as a residence by Esteve De Lancy, 1770. Tavern of Samuel Fraunces (later steward of Washington’s households) and others. Scene of Washington’s farewell to his officers, Dec. 4, 1783. Contains a Museum of Revolutionary relics, historic paintings and portraits, etc.

7:00 Supper (Reservations must be made in advance with Assistant Secretary Angell or Chase; capacity limited to 500)

8:30 Concert of THE OLD HARPSingers of Nashville, Tennessee; George Pullen Jackson, Founder, Parish Psalmody; Wesley’s Hymns, Charleston, S. C., 1772: Billings’ Fuguing Tunes; White Spirituals and Folk Songs

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13th
BEETHOVEN ASSOCIATION CLUB-ROOMS,
30 WEST 56TH STREET

9:30 Session on Primitive and Folk Music in North America—George Herzog (Columbia University), presiding
George Pullen Jackson (Vanderbilt University)—Art Music among Folk Music
Helen H. Roberts (Tryon, North Carolina)—North American Indian Music
Amelia Morris Buchman (University of Richmond)—Modal and Other Melodic Aspects of North American Folk Music
Roy lamson, Jr. (Williams College)—The English Broadside Ballad of the 16th and 17th Centuries and its Tunes
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Samuel P. Bayard (Harvard University)—British Folk Music in North America
George Herzog—African Influence in North American Indian Music
(Discussion at discretion of chairman)

2:30 Demonstrations of American Indian and Folk Music: Indian Melodies and Dances; Dulcimer player; Old-time fiddler; Folk Music of the White Man (Ballads, Shanty, Lumberjack Songs); Negro Contributions


7:00 Supper (Reservations must be made in advance with Assistant Secretary Angell or Chase)

AUDITORIUM OF THE NEW YORK HISTORICAL SOCIETY

179 Central Park West (Between 76th and 77th Streets)
(Takes Independent Subway to 72nd Street)
The Society contains American portraits, folk art exhibits, etc.

8:00 Concert of 19th- and 20th-Century American Music by Joan Kirkpatrick and assisting artists: Works by Louis Moreau Gottschalk, Edward MacDowell, Roger Sessions, Charles Ives

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14th

HARKNESS AUDITORIUM, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY BUILDING

(Take West Side I. R. T. Subway to 116th Street and Broadway)
Chartered in 1776 as King's College by George II. The eight students of the class of '74 met in the vestry room of "The New School adjoining Trinity Church on Lower Broadway". In 1796 the college erected its own buildings and twenty-four years later, during the Revolution, it partially changed its name to Columbia. In 1867 the college moved to what was then far up town—Madison Avenue and 36th Street—and again in 1897 to its present site.

9:30 Session on Medieval and Renaissance Music—Gustave Reese, presiding

Yvonne Rohseth (France)—Music of the German Passionsspiele in the Middle Ages
Albert Smijers (Holland)—Music of the Illustre Lieve Vrouwe Broederschaps in Herzenogenbusch 1330-1600
Fernando Liuzzi (Italy)—Notes on les "Barzellette" et "Canzoni a ballo" italiane del XVII secolo, d'après des documents inédits
Leonard Ellinwood (East Lansing, Michigan)—The French Renaissance of the 12th Century in Music
Johannes Wolf (Germany)—The Lewis van Gruythuyse Song Collection of the 14th Century
(Discussion at discretion of the chairman)

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY FACULTY CLUB, 400 WEST 117TH STREET
(Walk from Library)

1:00 Luncheon, Paul Henry Lang presiding
(Reservations must be made in advance with Assistant Secretary Angell or Chase; see note on last page)

2:00 Visit the University

THE CLOISTERS, FORT TRYON PARK
AT 190TH STREET

(Take Independent Subway to 190th Street and walk to the Museum at the No. 4 Bus up Riverside Drive)

George Grey Barnard, the sculptor, in 1914 opened to the public his fine collection of medieval sculpture and architectural material. In 1946 this was augmented by Mr. and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., through whose generosity the present building, housing the collection (which further enlarged), was constructed and opened in May, 1957. The plan of the building was developed around the architectural elements comprising much of the collection—large sections of the cloister of 12th-13th century French monasteries, etc. (Medieval musical instruments are represented in the chapel of a few of the cloisters), and the collection's 12th-century French, Flemish tapestries depicting the Hunting of Unicorns are the outstanding set of Gothic tapestries in this country.

4:00 Concert of Medieval Music by Yves Turrin, a Select Choir of the Paris X School of Liturgical Music, and assisting artists: Introit—Requiem aeternam (Gregorian); Kyrie: Aline Pater (Gregorian); Sanctus from Missa III (Gregorian); Responsory—
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Canite (Ambroian); Communion—Passer invent (Gregorian); Rorate caeli (Gregorian); Offertory—Jubilate Deo universa terra (Gregorian); Hecce dies (Leonin); Deum tierent (Leonin); Beata vobiscum (Pierotin); Agnus deus (13th century); Flore de vieja nascitur (13th century); Five Anonymous 13th-century Trouvère Songs; Rose lys printemps (Machaut); Flours, damres (Machaut); Adieu, mon amoureuse joye (Binciois); Mille bonjours (Dufay); Vergine bella (Dufay); Alleluia: Angelus Domini (13th-century organum); O nutriva-Salve mater-Kyrie (13th-century motet); Puellare gruim (14th-century motet); Qui cum Pace, from the Credo of the Missa Salve diva Parente (Okeghed); Urales hura Jerusalem (Kunperger); Flos florum (Dufay)

CLAREMONT INN, RIVERSIDE DRIVE & 124TH STREET
(Take Bus No. 4 down Riverside Drive)
The Claremont Inn, once a private house, was built in 1809 by Michael Hagan, an Irish immigrant from Country Clare. But the house is not to have been named for Hagan's County Clare, but after "Claremont", the Royal seat of Prince William (William IV) of England, who had sailed with Hagan as a midshipman in the British navy; later visiting him in America. The house was occupied for a time by the Earl of Devon and in 1871 by Joseph Bonaparte, the Ex-King of Spain. The trial trip of the first submarine, Fulton's "Claremont", took place opposite this point.
7:00 Supper (Reservations must be made in advance with Assistant Secretary Angell or Chace)

AUDITORIUM OF THE JUILLIARD GRADUATE SCHOOL, 130 CLAREMONT AVENUE
(Walk from Claremont Inn)
The Graduate School became active in 1924. A year later it merged with the Institute of Musical Art, founded in 1905 by Dr. Franz Durrath through the benefactions of James Liodh.
8:30 Concert of Unpublished Music by Georg Friedrich Händel, under the direction of J. M. Cooper-Smith. Soloists: Florence Vickland, soprano; Viola Silva, contralto; Ernest Victor Wolff, harpsichordist; assisted by a chamber orchestra. Diana Cacciatrice (Cantata con strumenti), E troppo bollu (Aria); Sarei troppo felice (Cantata a voce sola); Sonata in G minor (Violino, Violoncello obligato e Basso continuo); Handel not pub.; Miss Musa (Cantata a voce sola); Sonata in G minor (Due Flauto Traversieri e Basso continuo); Benché mi sia crudel; from "Ortione" (Aria); Ero e Leandri (Comenz con strumenti); Gli dirai, from "Alessandro Severo" (Duetto)

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 15th
COLUMBIA BROADCASTING THEATER
No. 1—424 WEST 43RD STREET
3:30 Session on Music and Science—Dayton C. Miller (Case School of Applied Science), presiding
Orr Ortmann (Peabody Conservatory, Baltimore)—The Psychology of Tone Quality
B. Hayden (University of North Carolina)—Alfred Day and the Theory of Harmony
Manfred Bockozer (New York)—The Evolution of Japanese Tone-Systems
Davidson Taylor (Columbia Broadcasting Systems)—Music Composed for Radio
Dayton C. Miller—Tone Color with Phonodec Demonstration (Discussion at discretion of the chairman)

MUSEUM OF MODERN ART, 11 WEST 53RD STREET
12:00 Luncheon on Terrace (Reservations must be made in advance with Assistant Secretary Angell or Chace)
2:15 Listen to Broadcast by Sir James Jeans from London
3:30 Film Library—Moving Pictures of particular musical interest
MUSIC & ART HIGH SCHOOL, CONVENT AVENUE & 135TH STREET
(Take Broadway L. R. T. Subway to 176th St.)
4:00 Instrumental and Vocal Demonstration of Student Work
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AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS & LETTERS,
632 WEST 51ST STREET
(Take Broadway I. R. T. Subway to 51st Street
or Fifth Avenue Bus No. 6, No. 7 or No. 16)
Conseils works and memorabilia of members of the
Academy and the National Institute of Arts &
Letters.
7:00 Buffet Supper (Reservations must be made in
advance with Assistant Secretary Angell or Chase).

AUDITORIUM OF THE AMERICAN
ACADEMY OF ARTS & LETTERS,
632 WEST 51ST STREET
8:30 A Concert of Hispanic Music Illustrating the
Musical Culture of Colonial and Contempo-
rary Latin America, Francisco Cart Lange

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 15th
BEETHOVEN ASSOCIATION CLUB-ROOMS,
30 WEST 51ST STREET
9:30 Hispanic Session, Gilbert Chase (New
York, N.Y.), presiding
Francisco Cart Lange (Uruguay) - Americani-
cano musical
Alfredo Sanz Malo (Panama) and Nicholas
Monizski (Boston) - Three Pieces by
Domingo Santa Clara and a Dance by
Guillermo Uribe Holguin.
Juan Leconta (Venezuela) - Venezuelan Folk
Lores (Illustrated at the Piano)
Eduardo Sanchez de Fuentes (Cuba) and
Gonzalo Ruiz (Cuba) - Subjects to be
announced.
H. Burle Marx (Brazil) - A Few Practical
Music Problems in Latin America
(Discussion at discretion of the chairman)
1:00 Luncheon (Reservations must be made in
advance with Assistant Secretary Angell or
Chase).

MUSEUM OF ART, FIFTH AVENUE &
82ND STREET
(Take Fifth Avenue Bus No. 1, 1, 2, 3 or 4)
4:00 Concert of 18th- and 19th-Century Ameri-
can Chamber Music, by Ralph Kirkpatrick
and soloing artists: J. R. Perez, String Quar-
et; J. C. Meiler, String Quartet; Raymond
Taylor, Cello Sonata; Alexander Reingold.

SONGS: James Hewitt, "Battle of Trenton";
Benjamin Cart, Songs; Gaetano Franceschin,
Trio Sonata.

WINDSOR THEATER, 48TH STREET,
EAST OF BROADWAY
8:40 Broadway Musical Comedy: Pins and
Needles. (Reservations must be obtained in
advance from Assistant Secretary Angell or
Chase; admission, 35 cents to $1.00)
After performance: Assembly outside theater
for Visit to Harlem under the chaperonage
of Wilder Hobson. (For those who can take it)

SUNDAY AND MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 17th and 18th
LEAVE FOR WASHINGTON SUNDAY AFTER-
NOON AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS ON
MONDAY.
Reservations for the trip must be made in
advance.

PRICES OF MEALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 14</td>
<td>Luncheon, Beethoven Association</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supper, Brazilian Pavilion</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 15</td>
<td>Luncheon, Rainbow Room, Lunch</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supper, Fruster's Tavern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 16</td>
<td>Luncheon, Beethoven Association</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luncheon, Faculty Club, Columba University (supported by the University, limited to 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supper, Classroom Inn</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 17</td>
<td>Luncheon, Memorial of Modern Art</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supper, American Academy of Arts &amp; Letters</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 18</td>
<td>Luncheon, Beethoven Association</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance at the series of Sessions and
Concerts is free to Members and Delegates.
A ticket, costing $1.00, obtainable upon ap-
plication from the Secretary, 30 East 56th
Street, will admit visitors (including wives
or husbands of members) to the series.

A New York Sightseeing Tour leaves the
Battery every day at 11:00 and 1:00, Fare, $3.00.
The trip round Manhattan Island lasts 3 hours.
While an organized tour is consummated by
the Society, the trip is strongly recommended.
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Past presidents, left to right, back row: Lewis Lockwood, Howard Smither, Philip Gossett, Jessie Owens, Peter Burkholder, James Webster, Richard Crawford; front row: Colin Slan, Margaret Bent, Wendy Allabrook, Elaine Sisman, Jane Bernstein, Ellen Rosand, James Haar.
Society Officers and Board Members

1935 Otto Kinkeldey, President; Charles Seeger, Oliver Strunk, Vice Presidents; Gustave Reese, Secretary; Paul Henry Lang, Treasurer; Jean Beck, Archibald T. Davison, Carl Engel, Carleton Sprague Smith, Members-at-Large

1936 Otto Kinkeldey, President; Oliver Strunk, George S. Dickinson, Vice Presidents; Gustave Reese, Secretary; Paul Henry Lang, Treasurer; Glen Haydon, Hugo Leichtentritt, Otto Ortmann, Roy D. Welch, Members-at-Large

1937 Carl Engel, President; George S. Dickinson, Carleton Sprague Smith, Vice Presidents; Gustave Reese, Secretary; Paul Henry Lang, Treasurer; Otto Kinkeldey, M. D. Herter Norton, Waldo S. Pratt, Harold Spivacke, Members-at-Large

1938 Carl Engel, President; Carleton Sprague Smith, Howard Hanson, Vice Presidents; Gustave Reese, Secretary; Paul Henry Lang, Treasurer; Dayton C. Miller, Otto Ortmann, Albert Riemenschneider, Oliver Strunk, Members-at-Large

1939 Carleton Sprague Smith, President; Howard Hanson, Dayton C. Miller, Vice Presidents; Gustave Reese, Secretary; Paul Henry Lang, Treasurer; Otto E. Albrecht, Charles Warren Fox, Curt Sachs, Edward N. Waters, Members-at-Large

1940 Carleton Sprague Smith, President; Dayton C. Miller, Harold Spivacke, Vice Presidents; Gustave Reese, Secretary; Paul Henry Lang, Treasurer; Warren D. Allen, Alfred Einstein, Carl Engel, Otto Kinkeldey, Members-at-Large

1941 Otto Kinkeldey, President; Harold Spivacke, George S. Dickinson, Vice Presidents; Gustave Reese, Secretary; Paul Henry Lang, Treasurer; Theodore M. Finney, Glen Haydon, Albert Riemenschneider, Helen M. Roberts, Members-at-Large

1942 Otto Kinkeldey, President; George S. Dickinson, Warren D. Allen, Vice Presidents; Gustave Reese, Secretary; Paul Henry Lang, Treasurer; Manfred F. Bukofzer, Helen E. Bush, Jacob M. Coopersmith, Ross Lee Finney, Members-at-Large
1943 Glen Haydon, President; Warren D. Allen, Carl Engel, Vice Presidents; Gustave Reese, Secretary; Paul Henry Lang, Treasurer; Gilbert Chase, Paul R. Farnsworth, Albert Riemenschneider, Curt Sachs, Members-at-Large
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI/3 – XIX/I</td>
<td>Fall 1963–Spring 1966</td>
<td>Lewis Lockwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII/2–3 – XXIV</td>
<td>Summer 1969–Fall 1971</td>
<td>Martin Picker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII – XXX</td>
<td>1975–1977</td>
<td>Lawrence F. Bernstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI – XXXIII</td>
<td>1978–1980</td>
<td>Nicholas Temperley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LII – LIV</td>
<td>1999–2001</td>
<td>Thomas S. Grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXI – LXIII</td>
<td>2008–2010</td>
<td>Kate van Orden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Meetings

1st Philadelphia, Pa., Dec. 28, 1935 (with Music Teachers National Association)
2nd Chicago, Ill., Dec. 29, 1936 (with MTNA)
3rd Pittsburgh, Pa., Dec. 29, 1937 (with MTNA)
4th Washington, D.C., Dec. 29–30, 1938 (with MTNA)
5th New York, N.Y., Sept. 11–16, 1939, International Congress
6th Cleveland, Ohio, Dec. 30–31, 1940 (with MTNA)
7th Minneapolis, Minn., Dec. 29–30, 1941 (with MTNA)
8th New York, N.Y., Dec. 29, 1942
9th New York, N.Y., Dec. 28, 1943
10th New York, N.Y., Dec. 27, 1944
11th Detroit, Mich., Feb. 23–24, 1946 (with MTNA)
14th Chicago, Ill., Dec. 28–30, 1948 (with MTNA & Music Library Association)
15th New York, N.Y., Dec. 27–29, 1949 (with Society for Music in the Liberal Arts College)
16th Washington, D.C., Dec. 27–29, 1950 (with College Music Association, MLA & MTNA)
17th Rochester, N.Y., Dec. 27–29, 1951 (with MLA & SMLAC)
18th New Haven, Conn., Dec. 29–31, 1952
19th Chapel Hill, N.C., Dec. 28–30, 1953
22nd Urbana, Ill., Dec. 28–30, 1956
23rd Los Angeles, Calif., Dec. 28–30, 1957
25th Chicago, Ill., Dec. 27–30, 1959 (with CMS & SEM)
26th Berkeley & Stanford, Calif., Dec. 27–30, 1960 (with CMS & SEM)
27th New York, N.Y., Sept. 5–11, 1961 (with International Musicological Society)
28th Columbus, Ohio, Dec. 27–29, 1962 (with CMS)
29th Seattle, Wash., Dec. 27–29, 1963 (with CMS)
30th Washington, D.C., Dec. 27–29, 1964
31st Ann Arbor, Mich., Dec. 27–29, 1965 (with CMS)
32nd New Orleans, La., Dec. 27–29, 1966 (with CMS & SEM)
33rd Santa Barbara, Calif., Dec. 27–29, 1967
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location, State, Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34th</td>
<td>New Haven, Conn., Dec. 27–29, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th</td>
<td>St. Louis, Mo., Dec. 27–29, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th</td>
<td>Toronto, Ont., Nov. 5–8, 1970 (with CMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th</td>
<td>Chapel Hill, N.C., Nov. 14–17, 1971 (with SEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th</td>
<td>Dallas, Tex., Nov. 2–5, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th</td>
<td>Chicago, Ill., Nov. 8–11, 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th</td>
<td>Washington, D.C., Oct. 31–Nov. 3, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st</td>
<td>Los Angeles, Calif., Oct. 30–Nov. 2, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd</td>
<td>Washington, D.C., Nov. 4–7, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45th</td>
<td>New York, N.Y., Nov. 1–4, 1979 (with SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46th</td>
<td>Denver, Colo., Nov. 6–9, 1980 (with CMS &amp; SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, Mich., Nov. 4–7, 1982 (with SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49th</td>
<td>Louisville, Ky., Oct. 27–30, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51st</td>
<td>Vancouver, B.C., Nov. 7–10, 1985 (with CMS, SEM &amp; SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd</td>
<td>Cleveland, Ohio, Nov. 6–9, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53rd</td>
<td>New Orleans, La., Oct. 15–18, 1987 (with Center for Black Music Research &amp; CMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54th</td>
<td>Baltimore, Md., Nov. 3–6, 1988 (with SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th</td>
<td>Austin, Tex., Oct. 26–29, 1989 (with SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th</td>
<td>Oakland, Calif., Nov. 7–10, 1990 (with SEM &amp; SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57th</td>
<td>Chicago, Ill., Nov. 7–10, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58th</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pa., Nov. 5–8, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59th</td>
<td>Montreal, Que., Nov. 4–7, 1993 (with SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th</td>
<td>Minneapolis, Minn., Oct. 27–30, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61st</td>
<td>New York, N.Y., Nov. 2–5, 1995 (with CBMR &amp; SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62nd</td>
<td>Baltimore, Md., Nov. 7–10, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63rd</td>
<td>Phoenix, Ariz., Oct. 30–Nov. 2, 1997 (with SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65th</td>
<td>Kansas City, Mo., Nov. 4–7, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th</td>
<td>Toronto, Ont., Nov. 1–5, 2000 (with 13 other organizations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67th</td>
<td>Atlanta, Ga., Nov. 15–18, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68th</td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio, Oct. 31–Nov. 3, 2002 (with SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69th</td>
<td>Houston, Tex., Nov. 13–16, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70th</td>
<td>Seattle, Wash., Nov. 11–14, 2004 (with SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71st</td>
<td>Washington, D.C., Oct. 27–30, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72nd</td>
<td>Los Angeles, Calif., Nov. 2–5, 2006 (SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73rd</td>
<td>Quebec City, Que., Nov. 1–4, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74th</td>
<td>Nashville, Tenn., Nov. 6–9, 2008 (with SMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th</td>
<td>Philadelphia, Pa., Nov. 12–15, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Winners of Society Awards

The Alfred Einstein Award

The Alfred Einstein Award honors each year a musicological article of exceptional merit by a scholar in the early stages of his or her career who is a citizen or permanent resident of Canada or the United States.


**The Noah Greenberg Award**

The Noah Greenberg Award, established by the Trustees of the New York Pro Musica Antiqua in memory of their founder and first director, is intended as a grant-in-aid to stimulate active cooperation between scholars and performers by recognizing and fostering outstanding contributions to historical performing practices.

1978  Cappella Nova (Richard Taruskin, director)

1979  John Hajdu

1980  Philip Brett
    Ross W. Duffin

1981  Maria Fowler
    Timothy Aarset

1982  Spencer Carroll

1983  Mary Cyr and Frederick Stoltzfus

1984  No award

1985  Boston Renaissance Ensemble
    John Hajdu

1986  Evan Johnson

1987  Peter Urquhart

1988  Robert Hill

1989  Linda Kobler
Celebrating the American Musicological Society at Seventy-five

1990
D.C. Hall’s New Concert and Quadrille Band (Peter Bloom, Director) 
Julianne Baird

1991
Kristin Thelander

1992
Alexander Blachly

1993
Richard G. King

1994
Frederick Gable

1995
Jeannette Sorrell and Apollo’s Fire

1996
Louise Stein and Andrew Lawrence King 
Jeanice Brooks and Daniel Leech-Wilkinson

1997
Kate van Orden and The King’s Noyse (David Douglass, Director)

1998
Musicians of the Old Post Road (Daniel Ryan and Suzanne Stumpf, Directors)

1999
Victor Coelho and Il Complesso Barocco (Alan Curtis, Director)

2000
Steven Zohn and The Publick Music (Steven Zohn and Thomas Folan, Directors)

2001
Talisman

2002
Maria I. Rose

2003
Christopher Stembridge

2004
Philip Cave and Sally Dunkley

2005
Catherine Gordon-Seifert, Elisabeth Belgrano, and Stephen Stubbs

2006
Christopher Wolverton and Honey Meconi

2007
Elisabeth Le Guin

2008
Adam Knight Gilbert

2009
Liber: Ensemble for Early Music
The Otto Kinkeldey Award

The Otto Kinkeldey Award honors each year a musicological book of exceptional merit published during the previous year in any language and in any country by a scholar who is past the early stages of his or her career and who is a member of the AMS or a citizen or permanent resident of Canada or the United States.


1979  No award


1991  No award


The Lewis Lockwood Award

The Lewis Lockwood Award honors each year a musicological book of exceptional merit published during the previous year in any language and in any country by a scholar in the early stages of his or her career who is a member of the AMS or a citizen or permanent resident of Canada or the United States.


The Music in American Culture Award

The Music in American Culture Award honors each year a book of exceptional merit that both illuminates some important aspect of the music of the United States and places that music in a rich cultural context. The goal of this award is to recognize the best writing on music in American culture, regardless of the source or intended audience of that writing; hence work by a broad range of authors—including performing musicians, journalists, and music critics, as well as academic scholars—will be considered.

Celebrating the American Musicological Society at Seventy-five

The Claude V. Palisca Award

The Claude V. Palisca Award honors each year a scholarly edition or translation in the field of musicology published during the previous year in any language and in any country by a scholar who is a member of the AMS or a citizen or permanent resident of Canada or the United States.


The Paul A. Pisk Prize

The Paul A. Prize is awarded annually to a graduate music student for a scholarly paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the AMS.

1991 Mark W. Stahura (University of Chicago). “Refuting the *Ripieno* in Handel’s Orchestra”


1993 John R. Clevenger (Eastman School of Music). “Achille at the Conservatoire (1872–1884)”

1994 Kelley Harness (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign). “*La flora* (1628): A Symbolic Transfer of Power in Early Seventeenth-Century Florence”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Thesis Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Kate van Orden (University of Chicago)</td>
<td>“‘Chansons plus ménestrières que musiciennes’: Singing to Timbres in Late Sixteenth-Century France”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Stefano Castelvecchi (University of Chicago)</td>
<td>“Sentimental and Anti-Sentimental in Da Ponte’s and Mozart’s <em>Le Nozze di Figaro</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Cormac Newark (Christ Church, Oxford)</td>
<td>“‘Mille sentiments confus l’agitent’: Understanding <em>La Muette de Portici</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Hilary Poriss (University of Chicago)</td>
<td>No award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Gundula Kreuzer (St. Hugh's College, University of Oxford)</td>
<td>“Oper in Kirchengewande’: Verdi’s Requiem and the Anxiety of the German Nation”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Jennifer Shaw (Stony Brook University)</td>
<td>“New Performance Sources and Old Modernist Productions: <em>Die Jakobsleiter</em> in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Silvio dos Santos (Brandeis University)</td>
<td>“Ascription of Identity: The <em>Bild</em> Motif and the Character of Lulu”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ted Dumitrescu (Universiteit Utrecht)</td>
<td>“A Flemish-Italian Gift to the Tudors”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Robert Fallon (University of California, Berkeley)</td>
<td>“The Record of Realism in Messiaen’s Bird Style”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Paul Berry (Yale University)</td>
<td>“‘Alte Liebe’: Johannes Brahms, Clara Schumann, and the Poetics of Musical Memory”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Jesse Rodin (Harvard University)</td>
<td>“‘When in Rome . . .’: What Josquin Learned in the Sistine Chapel”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Emily Abrams Ansari (University of Western Ontario and Harvard University)</td>
<td>“Aaron Copland and Cultural Diplomacy: ‘Un-American’ Composer Meets Cold War Ambassador”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Kimberly Anne Francis (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)</td>
<td>“Il reste encore des questions’: Nadia Boulanger and Igor Stravinsky Develop the <em>Symphonie de Psaumes</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Rebekah Ahrendt (University of California, Berkeley)</td>
<td>“‘Allons en paix, rebatir nos maisons’: Staging the <em>réfugié</em> experience”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The H. Colin Slim Award

The H. Colin Slim Award honors each year a musicological article of exceptional merit, published during the previous year in any language and in any country by a scholar who is past the early stages of her or his career and who is a member of the AMS or a citizen or permanent resident of Canada or the United States.


The Ruth A. Solie Award

The Ruth A. Solie Award honors each year a collection of musicological essays of exceptional merit published during the preceding calendar year in any language and in any country and edited by a scholar or scholars who are members of the AMS or citizens or permanent residents of Canada or the United States.


The Robert M. Stevenson Award

The Robert M. Stevenson Award recognizes outstanding scholarship in Iberian music, including music composed, performed, created, collected, belonging to, or descended from the musical cultures of Spain, Portugal, and all Latin American areas in which Spanish and Portuguese are spoken. The prize is awarded annually to a book, monograph, edition, or journal article, in English, published by a member of the AMS during the preceding three calendar years.


The Philip Brett Award

The Philip Brett Award, administered by the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender/Transsexual, Queer Study Group (LGBTQ) of the AMS, honors each year exceptional musicological work in the field of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender/transsexual studies completed during the previous two academic years in any country and in any language.


Research and Travel Grant Recipients

The M. Elizabeth C. Bartlet Fund

The M. Elizabeth C. Bartlet Fund for Research in France provides grants to doctoral students at or graduates of universities in the United States and Canada to conduct doctoral or post-doctoral musicological research in France.

2007  Willa J. Collins, Cornell University
2008  Will Gibbons, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
       Jennifer Saltzstein, University of Oklahoma
2009  Sarah Gutsche-Miller, McGill University

The Thomas Hampson Fund

The Thomas Hampson Fund was established in 2009 in honor of the OPUS Campaign and by the AMS in recognition of Hampson’s outstanding contributions to the field of music as a performer, teacher, and scholar. The fund is dedicated to fostering editions and scholarship on classic song in all its contexts, as well as new and innovative technologies for promoting and understanding classic song via interactive media and the Internet.

The Jan LaRue Travel Fund for Research Travel to Europe

The Jan LaRue Travel Fund is intended to encourage and assist Ph.D. candidates, post-doctoral scholars, independent scholars, and junior faculty to travel to Europe to carry out research. The fund honors the memory of Jan LaRue (1918–2004), a distinguished scholar and AMS member admired for his pioneering work on style analysis, the eighteenth-century symphony, and early computer applications in musicology.

2009  Sarah Williams, University of South Carolina
The Janet Levy Fund

The purpose of the Janet Levy Fund is to support professional travel and research expenses for independent scholars who are members of the AMS.

2005  Melania Bucciarelli
2006  Colleen R. Baade
      Jenny Doctor
2007  Vera Deak
      Kara Gardner
      Peter Poulos
2008  Robert Nosow
      Bonny Miller
2009  Ronit Seter
      Monique Ingalls
2010  Tina Fruehauf

The Harold Powers Fund

The Harold Powers World Travel Fund for Research on Music is intended to encourage and assist Ph.D. candidates, post-docs, and junior faculty in all fields of musical scholarship to travel anywhere in the world to carry out the necessary work for their dissertation or other research.

2007  Joshua Walden, Columbia University
2008  Max Katz, University of California, Santa Barbara
2009  Cassandra Hartford, Stony Brook University

The Eugene K. Wolf Fund

The Eugene K. Wolf Travel Fund for European Research is intended to encourage and assist Ph.D. candidates in all fields of musical scholarship to travel to Europe to carry out the necessary work for their dissertation on a topic in European music.

2004  Gregory Bloch, University of California, Berkeley
      Sarah J. Eyerly, University of California, Davis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2005 | Patricia Firca, University of Chicago  
Nathan Martin, McGill University |
| 2006 | Amy Brosius, New York University  
Michael Eisenberg, City University of New York |
| 2007 | Ewelina Boczkowska, University of California, Los Angeles  
Kimberly A. Francis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Loren M. Ludwig, University of Virginia |
| 2008 | Adeline Mueller, University of California, Berkeley  
Amber Youell-Fingleton, Columbia University |
| 2009 | Rebekah Ahrendt, University of California, Berkeley  
Rachel Mundy, New York University |
Alvin H. Johnson AMS 50 Dissertation Fellowships

AMS 50 Fellowships support completion of a dissertation for a doctorate at a North American university.

1986    David Gramit, Duke University
1987    Donald McLean, University of Toronto
        James Pritchett, New York University
1988    Steven Krantz, University of Minnesota
        Thomas Sipe, University of Pennsylvania
1989    Thomas Brothers, University of California, Berkeley
        Bridget Conrad, City University of New York
        Steven Saunders, University of Pittsburgh
1990    Susan Jackson, City University of New York
        Ray Komow, Brandeis University
        Michael Schiano, Brandeis University
        Amy Stillman, Harvard University
        Alicyn Warren, Princeton University
1991    David Cannata, New York University
        Robert Fink, University of California, Berkeley
        Robert Grimes, University of Pittsburgh
        Elizabeth Hudson, Cornell University
        Kristin Knittel, Princeton University
        Bruce McClung, Eastman School of Music
1992    Dexter Edge, University of Southern California
        Edmund Goehring, Columbia University
        Anne MacNeil, University of Chicago
        Alison Terbell, Princeton University
        Richard Will, Cornell University
1993  Daniel Beller-McKenna, Harvard University
      Wendy Heller, Brandeis University
      Berthold Hoeckner, Cornell University
      Peter Hoyt, University of Pennsylvania
      Joseph Lubben, Brandeis University
      Mary Ann Smart, Cornell University

1994  Arved Ashby, Yale University
      Stefano Castelvecchi, University of Chicago
      John Clevenger, University of Rochester
      Gayle Clark Kirkwood, University of Pittsburgh
      Benjamin Korstvedt, University of Pennsylvania

1995  Gregory Barnett, Princeton University
      Geoffrey Burgess, Cornell University
      Nancy Guy, University of Pittsburgh
      Heather Hadlock, Princeton University
      John Andrew Johnson, Harvard University
      Stefano Mengozzi, University of Chicago

1996  Todd Borgerding, University of Michigan
      Mary Davis, Harvard University
      Susan Boynton, Brandeis University
      Simon Morrison, Princeton University
      David Schneider, University of California, Berkeley
      Albin Zak, City University of New York

1997  Maribeth Clark, University of Pennsylvania
      Bernardo Illari, University of Chicago
      Gillian Rodger, University of Pittsburgh
      Leslie Sprout, University of California, Berkeley
      Marica Tacconi, Yale University

1998  Theo Cateforis, State University of New York, Stony Brook
      Danielle Fosler-Lussier, University of California, Berkeley
      Dana Gooley, Princeton University
      Beth Anne Lee-De Amici, University of Pennsylvania
      Klara Moricz, University of California, Berkeley
      Rebecca Wagner Oettinger, University of Wisconsin-Madison
      Emanuele Senici, Cornell University
      Rose Theresa, University of Pennsylvania

1999  Lisa Barg, State University of New York, Stony Brook
      Elizabeth Bergman Crist, Yale University
      Giuseppe Gerbino, Duke University
      Barbara Milewski, Princeton University
Fellowship Recipients

Martin Scherzinger, Columbia University
Anya Suschitzsky, University of California, Berkeley

2000
Beth Levy, University of California, Berkeley
Susan Lewis, Princeton University
Rebecca Maloy, University of Cincinnati
Ivan Raykoff, University of California, San Diego
Elizabeth Wells, Eastman School of Music

2001
Joanna Demers, Princeton University
Matthew Gelbart, University of California, Berkeley
Nalini Ghuman Gwynne, University of California, Berkeley
Olga Haldey, Ohio State University
Sherry D. Lee, University of British Columbia
Stephanic Tcharos, Princeton University

2002
Patrick Burke, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Julie McQuinn, Northwestern University
Pierpaolo Polzonetti, Cornell University
Holly Watkins, University of California, Berkeley

2003
Melina Esse, University of California, Berkeley
Charles Hiroshi Garrett, University of California, Los Angeles
Roger Moseley, University of California, Berkeley
Scott Paulin, Princeton University

2004
S. Andrew Granade, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Yossi Maurey, University of Chicago
Kiri Miller, Harvard University
Heather Wiebe, University of California, Berkeley

2005
Emily Iuliano Dolan, Cornell University
David C. Paul, University of California, Berkeley
Benjamin Adam Steege, Harvard University

2006
Marisa Biaggi, Princeton University
Todd R. Decker, University of Michigan
Margaret Martin, Stony Brook University
Lisa Musca, University of California, Los Angeles
Jesse Rodin, Harvard University

2007
Michael Alan Anderson, University of Chicago
Brigid Cohen, Harvard University
Nikos Pappas, University of Kentucky
Noel Verzosa, University of California, Berkeley
Celebrating the American Musicological Society at Seventy-five

2008  Esther Criscuola de Laix, University of California, Berkeley
       Karen Hiles, Columbia University
       Arman Schwartz, University of California, Berkeley
       Daniil Zavlunov, Princeton University

2009  Corbett Bazler, Columbia University
       Martin Nedbal, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester
       Andrew Oster, Princeton University
       Anna Zayaruznaya, Harvard University

The Howard Mayer Brown Fellowship

Intended to increase the presence of minority scholars and teachers in musicology, the Howard Mayer Brown Fellowship supports one year of graduate work for a student at a North American University who is a member of a group historically underrepresented in the discipline, including, in the U.S., African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans, and, in Canada, visible minorities.

1995  Bernardo Illari, University of Chicago
1997  Maya Gibson, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1999  Georgiary McElveen, Duke University
2001  Mark Burford, Columbia University
2002  Charles Hiroshi Garrett, University of California, Los Angeles
2004  Christina Sunardi, University of California, Berkeley
2005  Hedy Law, University of Chicago
2006  Charles Carson, University of Pennsylvania
2007  Valerie Dickerson, University of California, Los Angeles
2008  Ryan Bañagale, Harvard University
2009  Erika Honisch, University of Chicago
       Sumitra Ranganathan, University of California, Berkeley
Books and Editions Published by the Society


Music of the United States of America (MUSA)

MUSA was established by the American Musicological Society in 1988 as a series of scholarly editions that seeks to reflect the character and shape of American music making. MUSA, originally planned to encompass forty volumes, is designed and overseen by the Committee on the Publication of American Music (COPAM), an arm of the Society’s Publications Committee. Criteria for determining its contents have been: (1) that the series as a whole reflect breadth and balance among eras, genres, composers, and performance media; (2) that it avoid music already available through other channels, duplicating only where new editions of available music seem essential; and (3) that works in the series be representative, chosen to reflect particular excellence or to represent notable achievements in this country’s highly varied music history. All volumes in the series have been published by A-R Editions, Middleton, Wisconsin.

MUSA 1

MUSA 2

MUSA 3
Amy Beach. *Quartet for Strings (In One Movement), Opus 89*. Edited by Adrienne Fried Block. 1994.

MUSA 4

MUSA 5

MUSA 6
MUSA 7

MUSA 8

MUSA 9

MUSA 10

MUSA 11

MUSA 12

MUSA 13

MUSA 14

MUSA 15

MUSA 16

MUSA 17
MUSA 18

MUSA 19

MUSA 20
*Songs from “A New Circle of Voices”: The Sixteenth Annual Pow-wow at UCLA*. Edited by Tara Browner. 2009.
The American Musicological Society observed its seventy-fifth anniversary in 2009 with a number of special events and presentations at its Philadelphia Annual Meeting. This booklet marks the occasion by presenting remarks given at the Presidential Forum by Jane A. Bernstein, Lewis Lockwood, Suzanne Cusick, and Charles Hiroshi Garrett, and an anniversary essay by James Haar. Numerous photographs from the event and reproductions of selected memorabilia from the AMS archives also commemorate the event. Comprehensive lists dating from the foundation of the Society include:

- Society Officers and Board Members
- Honorary Members
- Corresponding Members
- Editors-in-Chief of the Journal of the American Musicological Society
- The Society’s Annual Meetings
- Society Award Winners
- Research and Travel Grant Recipients
- Fellowship Recipients
- Books and Editions Published by the Society
- The Music of the United States of America series