ABSTRACT

The analytical-narrative purpose of this paper is manifold and proportionally distributed among several directions of methodological and hermeneutical interrogation. A first idea refers to the year 1885, when Guido Adler published the text Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft, considered to be the “birth certificate” of musicology as a science and, later, as an academic discipline. However, while taking in consideration the Adler moment, one cannot overlook the equally important Riemann moment, whence it clearly results that European musicology had at least two generative moments in terms of methodology. A second interrogation refers to the object of musicology, or, in other words, to an answer to the question: what is historicized and, at the same time, systematized in Adler’s project? We define the object of musicology as a conceptual corpus structured as a hierarchy, which, in turn, consists of two triads: (a) a first, internal, technical one – musical sound, sonorous organization systems and musical forms and (b) a second, higher, sociological one – genre, style and musical canon. The ideational arc launched by Adler finds, among many other things, a methodological relevance in the system of musicological disciplines formulated by Manfred Bukofzer. The corollary of this entire paper is the understanding that musicology as a project, discourse and science becomes possible only in so far as in the context of post-Renaissance modernity music is no longer part of the Quadrivium of mathematical sciences, but of the trivium of verbal arts. To paraphrase the title of Adler’s text, we can say that this has defined its purpose, method and objective.
1. The “time zero” of musicology – the Adler “case”

As a descriptive-analytical academic discipline, musicology was invented by Guido Adler and was proposed as a project in 1885. In 1884, together with Friedrich Chrysander (Handel’s biographer) and Philipp Spittal (Bach’s biographer), Adler founded Vierteljahresschrift für Musikwissenschaft (a quarterly journal of musicology), which in 1885 included the founding text of musicology as a science – Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft [The Scope, Method and Aim of Musicology].

This chronological milestone therefore represents not only the moment of formulation of the name of a humanistic science, but also that of a specific method that would justify and legitimize this name – Musikwissenschaft – the Science of Music. On the other hand, the scientific act can be considered to be musicological only after the completion of:

(a) the formulation of the methodological conception in its main lines,
(b) the accumulations and negotiations related to the terminology apparatus and
(c) the systematic description of the object, scope and doctrine of the new science. It is only subject to certain reservations and related specifications that the entire body of ancient, medieval, Renaissance or Enlightenment treatises dealing with the musical imaginary, existence, thinking or practice can be regarded as documents of musicological literature. Projecting the Adler moment over the entire history that proceeded the year 1885 would lead to a real confusion. It is far from our intention to consider Glareanus’s treatise Dodecachordon (1547), Rameau’s Treatise on Harmony (1722) or Aristidus Quintilianus’s systematic treatise (approx. the 3rd century O.E.) as musicological writings, as long as they were not

---

106 In our opinion, the close reading and thorough understanding of this founding text of musicology is mandatory for the first-year students of a higher musical education institution (university, conservatory, academy of music).

107 In his analytical study entitled Guido Adler’s The Scope, Method, and Aim of Musicology (1885): An English Translation with an Historico-Analytical Commentary (in: Yearbook for Traditional Music, Vol. 13, 1981, pp. 1-21) researcher Erica Mugglesstone draws a parallel between the systematic organization of music studies as proposed by Aristides Quintilianus in his treatise Perì musikês (Περί Μουσικῆς, or, in Latin – De musica (On Music) and Guido Adler’s conception. But beyond the conception set out by the two authors and the idea of grouping the conceptual constituent elements, there can be no question
designed in terms of a doctrine, i.e. of a musicological methodology proper. Adler's conception represents something that is conceptually and methodologically entirely different and of which the aforementioned writings make no mention whatsoever. Thus, we speak about two states of affairs: (a) a pre-Adlerian, non-musicological one in doctrinal terms and (b) the other, Alderian one, by virtue of which both the present of his time and the historical past were organized in the light of the term Musikwissenschaft.

The inclusion of the entire theoretical legacy under the musicological conceptual “umbrella” is acceptable only as an artifice, pushing the limits in some way by attaching the qualifier “musicological” as a factor of conceptual and methodological reformulation, recategorization and “distortion” through alignment to a different scientific consciousness than the one existing in the original context in which the historical texts were conceived. However, this inclusion, albeit retroactive, could only be achieved in strict accordance with Adler's conception and methodology. Hence also a “double standard” in approaching these texts:

(a) the standard of the contemporary time of the (non- or pre-musicological) original and

(b) the standard of our contemporary time (already musicological in the full sense of the term).

The evaluation and interpretation of such documents must therefore take into account both standards, albeit within the limits of a certain comparative parallelism.

2. The science of music and the sciences of the 19th century

Adler’s idea regarding the two methods of musicology – historical and systematic, faithfully reflects the level of development of the European science at the end of the 19th century. The formulation of the idea of a science of music, this time in the literal sense of the word and not as a mere aesthetic appendix to different philosophical systems, becomes possible as a result of an obvious

---

108 The same situation can be considered in the case of the musical aesthetics discipline, because, for example, according to Russian logician Alexander Zinoviev’s idea regarding the science of logic, it cannot be mathematical, physical or philosophical. Logic can only be applied to mathematics, physics or philosophy. In like manner, aesthetics cannot be musical, architectural, literary or choreographic: aesthetics can only be of music, of architecture, of literature or of choreography. Given that the first use of the term aesthetics (Ästhetik) was in 1750 by German philosopher Alexander Baumgarten, it is clear that the entire body of texts written prior to that date can be considered as aesthetic only via a retroactive projection of the term and method of this new science of logicized sensations.
convergence between the methodology of history (von Ranke, but also Mommsen, Droysen, Treitschke), a synthesis between the models of taxonomic thinking (Buffon, Linnaeus)\textsuperscript{109}, the ideas of sciences such as palaeontology (Cuvier) and geology (the image of historical periods as geological strata) and finally positivism (Comte), with a promising opening both towards a sociology of music and, even more comprehensively, towards an epistemology of scientific thinking applied to the musical phenomenon.

The 19th century was also the period of elaboration of the systematic (synthetic) conception of sciences as a consensual doctrine of scholarly knowledge, and of formulation of an education system (in the modern sense of the word) based on its criteria.

(a) The former case is illustrated by the philosophical work \textit{Phänomenologie des Geistes} (The Phenomenology of Spirit, 1807) by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), conceived as the first part of the project \textit{System of Sciences}, the second part being the work entitled \textit{Wissenschaft der Logik} (Science of Logic, between 1812 and 1817). To Hegel we can add the German naturalist and explorer Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859), the founder of the Humboldtian science movement, by which we understand both the conception of the natural environment as a whole – \textit{ecology} (in the sense of \textit{botanical geography} or \textit{biogeography}), and a set of rules and regulations of the modern method of scientific research\textsuperscript{110};

(b) The latter case refers to Alexander’s elder brother, the German philologist Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835), who in his capacity as Minister of Education designed and implemented the \textit{Prussian education reform} (Königsberger Schulplan, 1809), which treated education as an organic whole encompassing all phases of education, from primary school right up to university (with the contribution of personalities like philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte or the academics and linguists Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm brothers), in the form of an \textit{educational canon}.

It is only in such a context that we can truly understand the nature of the specific conditions that determined Guido Adler’s founding gesture – \textit{Musikwissenschaft}, as a system of scientific fields (taxonomy) oriented towards the (formative-educational) study of music as a type of thinking and practice.

Musicologist Bruno Nettl emphasizes an additional, albeit essential aspect for the cultural and political context in which the 19th century European sciences emerged and developed: “In Adler’s world, there was no doubt that the true music

\textsuperscript{109} In further support of our assertions we recommend Benjamin Breuer’s Ph. D. thesis defended at the University of Pittsburgh in 2011, with a highly suggestive title: \textit{The Birth of Musicology from the Spirit of Evolution: Ernst Haeckel’s Entwicklungslehre as Central Component of Guido Adler’s Methodology for Musicology}.

was the music of Western culture and that the truest music was the art music of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Austria and Germany and maybe Italy and France.”

As an ethnomusicologist, Nettl substantiates his statement by using the argument of “Eurocentrism” and “Euro-supremacy”, which defined the collective mentality and especially the politics of the second half of the 19th century. Thus, musicology also appears as a proof of the exclusive status of the European musical culture, able to develop its own science and gradually asserting itself as a universal method of representation and understanding of the musical phenomenon.

3. Musicology as a dialectical taxonomic system

The following question should be asked: which of the two elements of Adler’s conception could have been the generative element of the idea of musicology, as well as of the entire system – binary, dialectical and consubstantial alike – the historical or the systematic element? The question is all the more opportune as it is more obvious that they relate to one other based on the antinomic relation between abstract (historical)-concrete (systematic). In other words, the historical element as a conceptual generator appears as a weak, inoperative element, being more of a deductible one, configurable through multiple levels of typological differentiation or temporal mediation (“layers”, periods, stages, but also documents, writings, reviews etc.) as well as semantic mediation (e.g. various historical meanings of the concept of musical style). This vacillation between genealogical and archaeological or, even worse, the direct and cumulative influence of both, exponentially amplifies the difficulty of operating with the historical element. The systematic element, on the other hand, acts as a powerful generative entity, one that is operative without any mediation or distortion filters, and connected to the current state of the scientific knowledge.

Here we could speak of the temporality of the historical element and of the immediacy and therefore atemporality of the systematic element as an atemporal cross section of the current state of musical culture, but also as a “...system of musical-theoretical categories as an instrument of analysis of musical culture and of its constituents and phenomena. The abstract nature of the theoretical universals (i.e. – systematic – O.G.) imposes the need for their historical materialization”.

Only thus and not conversely or in any otherwise way. This is about the systematic criterion as a synchronic typological totality and, on the other hand, about the historical criterion as a diachronic genealogical totality. This inversion reveals a


double semantic status of each of the two terms and, at the same time, their consubstantiality: (a) the function of form-structure of the systematic element and (b) the function of content of the historical element.

A clearer picture can be obtained by taking the next step and pointing to another antinomic pair – antique (historical)-current (systematic) or, by increasing the differentiation between fictional (historical)–real/authentic (systematic). This last dichotomous state diminishes even further the generative capacity of the historical element, given also the relatively young age of the historical science at that time\(^{113}\). Since the conception of musicology as a science appears as an epistemological synthesis resulting both from the adherence to the level of European scientific knowledge and, especially, from the typological “offer” of scientific activities existing at that time (the 1880s of the last century), it is not hard to imagine that what triggered Adler’s formulation of the idea of musicology as a science was the systematic element, concerned with the ordering of the obvious things of the immediate present (axiomatic), whereas the historical principle assumed reliance on multiple, re-evocative mediation of bringing cultural phenomena of the past back into the present (a theorem to be demonstrated). In a purely temporal-diachronic and historical sense, the approached phenomena simply do not exist as values of the present, even if the present is viewed as a sum of effects produced by temporally more or less remote causes. In the best case, it is only their residual forms that can be called upon – archived documents which in turn must be deciphered and interpreted, not so much in terms of the time when they were conceived, but rather in terms of the researcher’s present time, with all the good and mostly bad things that it involves. In other words, the historical constituent presents itself as an equation with multiple unknowns and with a very low probability for its original meanings to be revealed (demonstrated). Thus, the entire conception has a systematic structure, while the two constituents, i.e. systematic and historical, are presented as complex taxonomic fields.

As a preliminary conclusion, musicology can be represented as a tool for mediation\(^{114}\) between creative consciousness (subjectivity) and musical nature\(^{115}\) (objectivity, pure empiricism), as subject and object.

---

\(^{113}\) As a necessary point of reference, albeit of an obviously relative value, we choose the work of the German historian Leopold von Ranke, the founder of history as a science in the modern sense of the word. In 1824, the German historian published his first work entitled *Geschichte der romanischen und germanischen Völker von 1494 bis 1514* (History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations from 1494 until 1514).

\(^{114}\) The following quotation provides a spectacular and enlightening variety of attributes that can also be applied to a science such as musicology, the idea of a method of mediation between subject and object: “According to Goethe, when contemplating the universe, man cannot abstain from venturing into ideas and building concepts while trying to understand the essence of God or of nature. « Here we meet the real difficulty [...]: between idea and experience there inevitably yawns a chasm, which we struggle to cross with all our might, but in vain. In spite of this we are forever in search of a way to overcome this gap with reason, intellect, imagination, faith, feeling, delusion and – when all else fails – folly. In the end, after an honest effort, we will probably find ourselves agreeing with the
In a comparative image of the evolution of the European arts, music has always appeared as a “laggard” art. For example, the idea of classicity, formulated and actively developed by the 17th century French theatre (the genre of lyrical tragedy – Pierre Corneille and Jean Racine), revealed itself as a dominant concept in music only in the second half of the 18th century. This enables music to gain a comfortable ascendancy and thus the legitimacy to formulate the ideological, stylistic and aesthetic conclusions about an epoch (figures of composers who “close” an epoch, such as Bach, Beethoven, Mahler or Webern). Likewise, musicology as a science represents a “belated” emergence, though only in relation to other “older” sciences and in perfect accordance with the state of things in the field of musical thinking and practice. Paradoxically, however, in order to faithfully represent the musical existence and, at the same time, to live up to the normative definition of the concept of science, musicology is forced to turn to two methodologies that are seemingly extraneous to the musical artistic field.

In this sense, musicology appears as a synthetic expression of the convergence between the humanistic (history) and natural (biology) scientific disciplines, though with two important remarks:

(a) in the case of historical musicology, we are not speaking about a historiography as a simple narrative-descriptive genre (Herodotus), but about an analytical historiography, based on the critical research of the sources and assigning a major importance to documents and archive consultation;

(b) in spite of being conceived as a projection of the naturalistic taxonomies and of itself representing a hierarchical system of kingdoms, families and genera, musicological systematics operates as a dynamic system open to the assimilation of new typological entities, whose occurrence would be logically and legitimately determined by the evolution of the forms of social thinking and existence.

By musical nature we understand the field of musical practice as a pure empirical given, built in the form of an audio-sphere (in subjective terms) or sono-sphere (in objective terms). In a different perspective, we could represent the relation of the perceiving or creative subjectivity to a purely aural/sonorous mundanity in the light of the three concepts described by Boethius (c. 480-approx. 525) - musica humana, musica musica instrumentalis mundane, the last one appearing as a mediating element between the first two. Musicology necessarily appears as a mediating element between the two irrational natures – the pure intuition of the creative subject and the pure sonority of the world as universe.


115 By musical nature we understand the field of musical practice as a pure empirical given, built in the form of an audio-sphere (in subjective terms) or sono-sphere (in objective terms). In a different perspective, we could represent the relation of the perceiving or creative subjectivity to a purely aural/sonorous mundanity in the light of the three concepts described by Boethius (c. 480-approx. 525) - musica humana, musica musica instrumentalis mundane, the last one appearing as a mediating element between the first two. Musicology necessarily appears as a mediating element between the two irrational natures – the pure intuition of the creative subject and the pure sonority of the world as universe.
4. The Riemann “moment” – a second beginning of musicology: between Lexikon and Katechismus

Although the musicological systematics proposed by Adler (1855-1941) is quite satisfactory in content, one cannot overlook the personality of Hugo Riemann (1849-1919) and his own conception of musicology, so suggestively expressed in terms like Katechismus and Musiklexikon. His almost obsessive concern for normative writings of an exhaustive, encyclopaedic character, impresses, besides the purely quantitative aspect, by a systemic rigour and, equally importantly, by the need for a reformulation and total resignification of the entire body of musical knowledge accumulated until the end of the 19th century.

It is only by joining these names together – Adler and Riemann, that we can clearly discern their specific and mutually reinforcing contributions to the development of the concept of musicology. Thus, Adler proposes the idea, the system and the conceptual framework, whereas Riemann provides the patterns, the methodology and the musicological discourse as a complete typological system and, especially, as a corpus of texts of certain potential and already formulated academic disciplines.

As a first point of differentiation, on Adler’s side we find the foundation text of musicology (Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft, 1885), as well as a monograph dedicated to the musical style (Der Stil in der Musik, 1911), with the former being just a proposal of a concept. Riemann, in turn, accumulates dozens of titles and hundreds of normative musicological pages containing complete, up-to-date and therefore utterly practicable formulations of the musicological idea, concept and even methodology.

A second aspect would refer to the choice of the dominant concept. In contrast to Adler’s conception, Riemann’s Outline of Musicology focuses on the systematic idea in the first four chapters (pp. 1-112), while music history is dealt with only in the fifth chapter (pp. 113-148)\textsuperscript{116}. Riemann’s perspective is shared by many renowned musicologists including Charles Seeger (1886-1979), Willi Apel (1893-1988), Walter Wiora (1906-1997) and Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht (1919-1999), who wrote studies on systematic musicology.

Just by trying to plausibly explain the rate of expansion and implementation of the new concept – Musikwissenschaft – in the Austrian-German scientific and academic milieu, it becomes obvious that however original and useful Adler’s idea and system may have been, a simple epistemological statement (albeit supported by famous names such as Chrysander and Spitta) is not enough to have as spectacular and noteworthy an impact as that of the thinking and writings of Heinrich Schenker (Bruckner’s student) or Ernst Kurth (a colleague of

Adler and student of Bruckner and Hanslick). The rate of expansion and depth of implementation, besides the idea and concept, require a compelling amount of textual and methodologically functional evidence which Adler had no way to provide, when in his case we can only speak of a simple statement of a conception. The two functions of expansion and implementation can only be performed by a third function – the dissemination function, accomplished by Hugo Riemann, especially as his work coincides with the institutionalization of musicology as a curricular discipline.

Both musicologists had a concurrent “start” and we can assume that this spectacular synchrony is not at all accidental, because the two names – Adler and Riemann, actually stand for two models of musicology. Riemann’s writings “flank”, at three years distance, the date of the “Adler moment”, with the publication of the first edition of the Musiklexikon in Leipzig, in 1882, and of the first Katechismus der Musik (Allgemeine Musiklehre) also in Leipzig, in 1888. Riemann claims to virtually produce a “summa teologiae” (hence the term Catechism) of a universal value: no less than fifteen volumes as fifteen normative models entitled Katechismus, dealing with music theory and history, composition, orchestration, harmony, counterpoint, as well as a relevant and overarching title for his entire career – Grundriß der Musikwissenschaft [Outlines of Musicology, Leipzig, 1908]. In other words, Riemann actually offers a complete curricular proposal.

In a different light, musicology, as both a science of music and an academic discipline, emerges more as a synthetic discipline, generated by an intense conceptual interference existing in the penultimate decade of the 19th century in an extremely dynamic field of the Austrian-German scientific musical thinking. The key concept – Musikwissenschaft, comes to be uttered only as an acknowledgement of an already accomplished fact, as an expression of the accumulation of a critical mass of cultural substance and experience.

In analogy with the two diachronic beginnings of the European musical culture – the Greek antiquity and the civilization of the barbarian kingdoms of the Middle Ages, musicology as a science could too be considered as born of a double, cumulative, albeit synchronous paternity – Adler-Rieman117. We can also admit a chronological representation in which, for example, the works of Eduard Hanslick (1825-1904) or François-Joseph Fétis (1784-1871) are placed in a pre-Alderian position, while later, those of Heinrich Schenker (1868-1935) and Ernst Kurth (1886-1946) –, are placed in a post-Alderian position.

---

117 A relevant fact is that the English musicologist and teacher Alexander Rehding chooses Hugo Riemann, and not Guido Adler, as the representative name for the modern beginning of musicology, as we learn from his monograph entitled Hugo Riemann and the Birth of Modern Musical Thought, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
5. The missing element: the third, historical-systematic element of Adler’s system

After clearly distinguishing the substance of the two musicological methods – historical and systematic, as well as the two professional identities of a musicologist – teacher and researcher (with an extension towards the role of critic-evaluator), the next question concerns the object of musicology. What is historicized and, at the same time, systematized? What is this object of musicology that could be represented as an empirical-conceptual body whose evolutionary and accumulative articulation would assume, admit and even require a historiography of a sum of typological entities (fluctuating in number), in whose integrity and authenticity this body would recognize itself? And even more, which would be the nature of this empirical-conceptual body, for whose description both methods – historical and systematic – should function as a third, consubstantiated, synthetic one?

In the most general sense possible, musicology is a science whose object is the phenomenon of music, cumulatively considered in the totality of its aspects, starting from the acoustic constitution of the sonorous material up to the higher forms of social practice of music as an art (composition-performance) and science (research-teaching). In other words, musicology is a scientific activity oriented towards the study of music as a cultural collective consensus and has evolved in this way to the present day.

By distinguishing several degrees of acceptation of the two components of the term musicology – mousike and logos, we obtain a double demarcation:

(1) musicology as a type of activity (basically, as a theoretical-analytical reflection on the musical phenomenon), with its related subdivisions:

   (1.1) didactic (the teaching of the basics of music theory and the teaching of musical practice as an art of composition and performance) and

   (1.2) evaluative-scientific (research-criticism/aesthetics), including the methodological reflection on the historical and systematic constituents of musicology itself as an object of study;

(2) musicology as a project-conception of a didactic-scientific discipline: Adler’s founding theory – systematic and historical musicology.

6. Adler’s system: the image of a double “quadrivium”

As mentioned above, the image of Adler’s project is presented within the limits of the systematic idea, just as a methodological conception should be.

---

118 It is interesting to note that the New Musicology orientation (Joseph Kerman, Susan McClary, Garry Tomlinson) bases its doctrinal statement, on the one hand, on the criticism of the notion of consensus and, on the other, on the restorative methodology based on the reformulation of the norms and rules of the musicological play with the cultural past and present.
Paradoxically, however, in describing his system Adler does not bring the systematic constituent to the fore, as we would have expected, but the historical constituent, i.e. a weak, fictional and equally abstract one. Adler recognizes four constituent subfields:

A. Notation theory (musical palaeography);
B. Basic historical categories (grouping of musical forms);
C. Historical sequence of laws: (c.1.) as they are presented in the works of art of every epoch, (c.2) as taught by the theoreticians of the age in question and (c.3) ways of practising art;
D. Organology as history of musical instruments;

The systematic branch (as an ensemble of the highest laws in the individual branches of tonal art\textsuperscript{119}) is divided, in turn, into another four subdivisions:

A. Investigation and founding of these laws in: harmony, rhythm and melody;
B. Aesthetics of tonal art;
C. Musical pedagogy and didactics: (c.1) Musical scales (c.2) Theory of harmony, (c.3) Counterpoint (c.4) Composition theory, (c.5) Orchestration and (c.6) Methods of vocal and instrumental teaching;
D. Musicology (examination and comparison for ethnographic purposes)\textsuperscript{120}.

Adler’s graphical presentation of each of the two branches is accompanied by a set of auxiliary sciences, but what concerns us here is the answer to the above-formulated question: what would be the image, nature and objective constituent elements of this empirical-conceptual body for the description of which both methods – historical and systematic, should function in a consubstantialized, synthetic way? This is not so much about a mechanical division into historical and systematic, but rather about a system of categories which, besides the fact that they could be presented in a systematic order, could not be comprehended in their entirety other than in a historical cumulative-evolutionary way.

We resume this question because the two tetrads (a double quadrivium\textsuperscript{121}) formulated by Adler as normative constituents of musicology do not provide a

\textsuperscript{119} The term tonal has a double significance: (a) sound-tone, hence resulting clearly that the art of music is an art of sounds, and thus a tonal one and (b) tonality-tone, i.e. organization of the musical sounds as a functional assembly according to the modal, tonal -functional, atonal (bruitist, serial, stochastic, sonoristic etc.) principles. This is the tonal group of the sound organization systems.


\textsuperscript{121} This is the system of the seven liberal arts (in Latin – septem artem liberales), formulated in antiquity and used in the education of the Middle Ages, grouped into four typologies under the generic terms of quadrivium – arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy, and trivium – grammar, logic and rhetoric.
conclusive answer to our question, but only a “split” image of the field musicological thinking. In our view, musicology is not confined to the formulation of some theoretically staticized images of the musical phenomenon, but on the contrary, it serves two compensatory functions in its relation to the empirical practice of the musical art:

(a) in a morphological and perhaps even anatomical sense, in the image of a body as an integrated system of organs, musicology is an integral part of musical practice, freeing composition and performance from the limitations and dilettantism of a pure empiricism, while

(b) in a purely functional sense, musicology represents the other half of the trajectory of an imaginary pendulum, the absolute symmetry of a necessary reflexive recoil in an opposition of continuity to the practical forms of musical thinking already mentioned in the previous paragraph.

In both historical and systematic terms, musicology appears as a set of normative disciplines, a science of sciences, a technological summation aiming at reaching an epistemological consensus on certain unanimously accepted and thus stable, if not even invariable meanings. At the same time, the two constituents serve the task of implementing it as a unanimously accepted truth with specific significances: as language (normative-terminological), definitions (semantic-normative consensus), method (analytical-normative consensus) and, consequently, as a conceptual-discursive description of the studied phenomena as a consensus on the perceived data. Thus, we could put forth the idea that the object of musicology, with a strong focus on methodology, is the development of some

---

122 The dialectical relationship between theory and practice in the field of musical thinking appears as a fluctuating phenomenon, given that there is no absolute answer to the question regarding the primacy of theory or practice, and in our opinion such an assertion would only betray the dilettantism of its issuer. In reality, the situation is always fluctuating and we could formulate, for a start, the idea of an interrelationship between musicology as a system of knowledge about music and music itself as a systemic field of typologies of musical practices. However, the following question arises: does musicology represent a “mold” of the practice of music, or does music itself, as an idea and practice, represent a conceptual “construct” of musicology? In other words, is the nature of musical practice as a social-empirical phenomenon, i.e. the object of musicology itself systemic, or is it only a projection of musicology itself onto reality, as a coherent conceptual system? We could then ask ourselves about the primacy of theory over musical practice or vice versa in the history of European music. The answer could be a third, unbiased, diagonal hypothesis, because the relationship between theory and practice in music acts as an interaction that leads to their mutual reinforcement in both the recovery of the past, and the provision of a future. These two entities succeed each other at the behest and control of evolution, based on the paradigm shifts occurring within clearly defined historical periods.

123 Another suggestive image illustrating the relationship between theory and practice in the field of musical activities could be an iceberg, as a relevant symbol of the visible-invisible relationship: one tenth is visible and the other nine - invisible. The visible part obviously pertains to practice, with an exclusive focus on interpretive practice. The “umbrella” of invisibility would, however, encompass both the work of the composer and, especially, that of the musicologist in all its aspects.
consensual norms, cumulatively accepted as a doctrine of the unitary (unified) field of the forms of thinking (conceiving-representing) and practising (performing) music. In turn, as indicated above, this methodology has a dual applicability: normative-formative (didactic, learning the consensual norms) and normative-analytical (research, formulation-reformulation of the consensual configuration).

7. Adler and the object of his system: the double “trivium” of the categories of musical thinking and existence

In a compensatory antithesis and as an addition to, and update of Adler’s system, we can formulate the hypothesis of a system of interrelated systematic-historical concepts, organized as a double trivium and comprising the following two triads:

(a) the first (technical) triad, as forms of the compositional-technical thinking: the musical sound, the sound organization systems and the musical forms, and

(b) the second (sociological) triad, as conventions of the forms of representation and practise of music in society: genre, style and canon\(^{124}\).

7.1. The invention of musical notation as a trigger point of the European musical culture: (a) formulation of the image of music, (b) of the pitch of the musical sound, (c) of the polyphonic syntax, (d) of the composer’s figure and (e) of the idea of composition

The first constituent of the historical branch of Adler’s table – notation – is presented, in systematic terms, as a consensual norm that historically determines an impressive cascade of crucial events for the image and identity of the European musical culture, such as:

(a) the invention of an image of music and, concurrently with it\(^{125}\), both

(b) the invention of polyphony, and

(c) the invention of the composer’s figure and of the product of his work in the sense of the concept of opus.

Strongly stimulated during the Carolingian Renaissance, the concern for a universal musical notation eventually led to its invention. Thus, it was only three centuries later that the canonical project of Pope Gregory the Great (540-604) was

\(^{124}\) The entire system was presented thoroughly and gradually, starting from the musical sound, in the first part of our study entitled Musical Genres and the Regression towards the Primordial Organic: from Sociological to Anthropological, from Taxonomic to Archetypal (I ), in: the journal “Muzica”, Bucharest, Issue No. 3/2014.

\(^{125}\) We tend to believe that the invention of notation depended on the confluence of several “lines of force”, of which at least two – theoretical thinking and compositional practices, represent the primary determinant components.
finalized. This period of intense theoretical (and practical) activity can be considered to have extended between the work of the Frankish Benedictine monk Hucbald of St. Amand (850-930), with his treatise *De harmonica institutione* (approx. 880) and that of another, this time Italian Benedictine monk, Guido d’Arezzo (991-1033), with his famous treatise *Micrologus* (written in 1024).

A final, though very important link in this chain is the treatise *De musica cum tonario*, most likely belonging to the presumed Cistercian monk Johannes Affligemensis (1053-1121), also known as Johannes Cotto. As it clearly results from the three writings above, the invention of notation was not a purely conceptual-theoretical process, but, as the texts reveal, the result of a sustained *compositional* practice, consisting in the development of several contrapuntal works.

The conclusion is clear: musical notation was invented as a cumulative expression of several “vectors” of musical thinking and therefore of musical practice. Hence we can understand that the birth of notation could be attributed not only to the canonizing intentions of Charles the Great, among whose counsellors the English poet, ecclesiastic and teacher Alcuin (732-804) held a pre-eminence, but also to the aforementioned European musicians, who by then were already practising various forms of early organum and for whom notation was just as urgent an imperative as the canonization of the musical liturgical text was for Alcuin. It thus becomes clear that there can be no question of Leoninus' primacy in the practising of the Organum, and much less in the invention of this pre-contrapuntal technique. As to the historical period called the School of Notre Dame, in our opinion it represents the completion of a journey of accumulation, a decanting basin and a synthesis of a precursory epoch. Pérotin and Leonin open the list of composers who close an epoch.

This complex process of formulation of the musical means and of a new language also includes an entirely new representation of the musical sound. Today, by *musical sound* we understand a consensual construct consisting of the combination of the four parameters: pitch, duration, intensity and timbre. These four parameters represent in fact four historical stages, or different histories (discourses) of actual invention of the *consensual construct* called *musical sound*.

(a) A first stage consisted in the invention of pitch as image and concept, with the invention of the stave (the 11th century) as a visual field for pitch placement. The first problem consisted in the formulation of spatiality, though in its double dimension: (a) as a field and (b) as an actual pitch of the notated sounds;

(b) In the second stage, many theoreticians focused their attention on the formulation of mensural taxonomy — durations. In this respect, the representative, if

---

126 The works of the three monks are representative of the periods they were written in and are published in a commented edition: Claude Palisca V., *Hucbald, Guido and John on Music: Three Medieval Treatises*, (translation by Warren Babb), Yale, University Press, New Heaven, 1978
not founder of the doctrine was Johannis of Garland (1270-1320) with his treatise *De mensurabili musica* (ca. 1250), who is believed to have been a professor at the University of Paris. He differentiates *musica plana*, or unmeasured music, from *musica mensurabilis*, or measured music. The necessity to measure duration is, in turn, determined by the need to order and control several interdependent melodic planes (*plane* lines), combined into a contrapuntal writing. In this respect, the understanding of the genesis of the theoretical idea of duration is closely related to the birth of the polyphonic syntax.

(c) Conceived as a measure of the *spatial* relationships between the melodic/linear strands of a polyphonic texture, intensity contributes to the depth of the suggestive-expressive content, by means of

(1) the antiphonal/responsorial technique in the choral art of the Middle Ages and Renaissance, as well as of

(2) the terraced dynamics used in the instrumental music of the Baroque era. The second half of the 18th century witnessed the discovery of

(3) the process of gradual transition between the extremes of *piano* and *forte* – *crescendo* and *diminuendo*, implemented by Carl Stamitz (1745-1801), the promoter of the Mannheim school. With the emergence of Romantic aesthetics (late 18th century – early 19th century), intensity is defined as

(4) a sonorous analogy of the psycho-emotional dynamics, as a consequence of the orientation towards the theatrical/literary-dramatic psychologism of the Viennese classics and romantics.

(D) In this history of the invention of the musical sound, the last word belonged to *timbre*. According to Valentina Konen\(^{127}\), while it is surprising to see how timbrally colourless the music of the Viennese classics is, it is also easy to understand Debussy’s interest is the coloristic effects of the untempered sounds of Palestrina’s choral music, in Mussorgsky’s modalism, but also in the timbral richness of the non-European cultures (Balinese, Andalusian and African American). With the reformulation of timbrality from a *constituent element* into a *generative principle*, either in post-Romantic terms (colour-light-sound with Scriabin, or colour-sound with Rimsky-Korsakov and Wagner), or in Impressionist ones (Debussy), *noise* enters the stage (Russolo a.o.). One of the dominant features of contemporary music – the *sonoristic* conception, is based entirely on *timbre* and on its generative potential in terms of texture and process-form.

A first conclusion can be drawn: the consensuality of the musical sound as a synthetic sum of the four parameters is thus not a natural given, but rather a cultural acquisition in the field of musical thinking. Viewing things in this light, the

naturalness of the musical sound surrenders in the face of a systematic-historical convergence of three elements:

(a) systematic – the sum of the four parameters
(b) historical – the cultural-historical evolution in acquiring them as constants of musical thinking and
(c) the determining role of medieval musical notation in the formulation of the musical sound as a consensual fundamental concept of compositional thinking and practice.

In other words, systematics cannot be understood without understanding the cumulative historical evolution, through concomitance and mutual reinforcement. Systematic concepts have no meaning outside the historical evolutionary process, and the latter can only be understood as an evolution of certain conceptual entities. By invoking a systematic element (formal or stylistic typology), we invoke the entire array of historical meanings covered by this element before reaching its ultimate current form.

In turn, the formulation of musical notation is itself a process spread over several centuries (9th-17th), but the initial impulse occurs during the Carolingian Renaissance, as a consequence of the need for a universal, unanimously accepted and implemented canon of the liturgical chant, but also as a basis of the musical education in a first post-barbarian empire.\textsuperscript{128}

It is interesting to note that the invention of pitches and durations is just as indebted to musical notation as contrapuntal polyphony is, since both of them actually appear as consequences of the possibility to \textit{notate} the sound as an image. \textit{Punctum contra punctum} represents a description of the spatial relationship between pitches, while the mensural relations constitute a key factor in the discursive-structural contrapuntal deployment. The problem of temporality, i.e. duration, represented a solution to the (contrapuntal) organization of the linear unfolding of the sound “stream”.

\section*{7.2. Adler's system and the need for a different systematic order}

Already at this level, Adler's conception reveals its limitations. The things presented in different compartments – whether systematic or historical, intermingle, because the historical moment when notation appears generates a true “constellation” of important and largely representative events for the European musical culture:

(a) the transition from oral to written musical culture,

\textsuperscript{128} A similar purpose with that of the Carolingian reform was achieved by Humboldt's reform of the Prussian school system, about ten centuries later. The major goal of both reforms was to establish a unitary \textit{educational/formative canon}, and the effects were seen in the formulation and universalization of a \textit{standardized} taxonomic system of sciences and therefore of the normative methodology for their implementation.
(b) from the mono-linear (plain-chant – the Gregorian chant) to multi-linear (polyphonic-contrapuntal),

(c) from the anonymity of the canonical text to the canonization of the text conceived by the composer\textsuperscript{129}, whose figure it an absolute conceptual novelty.

In other words, this state of things fuels an evolutionary dialectics which differs from everything that could be thought of and practised until the Carolingian Renaissance and which, therefore, requires a different system of representation. At the same time, Adler’s system does not present the two constituents – systematic and historical, as consubstantial entities, but organizes them in the form of complex taxonomic fields. Thus, related phenomena such as notation and counterpoint occur in different boxes:

(a) notation opens the list of the historical categories, while

(b) counterpoint is placed in the third position – pedagogical-didactic, of the systematic categories. In other words, the taxonomic organization of the system has only a constative character, and not an organic-consubstantial one.

A possible solution can be reached only by rearranging the elements in a hierarchical order, starting from the primary element which, as shown earlier, is the musical sound. We can rightly consider it as the generating element of an entire system of categories of the European musical thinking and practice. Secondly, we can presume that the other categories that are higher in hierarchy than the musical sound can too be formulated in terms of the same systematic-historical consubstantiality: the contents of a systematic taxonomy will only be able to be understood in terms of their cumulative contribution to a historical taxonomy. In other words, each historical context will have its own systematics of the specific constituent categories, while their contemporary understanding or meaning will be the result of a long historical evolution, a cumulation in a trans-historical conceptual body, as the semantic guarantor of the relevance of the concepts used in the musicological discourse, of their ability to coherently represent both the musical past and, especially, the musical present in which we live. Thus, Adler’s

\textsuperscript{129} “The composer is «the man who writes», the composer is the man who creates musical texts, which later turn into the actual sound of music. [...] ... the principle of composition is first of all based on the placement of certain graphical elements. The Organum had already been born for more than a hundred years, but it became a composition only when it could be set down in some written form and seen as a graphical structure with which certain procedures (also graphical) could be performed. [...] Linear notation allows visualization of what is impossible to be heard. Often times, the compositional structure cannot be captured by the ear, but can be revealed through the eye; a useful example in this case is given by the Symphony Op. 21 by Anton Webern, where the aural perception does not offer representations of the myriad of crystalline facets, which become available by resorting to the graphical form of the score. This tendency is pushed to the extreme in Structures (I and II, for Two Pianos) by Boulez, but we must not forget that most of the structural tricks of the great Netherlanders can virtually not be perceived aurally.” Vladimir Martînov, Конец времени композиторов [The End of the Time of Composers], Russkii Puti Publishing House, Moscow, 2002, pp. 152, 158.
system can be described as a particular situation, framed this time within the evolutionary-historical “river” of musicological thinking and practice.

7.3. The polyphonic-contrapuntal syntax as a complex taxonomic field

Counterpoint is representative of another order of phenomena, as well as of a different logic of organization, thinking and operation than that of the musical sound. This is a second-order phenomenon to the musical sound, a higher positioned derivative thereof which includes it as a constituent element. Basically, it is a system of historical-structural typologies of organization (relation) of the musical sounds, which could generically be defines as sound organization system. Viewed from a contemporary perspective, the complete form of this group of phenomena consists of two conceptual groups:

(a) **syntactic organization systems** (monodic, heterophonic, polyphonic, homophonic and sonoristic)

(b) **tonal organization systems** (modal, tonal-functional, atonal)

Here we speak about specific principles of organization of the sound material as functional layers that are related in a particular way, characteristic of a given historical period. The historical succession of these systems appears as an organic growth and diversification:

1. **syntactic**: monodic-heterophonic (antiquity, the Middle Ages), polyphonic (the Middle Ages, Renaissance), homophonic (Baroque, Classicism, Romanticism) with priority emphasis on the linearity (horizontality, planus) of the melody as a primary element of organization¹³⁰, and

2. **tonal**: modal (Antiquity, the Middle Ages, Renaissance), tonal-functional (Baroque-Classicism, Romanticism), atonal (serial, dodecaphonic and bruitist modernism, with leanings towards sonoristics), with emphasis on structuring the whole as a system of relational functions of the sound layers within the musical material as a whole.

Towards the mid-1950s and in a radical opposition to the syntactic logic based on the melodic parameter, the sonoristic system made its appearance, placing a strong emphasis on the image of sound mass, while definitely establishing the sound organization systems as texture typologies and techniques. In this regard, Israeli musicologist Marc Reis proposes another systematization of the

---

¹³⁰ Also see the following studies by Romanian composer Ştefan Niculescu: Ştefan Niculescu, *Analiza fenomenologică a tipurilor fundamentale de fenomene sonore și raporturile lor cu eterofonia* [Phenomenological Analysis of the Fundamental Types of Sonorous Phenomena and Their Relations to Heterophony], in: *Studii de muzicologie* [Musicology Studies], Editura muzicală a Uniunii Compozitorilor, Bucharest, 1972, vol. VIII; Ştefan Niculescu, *Eterofonia* [Heterophony], in: *Reflecții despre muzică* [Reflections on Music], Editura Muzicală, Bucharest, 1980; Ştefan Niculescu, *O teorie a sintaxei muzicale* [A Theory of Musical Syntax], in: *Reflecții despre muzică*, Editura Muzicală, Bucharest, 1980
texture types than the traditional one, including the following elements and achievements of the late 20th century musical thinking:

**Tone-based texture types** (in original – тоновые склады – O.G.):
- **Monody** – one voice, the (basic – O.G.) element of the texture is the sound (in the original – tone – O.G.).
- **Polyphony** – several voices, the (basic – O.G.) element of the texture is the voice.
- **Harmonic texture** – several voices, the (basic – O.G.) element of the texture is an ensemble of sounds perceived as a unit.

**Timbre-based texture types** (in the original – тембровые склады – O.G.):
- **Sonoristics** – its primary material is the sound of traditional instruments.
- **Electroacoustic and concrete music** – the primary material is the sound of electronic generators.
- **Multimedia** – the material is based on non-musical constituents (action elements, video effects, etc.).

The sound organization systems contain in grouped form what in Adler's table is disseminated in the systematic chapter:
- A. harmony, rhythm and melody, but also
- B. the theory of harmony. All of them together and in their significance as technical concepts and sound phenomena are reflected in the convergence between the tonal – tonal-functional system and the homophonic syntactic type, i.e. "tonal art" (in Adler's terms).

As a system, idea or concept of articulation of duration, rhythm pertains to the primary level of the musical sound. The melody (including its function as a theme) – pertains primarily to the flat linearity of the monodic syntactic type, while harmony represents a synthetic concept, obtained by the fusion of the homophonic syntactic type and the tonal-functional type.

### 7.4. The principle and systematics of the musical forms – an archetypal “architecture”

The next step leads us to the last element of the first triad – the musical forms, serving as a skeleton, or more exactly, a framework, support and platform for the sound organization systems. Musical forms can be considered as a system of concatenated functional articulations designed to create a logically organized processual-evolutionary succession, as a process of architectural accumulation. This is about the evolutionary process as a mechanism of architectonic accumulation and integration of the musical work as an entire ensemble of functional articulations.

---

131 Марк Райс (Marc Reis), Функциональность в музыке тембров [Functionality in the Music of Timbres], available at: [http://www.21israel-music.com/Timbres.htm](http://www.21israel-music.com/Timbres.htm)
In a simpler way, we consider the concept of *musical form* in its (cumulative-synthetic) quality of system of logical models of division of the sound flow into discrete structural articulations. At the same time, there occurs the need to also mention the processual, dynamic image of the musical form, in which the articulations, as “organs” of the hyper-body of the musical work, represent constituents of the process of growth (concurrent) and integration (gradual amplification) of the musical composition. This process basically covers only the elements pertaining to the accumulative growth of the musical work.

As in the case of the relation of derivation of the sound organization systems from the musical sound, musical forms too emerge as derivatives of the sound organization systems. Organized as a hierarchical system, each lower element serves as *content* for the higher element, in its quality as *form*. In other words, the sound organization systems (as form) function as (logical) models of operation with the musical sound (as content), just as the musical forms (as form) function, in turn, as (logical) models of operation with the sound organization systems (as content). We perceive this relationship between *form* and *content* rather in the sense ascribed to it by Eduard Hanslick (stated in the text entitled *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*), according to which the content of music is the musical sounds. Likewise, in the case of music, the proper sense of the conceptual binomial *music-form* can be expressed only through a relation of interdependence of a set of musical thinking concepts (musical sound, sound organization systems, forms, musical genres and styles etc.). This is not about images, affects, notional text etc.

A musical formulation of the binomial *form-content* can be obtained by considering the function of *content* as *medium* of operation (material to be organized), and the function of *form* as a (logical) *system* of operation (with a specific material, which would claim it). The musical sound therefore represents a *medium* of operation for the sound organization systems (models), which in turn become *medium* of operation for the system (models) of musical forms.

Adler’s system contains the term *forms* in the first list – at position B. Basic historical categories (grouping the musical forms).

Basically, the principle and concept of musical forms serves as a structural gear for the articulation of the sound organization systems. This relation can be represented within the limits of the *form-content* model, where the forms represent the models of processual-architectonic structures, designed to articulate a content, which can be reduced to the generic title of *texture types*. The genesis of the concept of *musical form* as exoskeleton of the *content* can be better understood by starting from two images:

(a) the analogy between the musical work in the entirety of its data and the human body as a functional totality of an ensemble of organs and, at the same time,
(b) the image of the human body as a mechanism: “... the body at the beginning of the eighteenth century was not (perceived as – O.G.) a living organism but (as – O.G.) a mechanical structure of levers, pumps and sieves”\(^\text{132}\).

As an analogy, we can formulate the image of the musical form as a multi-layered system, processually moving towards an accumulation of “corporeality” – structure and meaning:

(a) the microstructural level: from intonation/cell up to the level of the period;

(B) the macrostructural level: from the monostrophic pattern toward the level of the cyclical forms. Here we can also include the manifestation of the binary and ternary archetypes (small and large strophic forms), as well as that of rotation (rondo) and transformation (variations);

(c) the level of compositional functions: the initio-motus-terminus categories implemented by Boris Asafiev;

It is clear that the elements of the hierarchical system are organized according to the principle of incorporation – each element of the hierarchy synthetically subsumes all the lower ones. In other words, it represents the synthetic sum of the qualities of all the elements it incorporates. At the level of the first, technological “triad”, this relation reveals itself only partially, because, for example, we could not infer the logic of the musical forms from the (consensual) parameters of the musical sound other than by mediation through the sound organization systems, although musical forms logically consist of musical sounds articulated in sound organization systems. Hence results the specific synthetic quality of the concept of musical form: the state of interdependence between the musical-sonorous quality of the working material, to which we add its system of sonorous organization, though in a way that enables it to configure its own structural-articulated support, specific to each given historical period.

However, the entire system of the two “triads” reveals its organic character as we move toward the higher levels of conceptual development. It is only through the constituent concepts of the second “triad” (genre-style-canon) that the possibility of “traversing” the entire hierarchy in both directions – both towards the lower elements and vice versa, towards the “keystone” of the entire system, i.e. the canon, becomes more visible and imposes itself as the only criterion of internal cohesion.

7.5. The second triad: the musical genre and the system of musical “species”

The second (sociological) triad starts from the concept of musical genre, in total accordance with Franco Fabbrì’s definition: “A musical genre is a set of

\(^{132}\) Daniel Chua, Absolute Music and the Constructing of Meaning, Cambridge University Press (Virtual Publishing), 2003, p. 82.
musical events (real or possible) whose course is governed by a definite set of socially accepted rules.” There is hardly anything resembling a clear description of musical genres in Adler’s conception, although the list of systematic categories, at letter C. Musical Pedagogy and Didactics, contains a suggestive dichotomy at position number 6. Vocal and Instrumental Teaching Methods.

This opposition – vocal-instrumental (organic-mechanical), representing a traditional musical-artistic opposition (dating from the European Antiquity), reminds of another, this time archetypal dichotomy between vocal and choreographic. Both constituents are related to the organic character of (human) corporeality, as functions thereof, as well as to the pool of human universal (ethos) contents that can be formulated and expressed only through singing and dance. Only thus can we relate the genesis of the idea of musical genre to the (English) term and concept of gender, in terms of the distinction between female (vocal) and male (choreographic). And it is only at the level of and through the genres that it becomes possible to overcome the mechanicity, anatomism and discursivism that are so evident at the level of musical forms. At the level of musical genres, and in complete accordance with Franco Fabbri’s definition, we can speak of an “ecology” as well as of an “ecosystem”, but also of a history of the two, in which musical genres would appear as “species”, in total conformity with the data of biology and zoology as systematic-taxonomic fields, and hence of palaeontology as a historical-taxonomic field.

We cannot conceive of a social existence of the musical forms in their “anatomical” quality (structural models) other than under the quasi-biological form of species, genres, just as they were formulated in the taxonomic systems of naturalists Carl von Linné (1707 -1778) and Georges-Louis Leclerc de Buffon (1707-1788).

7.6. The “climax” of Adler’s system: the musical style as an individual identitary sign

On a higher level after the genres comes the idea and concept of style. As a category, style represents the culminating point of Adler’s system, the keystone and organizing principle of the two constituent elements – historical and systematic. Style also constitutes a major concern of the musicologist, as reflected in the monograph entitled Der Stil in der Musik (Breitkopf & Härtel, Leipzig, 1911). The meaning of the concept of style is revealed right from the beginning of the text, 133 Franco Fabbri, A Theory of Musical Genres: Two Applications, la adresa: http://www.tagg.org/others/ffabbri81a.html
134 The idea and concept of instrumentality therefore represents in our opinion only a function of overcoming the distinction between female (vocal) and male (choreographic), by cumulating the characteristics of both elements and reformulating them under the form of instrumental “androgyne”.
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in the second section of Stilprinzipien, where on page 13 we find a relevant title – Tonkunst als Organismus (The Art of Sounds as Organism).

During the post-Enlightenment modernity of the European 19th century, this organic-biological significance will evolve and culminate on the note of Buffon’s famous remark – style is man: “From now on (although this is far from being a non-contradictory, linear process) style will acquire various formulations, though grouped around and converging towards one constant: style is an expression of the self, the involuntary albeit indelible resultant of the personality or of its dialogue as a primary, generating core, with the external circumstances; the face that this dialogue takes; “having style” does not mean adopting it (our emphasis – O.G.), but attaining it as an absolute form of manifestation of one's singularity as an artist.”

This clearly represents a characteristic feature of the European musical thinking starting with the model of Beethoven's artistic personality, whose style was adopted by the Romantic composers for its exemplarity as an absolute normative and value-based referent. It is the very idea of the artist-genius, the transcendental quality of his intuition and oeuvre and hence the absolute value of his creative gesture that determined the radical semantic shift in the accepted sense of the term style and its detachment from the philological-rhetorical origins from before the Romantic period (from Antiquity until the Baroque period). The Romantic sense of the term style is still applicable in the contemporary period, albeit only as a historical category and only in the practical teaching of the normative concepts of musical thinking and practice.

In a clear opposition to the accepted meaning of style as a tool for identification (Asafiev), or as a concept that can be defined as idiosyncratic (Leonard B. Meyer), American musicologist Manfred Bukofzer reinvests the concept of style with its unifying-organic significance: “Style must not be confused with mannerism or with a cliché by which a composer may be recognized immediately. It embraces all those factors that in their distinct configuration produce the unity and coherence of the music.”

7.7. Beyond the limits of the system: the canon as letter and spirit of the musical “law”

The last category of the second triad is the term and concept of canon. Its counterpart in Adler's systematic approach could be the term Gesetz, meaning law, rule or regulation. For example, in the historical section, history is considered “…according to epochs, peoples, empires, nations, regions, cities, schools of art,

artists”\textsuperscript{137}, whereas the systematic section focuses on the “establishing of the highest laws” (our emphasis – O.G.) in the individual branches of tonal art\textsuperscript{138}.

Though he does not use the term \textit{canon}, Guido Adler suggests this term, in both cases, as a function of correlation between the totality of information and the normative function of a consensual (suggested) concept of universal value which is also the concept of \textit{canon}. Here we can already see what about a century later Joseph Kerman, the pioneer in taking up the problem of \textit{canon} in music, will clarify in the opening phrase of his study \textit{A Few Canonic Variations} (1983): “Wir haben ein Gesetz” (“We have a law”), to which he adds that by \textit{canon} musicians understand something else (than, for example, the literati, painters, sculptors or architects do).

By combining all the ideas exposed above, we can say that Adler’s system proposes a new epistemological concept – Musikwissenschaft, which he manages to impose in this foreground quality by the way he formulates its two constituents – historical and systematic, thereby providing it with an authentic evolutionary perspective. In other words, both the rapid implementation of musicology as a didactic-scientific discipline, and its subsequent evolution throughout the 20th century, have demonstrated with solid evidence the conceptual adaptability of Adler’s system to ever new cultural and artistic configurations, as well as its real potential of evolution from the inside, either in a systematic or a historical frame.

The comparative correlation of Adler’s double “quadrivium” (historical-systematic) with the idea of the double “trivium” (of systematic-historical consubstantiality) is meant to reveal a backbone inside Adler’s system, which would indicate a concealed system within his declared and visible conception. This is about the explicit formulation of a complex, multi-layered taxonomic ensemble, organized as a hierarchy and which essentially represents the sum of the terminological-procedural dominants of musical thinking and practice, with exclusive focus on the ontology of the musical fact.

Thus, Adler’s entire system can be divided into at least two subsystems: (a) a primary, basic one and (b) a secondary, higher-order one. The technology of the compositional act as a system of algorithms and means of musical thinking\textsuperscript{139} (musical sound, sound organization systems, musical forms), along with the history of their evolution (musical genres, styles and canons) constitute the central pillar of Adler’s system, which can be imagined as “roots” and ”stem”. The “crown” of this system consists of the disciplines of the second system, of propagation, interpretation and implementation of the generic, basic concepts: aesthetics, pedagogy, psychology (of perception) and physiology (of hearing), acoustics, mathematics applied to music, logic, sociology etc.

\textsuperscript{137} Mugglestone, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{138} \textit{Idem}, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{139} The Theory of Composition is included in the table of the systematic categories, at letter C. Musical Pedagogics and Didactics, position 4; in: Mugglestone, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 15.
8. The criterion of the right balance – Manfred Bukofzer's system

In 1957, i.e. seventy-two years after the publication of Adler's book, American musicologist Manfred Bukofzer published his text entitled *The Place of Musicology in American Institutions of Higher Learning*. This time we are presented with the contemporary image of a discipline at its full methodological maturity. Unlike the structure of Adler's conception – with two major subdivisions: historical and systematic musicology, each with four constituent “chapters”, the image of Bukofzer's system is different, more “flexible”, clearer and more strongly focused on highlighting the specificity of each conceptual constituent, while avoiding the mixture of heterogeneous categories.

It consists of four large “areas”:

A. Theory.
B. History,
C. Interpretation (performance) and
D. Music Education.

Thus, the key feature of Adler's system – the division into historical and systematic, is present only in the first two subdivisions, A and B, of Bukofzer's system. Moreover, the system presented in this text is strongly focused on the practical application and assimilation of all the constituent concepts of musicology, given that the American musicologist does not provide the conception of a science, it being no longer needed, but rather the image of musicology as an institutional discipline. Here the keyword is not *Gesetz* (law or norm), as in Adler’s system, but *exercises, courses* and *instruction*, all carrying a pedagogical and didactic character. If the criterion of organization of Adlers' entire conception is of a taxonomic-systematic nature, in Bukofzer’s case this criterion is rather that of a propaedeutic taxonomy.

This apparent epistemological “weakening” of Bukofzer's approach is the price paid for the possibility of detailing, deepening and diversifying the constituent disciplines of musicology. At the same time, the reconfiguration of the system by presenting interpretation (performance) and music education as standalone chapters could be simply the consequence of correlating musicology as an institutional discipline with the realities of musical existence, which were different from those of the late 19th century.

In other words, this reformulation of the Adlerian system, adapted to the normative and formative requirements, is a clear evidence of the evolutionary energy, of the capacity for adaptive transformation and of the openness to new categories and concepts of musical thinking, as well as to new conceptions regarding both new models of internal configuration of the already existing musicological disciplines, and the acceptance of new disciplines in the system.
Conclusions

A science of music – Musikwissenschaft, as formulated by Guido Adler in 1885, becomes possible by virtue of at least two reasons:

(a) through emulation, “calques”, loan and epistemological mimicry, forcing things in some way with the intention to formulate its own episteme. As long as the ensemble of imitated referents (the European sciences of the second half of the 19th century) ends up being formulated in a strong sense of the term science, providing the terminology, logic and method, music eventually manages to remove itself from under the “umbrella” of philosophy and aesthetics. The evolutionary-historical arc of about sixteen centuries spanning from the systematics of Aristides Quintilianus to that of Guido Adler reveals a spectacular epistemological evolution from the didactic science of a music included in an ample formative programme to the science of an emancipated music, as a standalone area of knowledge in the full sense of the word, and

(b) the idea of the (scientific) discourse on the phenomenon of music as a conceptual-textual description. An important note should be made here: in order to acquire a notional discourse that would explain its meanings, music must first represent itself a discursive entity and not an ontological one. In order to be transferred into a notional discourse, the constituent meanings of music itself must be notional and discursive, while music must be conceived and represented as an utterly descriptive technique. In other words, music must first of all appear as a description of things that are external to it – ideas, emotions, characters, images of nature and unfolding of events. This possibility, as demonstrated by the musical practice of the 18th and 19th centuries, was provided by the loan of ideas, images and concepts from rhetoric, literature, poetry and philosophy, theatre and visual arts. Whether explicitly programmatic or “pure”, music was conceived as a sum of discursable contents, which was its only way to achieve a minimum level of accessibility.

This state of things, so normal during the times of the Baroque, Classicism and Romanticism, and actively implemented in the present too, is, in fact, a post-Renaissance form of conceiving the meaning of musical art. For example, in the view of Martianus Capella, Carthaginian author and lawyer of late Antiquity (5th century A.D.), exposed in the nine-volume treatise De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii (On the Marriage of Philology and Mercury), written between 410 and 439 A.D.), music was part of the quadrivium of the mathematical, scientific, or even cosmic/universal arts, based on the common denominator of number: arithmetic (number), geometry (number in space), music (number in time) and astronomy/astrology (number in space and time). Thus, music belonged to the group of sciences that were concerned with what there is, or, in other words, with the purely ontological aspect of reality. The genealogy of this concept clearly
descends from Pythagoras’s faith (580-495 B.C.) that music, just like the universe, is based on the principles underlying the numerical proportions, hence deriving the famous music of the spheres. The thematic arc stretches from the ancient philosopher Pythagoras to the Renaissance astronomer Johannes Kepler (1571-1630).

The second group of the *Septem artes liberales*, composed of rhetoric, logic and grammar, represented the humanistic sciences or, as they would be called in the Renaissance – *Studia humanitatis*.

The decisive step for the modern image of music was taken by the humanists of the Italian Renaissance, in the person of Giulio del Bene, who in 1586, i.e. four centuries before Adler, “gave a speech to another *Camerata* in Florence, the *Accademia degli Alterati*, proposing that music should be transferred from the *quadrivium* to the *trivium*, that is, from the immutable structure of the medieval cosmos to the linguistic relativity of rhetoric, grammar and dialectics.”

This is, in fact, the final solution to the antinomic tension between Pythagoras’s cosmic-numerical musical “ontologism” and Plato's philosophical discursive hermeneutics.


Fatally irreversible, this reconsideration of the primordial order by simply moving music from the *quadrivium* to the *trivium* brings about an inversion of the worlds, shifting the priority focus from the strong original (ontological) meanings to the weak modern (discursive) ones, from Cosmos to Man, from the imperative of necessity to the imperative of the will. Thus, music becomes deprived of its ontological status, subsiding into a mere art of the discourse, of the text, of description and, most importantly for the modern mentality, of hermeneutical

---


141 The plan of the latter text quoted above (but also together with two titles) is worth analysing in terms of an almost uncontrollable overuse of a set of keywords by which music is quite violently reformulated solely as a discourse: 1. La musique raconte-t-elle (our emphases here and following – O.G.) une histoire?; 2. La narrativisation de la musique: la musique comme proto-récit; 3. Les origines développements de la proto-narrativité musicale; 4. Le discours de la musicologie narratologique comme récit de fiction. Available at: [http://narratologie.revues.org/6467](http://narratologie.revues.org/6467)
interpretation. It is in this last sense that this painful downgrading of music can also be understood as a possibility to “lower” music from its fixed, universal and archetypal meanings and, albeit at the cost of an enormous loss, to make it accessible by the very virtue of the fact that the art of sound, in its new position, would contain nothing but human emotions. From Cosmos to Anthropos\textsuperscript{142}, in the strictest conformity with the precepts of Renaissance humanism.

While Guido Adler’s science of music appeared as a belated accomplishment of this shift, beginning with the first decades of the 20th century, musical thinking would embark upon a fascinating “crusade” or, perhaps, revolution for the liberation of sound and restoration of the primary ontological meaning, which would reveal itself in all its “multi-faceted” splendour only in the art of the 1950s avant-garde art.
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