

**The Vienna School of Comparative-Systematic Musicology:
On the Construction, Function, and Discursive Career of a Narrative
in the Historiography of Austrian Musicology**

Malik Sharif

*Music and Minorities Research Center, University of Music and Performing Arts Vienna,
Austria*

ORCID: [0000-0002-9526-4900](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9526-4900)

Version

This is a revised and expanded version of [a paper presented on September 7, 2021](#) at the conference [“Narrating Musicology: The History of Musicology”](#) hosted by the Institute of Musicology, University of Bern, Switzerland.

Date of this version: October 26, 2024

Copyright

This paper is deposited under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International \(CC BY-NC 4.0\)](#) License.



Abstract

The concept of the Vienna School of Comparative Musicology, later renamed as Vienna School of Comparative-Systematic Musicology, plays an important role in received historical accounts of musicology in twentieth-century Austria (used as shorthand for the various political entities to which the territory of post-World War II Austria belonged). The concept was developed in the second half of the twentieth century, most notably by Walter Graf (1903–1982) and Franz Födermayr (1933–2020), both former professors of comparative(-systematic) musicology at the University of Vienna. Proponents of this concept point to Richard Wallaschek (1860–1917) and especially Robert Lach (1874–1958) as the founders of the school and emphasize the synthetic character of the Vienna School, combining approaches from the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.

The Vienna School of Comparative-Systematic Musicology can be analyzed as a historiographical narrative, as a coherent story of how a particular branch of Austrian musicology developed over time, mostly as a kind of “Whig history.” This paper examines key aspects of this narrative: Who contributed to its construction? How did the narrative evolve over time? Which scholars, institutions, and types of research are part of the narrative? Which are excluded or appear only as supporting characters? How is this particular form of comparative-systematic musicology represented in relation to other forms and schools of (comparative) musicology? What discursive function(s) did this narrative serve? How was it received? And to what extent has it remained relevant in the present?

Introduction

The notion of a Vienna School of Comparative Musicology (*Wiener Schule der Vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft*) or a Vienna School of Comparative-Systematic Musicology (*Wiener Schule der Vergleichend-Systematischen Musikwissenschaft*) is a recurring theme in the historiography of Austrian musicology in the twentieth century (“musicology” understood in a broad sense, as an umbrella term encompassing various musicological subdisciplines, not just historical musicology). Similarly, the notion can occasionally be found in historiographical accounts of the development of comparative musicology and ethnomusicology from an international perspective. This notion is often explicitly referred to as the Vienna School, but sometimes there are descriptions of a specific Viennese inter-generational research tradition in comparative musicology that can be considered equivalent, even if the label “school” is not used.

The general idea is that, beginning with Richard Wallaschek (1860–1917), who in turn was followed by Robert Lach (1874–1958), Walter Graf (1903–1982), and Franz Födermayr (1933–2020) as, so to speak, successive school principals, several generations of researchers primarily associated with the University of Vienna continuously cultivated an approach to music research that seeks a systematically ordered understanding of all musics past and present and attempts to identify more universal regularities, perhaps even laws of music.¹ This approach has been characterized as follows:

Since its foundation about one hundred years ago, the specialty of Viennese comparative musicology has been the pursuit of an approach that seeks to understand musical phenomena not only as cultural phenomena, but also to take into account the physical, physiological, and psychological prerequisites and conditions. The theoretical basis for this is the fact that music is a universal human phenomenon and that humans are living beings with a certain biological endowment, which must be assumed to be effective also in creating and listening to music. Without vibrations and waves, without sense organs and nerve action potentials there is no music. This domain is in principle accessible to natural scientific research. But humans are also – and by necessity of natural law –

¹ See Franz Födermayr, “Zum Konzept einer vergleichend-systematischen Musikwissenschaft,” in *Musikethnologisches Kolloquium zum 70. Geburtstag von Walther Wünsch (1978). Die südosteuropäische Volkskultur in der Gegenwart: Referate der 4. Internationalen Balkanologentagung (1970)*, ed. Alois Mauerhofer (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1983), 27.

communal beings. The consequences of this, however, are more accessible to the cultural and social sciences.²

The Vienna School of Comparative(-Systematic) Musicology has been primarily described and theorized by Graf and Födermayr in a series of programmatic and historiographical texts published from the 1950s until the beginning of the twenty-first century.³ A number of other authors associated in one way or another with the Institute of Musicology at the University of Vienna have taken up this idea and thus validated it discursively.⁴ But also scholars without such a direct relationship have invoked the notion.⁵ In the present paper, I focus on Graf's and Födermayr's accounts of the Vienna School, because even today, if one is interested in reading

² "Die Spezialität der Wiener Vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft liegt seit ihrer Begründung vor rund 100 Jahren in der Verfolgung eines Ansatzes, der die musikalischen Erscheinungen nicht nur als kulturelle Phänomene zu begreifen sucht, sondern der auch die physikalischen, physiologischen und psychologischen Voraussetzungen und Bedingungen entsprechend berücksichtigt. Die theoretische Basis hierfür ist die Tatsache, daß Musik ein allgemein menschliches Phänomen ist und der Mensch ein Lebewesen mit einer bestimmten biologischen Ausstattung, von der man annehmen muß, daß sie auch beim Musikschaffen und -hören wirksam ist. Ohne Schwingungen und Wellen, ohne Sinnesorgane und Nervenaktionspotentiale gibt es keine Musik. Dieser Bereich ist grundsätzlich naturwissenschaftlicher Forschung zugänglich. Der Mensch ist aber auch – und zwar mit naturgesetzlicher Notwendigkeit – ein Gemeinschaftswesen. Die daraus sich ergebenden Konsequenzen eröffnen sich aber mehr dem Zugriff der Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften." Franz Födermayr and Werner A. Deutsch, "Systematische Musikwissenschaft aus der Sicht der Wiener Vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft," *Systematische Musikwissenschaft* 1, no. 2 (1993): 131; all translations from German to English are my own.

³ See the references in the discussion below.

⁴ See, for example, Oskár Elsček, "Experimentelle, systematische und vergleichende Musikwissenschaft (Begriffe, Inhalte, Konsequenzen)," in *Vergleichend-Systematische Musikwissenschaft: Beiträge zu Methode und Problematik der systematischen, ethnologischen und historischen Musikwissenschaft. Franz Födermayr zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Elisabeth Hiltscher and Theophil Antonicek (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1994), 14–15; Ida Halpern, "Aural History and Ethnomusicology," *Canadian Folk Music Journal* 4 (1976): 40; Helmut Rösing, "Musikpsychologie: I. Geschichte der Musikpsychologie," in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik*, Sachteil vol. 6, ed. Ludwig Finscher, 2nd ed. (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1997), 1561; Joel Walbe, *Der Gesang Israels und seine Quellen: Ein Beitrag zur hebräischen Musikologie* (Hamburg: Hans Christians, 1975), xiii, 270, 336–337; Michael Weber, *Eine "andere" Musikwissenschaft? Vorstudien zu Theorie und Methodologie* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1990), 175–185; Weber, "Zum Wandel der Ethnomusikologie," *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 42 (1993): 446.

⁵ See, for example, Fritz Bose, "Musikethnologie," in *Riemann Musiklexikon*, Sachteil, ed. Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht (Mainz: Schott, 1967), 607; Pamela Potter, "Musicology, §III, 4: National Traditions: Germany and Austria," in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., ed. Stanley Sadie (London: Macmillan, 2001), 16:514–517; Albrecht Schneider, "Northern and Western Europe: 1. Germany and Austria," in *Ethnomusicology: Historical and Regional Studies*, ed. Helen Myers (London: Macmillan, 1993), 83; Wolfgang Suppan, review of *Einführung in die Musikethnologie*, by Kurt Reinhard, *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung* 14 (1969): 172; Suppan, review of *Ergebnisse und Aufgaben Vergleichender Musikforschung*, by Walter Wiora, *Musica* 30, no. 2 (1976): 153; Suppan, review of *Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft*, by Walter Graf, *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 15: 167–168; Suppan, *Der musizierende Mensch: Eine Anthropologie der Musik* (Mainz: Schott, 1984), 11, 85, 113, 114; Suppan, "Ansätze und Ideen zu einer interdisziplinär arbeitenden Anthropologie der Musik," in Suppan, *Werk und Wirkung: Musikwissenschaft als Menschen- und Kulturgüterforschung*, vol. 1 (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, [1990/91] 2000), 93, 98–99; Walter Wiora, *Ergebnisse und Aufgaben vergleichender Musikforschung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975), 4–5, 21.

about the overall history of comparative musicology in Austria, one will most likely encounter their interpretations of it, either directly or indirectly.

I approach Graf's and Födermayr's historiographical texts from a perspective that can be characterized as metahistorical in the sense of Hayden White.⁶ Thus, I am not so much interested in the extent to which it is theoretically and empirically justified to speak of a Vienna School in the emphatic sense of a scientific school as it is theorized in the sociology and history of science,⁷ and to what extent Graf and Födermayr's account does justice to such a social entity. Rather, I am interested in how and to what ends the historiographical account of this presumed multi-generational collective entity is constructed. I therefore approach the Vienna School as a historical narrative that, through the continuous efforts of Graf and Födermayr, has entered the historiography of Austrian musicology as well as the historiography of comparative musicology and ethnomusicology in general.⁸ Against this background, I focus on the following questions: How has the narrative and its presence in the discourse evolved over time? Who are the characters in the narrative? What is their constellation? How is the plot of the narrative constructed? What is included in the narrative and what is excluded? What are the discursive implications of the narrative?⁹

The Emergence of the Narrative

With Lach's retirement as professor ordinarius of musicology in 1939, there was no longer a representative of comparative musicology at the Institute of Musicology at the University of Vienna. Lach's former student Graf worked outside of academia, but continued his research in

⁶ Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973).

⁷ For an overview of different conceptions of scientific schools see, for example, Christian Dayé, "Schools in the Social and Behavioral Sciences: Concepts and Historical Relevance," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 21, ed. James D. Wright, 2nd ed. (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2015), 128–133.

⁸ For a more detailed discussion of the specific understanding of the concept of "historical narrative" that underlies the following discussion, see Norman Ächtler, "Was ist ein Narrativ? Begriffsgeschichtliche Überlegungen anlässlich der aktuellen Europa-Debatte," *KulturPoetik* 14, no. 2 (2014): 244–259.

⁹ Theoretical impulses for these narratologically informed investigations come from Tilmann Köppe and Tom Kindt, *Erzähltheorie: Eine Einführung* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2014).

comparative musicology. He completed his *Habilitation* in 1952, and in 1957 he became director of the Phonogrammarchiv at the Austrian Academy of Sciences. Finally, in 1963, he was appointed professor extraordinarius of comparative musicology at the Institute of Musicology. In the 1950s, Graf published his first articles on the history of comparative musicology. At the heart of these articles is a gradually evolving argument for a specific Viennese approach to comparative musicology which was passed on in a series of teacher-student relationships and in turn formed the essence of Austrian comparative musicology and ethnomusicology.¹⁰ Födermayr later continued this historiographical project in a series of publications from the 1980s to the early 2000s.¹¹

It is interesting to note that despite his historical argument, Graf does not yet use the explicit label “Vienna School,” although he does acknowledge the existence of a Berlin School of Comparative Musicology composed of Carl Stumpf (1848–1936), Erich Moritz von Hornbostel (1877–1935) – who is always introduced as having been born and studied in Vienna –, Curt Sachs (1881–1959), and their colleagues and students.¹² From time to time, Graf also refers to other non-musicological schools, such as the Vienna School of *Völkerkunde* (Ethnology).¹³ I

¹⁰ The first embryonic version of this argument, without using the term “school,” can be found in Walter Graf, “Österreichs Anteil an der musikethnologischen Forschung,” *Wiener Völkerkundliche Mitteilungen* 2 (1954): 200–209. The most important later publications by Graf in which he develops the narrative are: “Österreichs Beitrag zur Musikethnologie,” in *Beiträge Österreichs zur Erforschung der Vergangenheit und Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit: Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Mitteleuropas. Bericht über das 1. österreichische Symposium auf Burg Wartenstein bei Gloggnitz, 8.–12. September 1958*, ed. Emil Breitingner, Josef Haekel, and Richard Pittioni (Horn: Berger, 1959), 148–161; “Die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft an der Universität Wien,” *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 95 (1965): 151–161; “Die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft in Österreich seit 1896,” *Yearbook of the International Folk Music Council* 6 (1974): 15–43; “Einige Entwicklungslinien der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft im deutschen Sprachraum,” *Musicologica Slovaca* 7 (1978): 55–76.

¹¹ See especially Franz Födermayr, “Zum Konzept einer vergleichend-systematischen Musikwissenschaft,” 25–39; “Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft,” in *Musikgeschichte Österreichs, vol. 3: Von der Revolution 1848 zur Gegenwart*, ed. Rudolf Flotzinger and Gernot Gruber (Vienna: Böhlau, 1995), 334–336; “Interdisziplinär und nicht aufgespalten: Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft,” *Österreichische Musikzeitung* 53, no. 10 (1998): 20–23; “Ethnomusikologie,” in *Oesterreichisches Musiklexikon*, vol. 1, ed. Rudolf Flotzinger (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2002), 400–402, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1553/0x0001fd9f>; “Musikwissenschaft, Vergleichende (Vergleichend-systematische),” in *Oesterreichisches Musiklexikon*, vol. 3, ed. Rudolf Flotzinger (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), 1567–1568, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1553/0x000254af>; and Födermayr’s part of Gernot Gruber and Franz Födermayr, “Musikwissenschaft,” in *Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften, vol 5: Sprache, Literatur und Kunst*, ed. Karl Acham (Vienna: Passagen, 2003), 339–401.

¹² For an early example of Graf mentioning the Berlin School, see Walter Graf, “Musikethnologie und vergleichende Musikwissenschaft,” *Wiener völkerkundliche Mitteilungen* 5 (1957): 7.

¹³ See Graf, “Einige Entwicklungslinien der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft im deutschen Sprachraum,” 67.

found the earliest published explicit reference to a Vienna School of Comparative Musicology in a 1956 conference paper by Wilhelm Heinitz, in which he argues for the existence of a Hamburg School of Comparative Musicology.¹⁴ In this context, Heinitz refers to Lach as the former leader of the Vienna School and states that Lach—on an unspecified occasion—had acknowledged the existence of a Hamburg School in addition to the Berlin School around Hornbostel.¹⁵ A 1958 portrait of Graf in the *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* was the first to explicitly identify him as the keeper of the tradition of the Vienna School of Comparative Musicology:

It is one of the characteristics of the Vienna School of Comparative Musicology (1st professor extraordinarius Richard Wallaschek, 2nd professor extraordinarius Robert Lach, after whose appointment as chair and professor ordinarius [of musicology] the extraordinarius professorship was dropped) that it does not view the musical product in isolation and purely formally, but always in its relationship to its bearer (composer, listener). Maintaining this principle is Walter Graf's foremost task.¹⁶

There are other instances of this label being used by authors other than Graf in the 1960s and 1970s.¹⁷ I could only find one example of Graf himself explicitly referring to a Vienna School, published in 1978.¹⁸ Födermayr, in contrast, uses the label quite consistently in his historiographical and programmatic writings. Despite Graf's reluctance to use the label, his specific historical narrative obviously did not exist in isolation but could connect to and interact with existing notions of Vienna as one of the pioneering and paradigm-setting centers of comparative

¹⁴ Wilhelm Heinitz, "Hamburg und die Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft," in *Bericht über den internationalen musikwissenschaftlichen Kongress Hamburg 1956*, ed. Walter Gerstenberg, Heinrich Husmann, and Harald Heckmann (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1957), 109–111.

¹⁵ Heinitz, "Hamburg und die Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft," 109. Lach published two reviews of Heinitz's book *Strukturprobleme in primitiver Musik*, which would be likely places for such a statement but do not mention a Hamburg School; see Robert Lach, review of *Strukturprobleme in primitiver Musik*, by Wilhelm Heinitz, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, September 13, 1931, 1760–1762; review of *Strukturprobleme in primitiver Musik*, by Wilhelm Heinitz, *Vox: Mitteilungen aus dem Phonetischen Laboratorium der Universität Hamburg* 17, no. 2 (1931): 73. Nor could I find such a statement elsewhere in Lach's writings.

¹⁶ "Es ist eines der Charakteristika der Wiener Schule der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft (1. Extraordinarius Richard Wallaschek, 2. Extraordinarius Robert Lach, nach dessen Bestellung zum Ordinarius der Lehrkanzel das Extraordinariat entfiel), daß sie das musikalische Produkt nicht isoliert und rein formal, sondern stets in seiner Beziehung zu seinem Träger (Komponist, Hörer) betrachtet. Diese Richtlinie beizubehalten ist vornehmste Aufgabe Walter Graf's." Dolf Lindner, "Walter Graf, Franz Zagiba, Hans Zingerle," *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 13, no. 12 (1958): 519.

¹⁷ See the publications from this era cited in footnotes 4 and 5.

¹⁸ Graf, "Einige Entwicklungslinien der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft im deutschen Sprachraum," 75.

musicology, even if it was seen only as a case of a “second city” in comparison to a dominant Berlin.

Although the historical period covered by Graf’s and Födermayr’s accounts always extends to the respective present, and although the geographical scope of the discussion varies, there are, in my opinion, no essential changes in the basic arrangement of the narrative produced and reproduced in these texts. Thus, in the following analyses, I will treat the sources in a synoptic and somewhat synchronic fashion, without going into details of the historical development of the narrative.

Characters and their Constellation in the Narrative

The central character in the narrative is not so much an individual as the hypothetical collective entity of the Vienna School, which unfolds and flourishes over time. Its principal members, who receive the most attention, are the four professors at the Institute of Musicology at the University of Vienna, each of whom was a student of his predecessor. Wallaschek is recognized as a pioneer, and his sympathy for a natural scientific study of music, as well as his synthetic and global perspective on music through the collation of ethnographic accounts and pathological studies, are appreciated. The main historical protagonist of the Vienna School in the narrative, however, is Lach. He is credited with providing the Vienna School with exemplary works and a solid theoretical and methodological foundation with lasting relevance: comparative musicology integrates the results of a variety of humanistic and natural scientific disciplines within and beyond musicology and seeks to explain music as a biologically determined phenomenon through systematic comparison. Lach writes in 1924 that in this process *comparative musicology* becomes *systematic musicology*.¹⁹ This statement later inspired the change of label to “comparative-systematic musicology,” as Födermayr and Graf understand this concern with the

¹⁹ See Robert Lach, *Die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft, ihre Methoden und Probleme* (Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1924), 12.

natural, culturally independent foundations of music as defining the Vienna School.²⁰ Lach's monographic study of melopoeia is treated as exemplary in this regard;²¹ other publications are also briefly and appreciatively discussed, including his multi-volume collection of songs recorded in prisoner-of-war camps during World War I.²²

The narrative attributes to Graf the important achievement of keeping the flame of the Vienna School alive at a time when comparative musicology was not institutionally represented at the University of Vienna. Apart from this, Graf – and in turn also Födermayr – are portrayed as refiners, enhancers, and modernizers of the paradigm defined by Lach: For example, in contrast to Albert Wellek (1904–1972), another student of Lach's, Graf does not *reject* the rigorous biological reading of music proposed by Lach, but rather *expands* it into a theory of biological foundation and cultural superstructure, in which the superstructure is constrained but not determined by the foundation.²³ Graf is also credited with various methodological innovations regarding the now – in contrast to Lach – central use of field recordings as research data, with the implementation of technological improvements in audio recording and audio analysis, and with supporting the institutionalization of acoustic research at the Austrian Academy of Sciences. Födermayr is described as continuing in this vein by working closely with another Graf student, Werner A. Deutsch (born in 1942), a psycho-acoustician and leading figure in acoustic research

²⁰ Graf, "Einige Entwicklungslinien der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft im deutschen Sprachraum," 73–74, 76; Franz Födermayr, "Vorwort," in *Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft: Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, by Walter Graf, ed. Franz Födermayr (Vienna: Elisabeth Stiglmayr, 1980), 11. The term "comparative-systematic musicology" was apparently first used in a symposium paper by Födermayr originally presented on January 12, 1974; see Gernot Gruber, Franz Födermayr, and Erhard Rosner, "Gedanken zu einer Universalgeschichte der Musik," *Musicologica Austriaca* 1 (1977): 12; see also Weber, *Eine "andere" Musikwissenschaft?*, 181n695, who erroneously gives the year of the original paper as 1973. Note that the related English term "systematic comparative musicology" was used as early as 1934 in a treatise on mathematical scale theory by the Danish author Thorvald Kornerup, *Acoustic Methods of Work in Relation to Systematic Comparative Musicology* (Copenhagen: n.p., 1934).

²¹ Robert Lach, *Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der ornamentalen Melopöie* (Leipzig: C. F. Kahnt, 1913).

²² Robert Lach, *Gesänge russischer Kriegsgefangener*, 3 vols. (Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1926–1952). On the background of this research endeavor, see in particular Britta Lange, *Die Wiener Forschungen an Kriegsgefangenen 1915–1918: Anthropologische und ethnografische Verfahren im Lager* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2013).

²³ Regarding Graf expanding Lach's theories see Graf, "Die Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft in Österreich seit 1896," 29–30; Graf, "Einige Entwicklungslinien der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft im deutschen Sprachraum," 76; Födermayr, "Interdisziplinär und nicht aufgespalten: Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft," 21; Födermayr, "Ethnomusikologie," 401; Födermayr, "Musikwissenschaft, Vergleichende (Vergleichend-systematische)," 1568; Gruber and Födermayr, "Musikwissenschaft," 391–393. Regarding Wellek rejecting Lach's theories see Graf, "Einige Entwicklungslinien der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft im deutschen Sprachraum," 73.

at the Academy of Sciences, and consequently introducing digital analysis methods into the research of the Vienna School. Overall, this cumulative intergenerational description of scholarship bears some resemblance to the scholastic treatment of past authorities and the “dwarfs standing on the shoulders of giants” metaphor.²⁴

In addition to these main protagonists of the Vienna School, other students of Lach, Graf, and Födermayr are mentioned as side characters in at least some of the historiographical texts analyzed, usually as researchers who follow the general paradigm and work on a specific subset of questions, apply it in a specific field, or use Viennese comparative musicology as a springboard to become renowned scholars in neighboring disciplines.²⁵

The representatives of the Vienna School are situated in a tableau of past and contemporary Austrian and international researchers, researchers’ collectives, and institutions, primarily from the fields of acoustics, music psychology, and, of course, comparative musicology. Scholars such as Raphael Georg Kiesewetter (1773–1850), Hermann von Helmholtz (1821–1894), Alexander John Ellis (1814–1890), or Walter Fewkes (1850–1930) are presented as forerunners who set the stage for modern comparative musicology in Vienna and elsewhere. Others, such as Karl Bücher (1847–1930), Yrjö Hirn (1870–1952), or Wolfgang Suppan (1933–2015) are presented as mere epigones or as developers of ideas originating from the Vienna School.²⁶ Of course, the Vienna Phonogrammarchiv as a whole and individuals associated with it play an important role in the narrative as collectors and suppliers of data for the Vienna School.

A special role is reserved for the Berlin School of Comparative Musicology, which, as mentioned above, is often explicitly identified as such and presented as the second defining strand

²⁴ The history of this metaphor has been traced back to the 12th century philosopher Bernard of Chartres by Robert K. Merton, *On the Shoulders of Giants: A Shandean Postscript* (New York: The Free Press, 1965).

²⁵ In informal conversations, some of Födermayr’s students told me that they were surprised that he had counted them as part of the school.

²⁶ See, for example, Graf, “Österreichs Anteil an der musikethnologischen Forschung,” 205; Graf, “Österreichs Beitrag zur Musikethnologie,” 153; Födermayr, “Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft,” 335; Gruber and Födermayr, “Musikwissenschaft,” 395.

in the development of comparative musicology.²⁷ Several texts offer a fully-fledged parallel narrative of the development and achievements of the Berlin School alongside that of the Vienna School.²⁸ Twentieth-century comparative musicology or ethnomusicology beyond Austria and Germany, however, is largely absent from the narrative.

The achievements of the Berlin School and the original goals shared by Berlin and Vienna are openly acknowledged. But while the narrative of the Vienna School is one of continuous ascent, Graf's and Födermayr's account of the Berlin School is one of decline, presenting it not so much as the antagonist of the Vienna School but as a contrasting character: On the one hand, the Berlin School drifts into theoretical dead ends such as the *Kulturkreislehre* or the blown-fifth theory.²⁹ However, Lach's radical biologism, his assumption of a uniform line of development of musical expressive techniques, which would reflect an equally uniform but asynchronous and unevenly advanced natural line of development of biologically defined peoples/nations or races, and finally his hope for a theory of racial characteristics of music as at least a long-term goal of comparative musicology could be seen as similar dead ends, but they are not critically framed in the narrative or do not appear at all.³⁰ On the other hand, the Berlin School is described as having abandoned the cause of comparative study in the emphatic sense and as having gradually limited its research program to mere *Musikethnologie*, ethnomusicology or musical ethnography, characterized as the study of individual, regionally limited music cultures.³¹ In Graf's and Födermayr's understanding, comparative musicology is not identical

²⁷ Födermayr, for example, states that "comparative musicology" – after Adler had included it in his system of musicology – "received its profile in Berlin and Vienna, if one considers the main stream of its development" ("vergleichende Musikwissenschaft bekam, wenn man den Hauptstrom der Entwicklung betrachtet, ihr Profil in Berlin und Wien"), Födermayr "Zum Konzept einer vergleichend-systematischen Musikwissenschaft," 26.

²⁸ See, for example, Graf, "Die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft in Österreich seit 1896," Graf, "Einige Entwicklungslinien der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft im deutschen Sprachraum." In this context, it is usually pointed out that Hornbostel was from Vienna and had studied at the University of Vienna.

²⁹ See Graf, "Die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft in Österreich seit 1896," 18; Graf, "Einige Entwicklungslinien der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft im deutschen Sprachraum," 61–64

³⁰ See Lach, *Die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft, ihre Methoden und Probleme*, 5–7, 113–116; "Das Rassenproblem in der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft," *Berichte des Forschungsinstitutes für Osten und Orient* 3 (1923): 122.

³¹ See especially Födermayr, "Vorwort," 9–10; see furthermore Födermayr, "Zum Konzept einer vergleichend-systematischen Musikwissenschaft," 26; Graf, "Die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft in Österreich seit 1896," 18, 22. The Berlin School's abandonment of comparative research in the narrower sense in favor of studies limited

with such research, but would draw on the data generated by ethnomusicological research in an attempt to produce a systematic and comprehensive understanding through comparison.³² The Vienna School is thus portrayed as pursuing broader and more ambitious epistemological goals than the Berlin School.³³

The only historical musicologist who appears regularly in the narrative is Guido Adler (1855–1941), and he is mentioned only insofar as he recognized comparative musicology as a subdivision of musicology in his famous article on “The Scope, Method, and Aim of Musicology.”³⁴ Other music historians are seldom mentioned, and since the late 1970s, and especially Födermayr, the discipline of historical musicology has been positioned alongside regionally focused ethnomusicology as a provider of data to be processed by comparative musicology.³⁵

to individual musical cultures is also deplored by Wolfgang Suppan, see his review of *Ergebnisse und Aufgaben Vergleichender Musikforschung*, 153. General conceptual considerations on the distinction between comparative musicology and ethnomusicology can be found in Graf, “Musikethnologie und vergleichende Musikwissenschaft,” 8–9; Graf, “Neue Möglichkeiten, neue Aufgaben der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft,” *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 25 (1962): 236; Graf, “Die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft an der Universität Wien,” *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 95 (1965): 161; Graf, “Zur Fachbezeichnung ‘Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft’, ‘Ethnomusikologie’, ‘Musikethnologie’, ‘Musik-Folklore’, ‘Musikalische Volks- und Völkerkunde’ usw.,” *Musica Austriaca* 5 (1985): 37–45; Födermayr, “Zum Konzept einer vergleichend-systematischen Musikwissenschaft,” 25–26.

³² See, for example, Graf, *Die musikwissenschaftlichen Phonogramme Rudolf Pöch von der Nordküste Neuguineas: Eine materialkritische Studie unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der völkerkundlichen Grundlagen* (Vienna: Rudolf M. Rohrer, 1950), 2; “Österreichs Beitrag zur Musikethnologie,” 155–156; “Zur Fachbezeichnung ‘Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft’, ‘Ethnomusikologie’, ‘Musikethnologie’, ‘Musik-Folklore’, ‘Musikalische Volks- und Völkerkunde’ usw.,” 40; “Einige Entwicklungslinien der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft im deutschen Sprachraum,” 76; Födermayr, “Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft: Einer neuen Reihe zum Geleit,” in *Kritische Lieder und Politrock in Österreich: Eine analytische Studie*, by Christiane Juhasz (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1994), VII; “Interdisziplinär und nicht aufgespalten: Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft,” 22.

³³ Graf also conducts occasional boundary work against Jaap Kunst’s definition of ethnomusicology, proposed in his book *Musica: A Study of the Nature of Ethno-Musicology, Its Problems, Methods and Representative Personalities* (Amsterdam: Indisch Instituut, 1950), 7. See, for example, Graf, “Die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft in Österreich seit 1896,” 15; “Zur Fachbezeichnung ‘Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft’, ‘Ethnomusikologie’, ‘Musikethnologie’, ‘Musik-Folklore’, ‘Musikalische Volks- und Völkerkunde’ usw.,” 43. Discussions of further conceptualizations of ethnomusicology beyond the German-speaking context, especially of US-American approaches after World War II, are practically non-existent in the relevant publications by Graf and Födermayr.

³⁴ Guido Adler, “Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft,” *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 1, no. 1 (1885): 5–20.

³⁵ See, for example, Graf, “Einige Entwicklungslinien der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft im deutschen Sprachraum,” 76; Födermayr, “Interdisziplinär und nicht-aufgespalten,” 22; Gruber and Födermayr, “Musikwissenschaft,” 398.

Some Things That Are Not Told

Much remains untold in the narrative of the Vienna School, which from another perspective could be a relevant part of its historiography. Most importantly, scholarship is conceived as a largely autonomous system, resulting in a somewhat socially aseptic historiographic account. For example, Adler's critical attitude toward Wallaschek and the conflict-ridden nature of the relationship between Lach and Adler, which went far beyond differences of scholarly opinion, are not mentioned.³⁶ If incorporated into the narrative, these aspects would render precarious Adler's current role as an honored but peripheral character who sets the programmatic stage within which comparative musicology is developed by others. Graf can be expected to have been aware of at least some of these aspects of Adler's relationship with his colleagues in comparative musicology as they were in part publicly discussed, especially the controversy surrounding Lach's succession to Adler as professor of musicology.³⁷ Moreover, in the case of Födermayr, relevant historical research on these issues has been published since the 1980s, of which he can be expected to have been at least somewhat aware.³⁸

Neither Graf nor Födermayr see any need to discuss, even apologetically, the circumstances of Lach's collecting in prisoner-of-war camps. It is a fact of the school's history that is merely acknowledged and apparently does not need to be reconsidered by those who see themselves in Lach's tradition. Lach's biologicistic and race-theoretical perspective, or the school's long-

³⁶ See, for example, Theophil Antonicek, "Musikwissenschaft in Wien zur Zeit Guido Adlers," *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 37 (1986): 165–193; Günter Brosche, "Warum Richard Strauss nicht Ehrendoktor der Wiener Universität werden konnte," *Richard Strauss-Blätter* 31 (1994): 60–69; Kamila Staudigl-Ciechowicz, "'Hier ist der reinste Hexenkessel!' Rudolf von Ficker und das Wiener Musikwissenschaftliche Seminar," *Mitteilungen aus dem Brenner-Archiv* 34 (2015): 101–123.

³⁷ See, for example, "Eine Gefahr für das Wiener Musikleben: Robert Lach zum Nachfolger Guido Adlers vorgeschlagen," *Der Tag*, March 16, 1927, 5; "Der jüdische Kulturkampf um die Musik: Hetzerische Angriffe auf Professor Lach," *Deutschösterreichische Tages-Zeitung* (March 23, 1927), 7; "Guido Adler und sein Nachfolger," *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, April 16, 1927, 10–11; "Warum Richard Strauß nicht Ehrendoktor werden durfte: Das Schicksal des Musikhistorischen Instituts. – Professor Lachs Berufung und ihre Vorgeschichte," *Neues Wiener Journal*, September 30, 1927, 5; "Guido Adlers Nachfolge," *Die Stunde*, October 5, 1927, 4; Guido Adler, *Wollen und Wirken: Aus dem Leben eines Musikhistorikers* (Vienna: Universal-Edition, 1935), 118–119.

³⁸ See in particular the substantial article "Musikwissenschaft in Wien zur Zeit Guido Adlers" written by Theophil Antonicek, a colleague of Födermayr at the Institute of Musicology.

standing dependence on data produced in colonial networks, is not a subject for critical discussion either, not even for Födermayr in his later texts.³⁹

Political circumstances are rarely taken into account, be it the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the First or Second Republic, or Austrofascism. National Socialism is mentioned only once, in a 1974 text by Graf dedicated to Lach on the occasion of his 100th birthday, and there it appears in a peculiar way. Graf states that “in 1939, the year of Hitler’s invasion of Austria, Lach had to retire because of the now lowered pension age.”⁴⁰ It is correct that Lach retired in 1939 under German law – but the annexation of Austria took place already in 1938. Thus, unlike those professors in Vienna who were actually forced out of their positions immediately after the annexation,⁴¹ he not only remained in his position until he reached the official retirement age, but was even allowed to work one more semester to improve his financial situation.⁴² He was also not removed from his teaching position at the Academy of Music and Performing Arts in

³⁹ The relationship between colonialism and comparative musicology / ethnomusicology has been critically discussed since at least the late 1970s, if not as extensively as in the ethnomusicological discourse of the twenty-first century. See, for example, José Maceda, “A Search for an Old and a New Music in Southeast Asia,” *Acta Musicologica* 51, no. 1 (1979): 160–168; Bruno Nettl, “Western Musical Values and the Character of Ethnomusicology,” *The World of Music* 26, no. 1 (1984): 29–42; J. H. Kwabena Nketia and Jacqueline C. Djedje, “Introduction: Trends in African Musicology,” *Selected Reports in Ethnomusicology* 5: ix–xx; J. H. Kwabena Nketia, “African Music and Western Praxis: A Review of Western Perspectives on African Musicology,” *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 20, no. 1 (1986): 36–56; Anthony Seeger, “The Role of Sound Archives in Ethnomusicology Today,” *Ethnomusicology* 30, no. 2 (1986): 261–276; Carol M. Babiracki, “Tribal Music in the Study of Great and Little Traditions of Indian Music,” in *Comparative Musicology and Anthropology of Music: Essays on the History of Ethnomusicology*, ed. Bruno Nettl and Philip V. Bohlman (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1991), 69–90; Kofi Agawu, “Representing African Music,” *Critical Inquiry* 18, no. 2 (1992): 245–266; Michelle Kisliuk, “(Un)Doing Fieldwork: Sharing Songs, Sharing Lives,” in *Shadows in the Field: New Perspectives for Fieldwork in Ethnomusicology*, ed. Gregory F. Barz and Timothy J. Cooley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 23–44. Such a critical reassessment of colonial complicity had begun even earlier in cultural/social anthropology and ethnology; see, among others, Diane Lewis, “Anthropology and Colonialism,” *Current Anthropology* 14, no. 5 (1973): 581–602; Talal Asad, ed., *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (London: Ithaca Press, 1973); Hans Fischer, *Die Hamburger Südsee-Expedition: Über Ethnographie und Kolonialismus* (Frankfurt am Main: Syndikat, 1981); Manfred Gothsch, *Die deutsche Völkerkunde und ihr Verhältnis zum Kolonialismus: Ein Beitrag zur kolonialideologischen und kolonialpraktischen Bedeutung der deutschen Völkerkunde in der Zeit von 1870 bis 1975* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1983).

⁴⁰ “1939, im Jahr von Hitlers Einmarsch in Österreich, muß Lach wegen Erreichung des nunmehr herabgesetzten Pensionsalters in den Ruhestand treten.” Graf “Die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft in Österreich seit 1896,” 27; my translation.

⁴¹ See Klaus Taschwer, *Hochburg des Anti-Semitismus: Der Niedergang der Universität Wien im 20. Jahrhundert* (Vienna: Czernin, 2015), 201–216.

⁴² Dean Victor Christian argued that this was fair, since Lach had a work history that would adversely affect his pension benefits on the one hand, and was a long-time supporter of the National Socialist cause on the other. See Letter from Dean Victor Christian to the Ministerium für innere und kulturelle Angelegenheiten, Abt. IV, Erziehung Kultus und Volksbildung, January 5, 1939 (Universität Wien, Universitätsarchiv, Dekanat der philosophischen Fakultät, D.Z. 240 aus 1938/39); see also Pamela M. Potter, *Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler’s Reich* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 115.

Vienna, which he held until 1945. This passage may be an honest mistake on Graf's part, but it implies that Lach somehow *suffered* immediately and specifically from the annexation – when in fact he was a long-standing and outspoken German nationalist and anti-Semite who had joined the NSDAP in 1933 and was well-connected with like-minded members of the University of Vienna.⁴³ This odd passage makes is even more irritating when, a few lines later, the same text briefly mentions Lach's student Ida Halpern as having become a renowned scholar in Canada – without pointing out that she left Austria in 1938 as a Jew fleeing Nazi persecution.⁴⁴

The Narrative of the Vienna School as Whig History

In light of the foregoing analyses, the established narrative of the Vienna School can plausibly be interpreted as a kind of Whig history:⁴⁵ Within this school, comparative musicology progresses linearly from generation to generation, with no twists or turns, errors or dead ends.⁴⁶ It is always and only getting better; it could be characterized, in Hayden White's terms, as organicist and conservative progress.⁴⁷ In fact, its continuous progress is the unfolding of the synthesizing and systematizing crown of all musicological endeavors, "a general musicology," in Födermayr's words.⁴⁸ Progress is not described as the result of a messy interaction of various agents, but the members of the Vienna School are the "friends of progress," to borrow a phrase from Herbert Butterfield,⁴⁹ who guarantee the advancement of scholarship. The Berlin School and related figures like Jaap Kunst are not essentially bad scholars, though they are the ones who, unlike the members of the Vienna School, also make mistakes. Their mistake is to go

⁴³ See Taschwer, 111–112.

⁴⁴ Graf, "Die Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft in Österreich seit 1896," 27; regarding Halpern's biography see Douglas Cole and Christine Mullins, "'Haida Ida': The Musical World of Ida Halpern," *BC Studies* 97 (1993): 3–37.

⁴⁵ On the notion of "Whig history of science" see Nick Jardine, "Whigs and Stories: Herbert Butterfield and the Historiography of Science," *History of Science* 41, no. 2 (2003): 125–140.

⁴⁶ See Jardine, 131.

⁴⁷ See Hayden White, *Metahistory*, 14–17, 23–28.

⁴⁸ "einer allgemeinen Musikwissenschaft," Födermayr, "Interdisziplinär und nicht aufgespalten: Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft," 22; my translation.

⁴⁹ Herbert Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1965), 5.

astray by unnecessarily and erroneously limiting the scope and aim of comparative musicology and thus of music research in general, thereby effectively impeding scholarly progress.

Discursive Affordances and Implications

It is now possible to identify a number of discursive affordances and implications of this narrative. In their study of academic tribes and territories, Becher and Trowler have argued that “the ways in which academics engage with their subject matter, and the narratives they develop about this, are important structural factors in the formulation of disciplinary cultures. Together they represent features that lend coherence and relative permanence to academics’ social practices, values and attitudes across time and places.”⁵⁰ I would argue that this is particularly true of the *historical* narratives that scholars develop about their own research traditions. As such, the narrative of the Vienna School can be read as a potential means of disciplinary identity politics: for researchers sympathetic to the Vienna School, it provides a meaningful, complexity-reduced, and intelligible teleological form for contingent processes of the past.⁵¹ This narrative offers value and justification through an implicit genetic fallacy mixed with an argumentum ad verecundiam: we are part of a great tradition of great scholars who never erred in the way of scholarship, so the same must hold for us in the present and in the future. The terminological association with other, better known Vienna Schools in scholarship and art is an additional implicit source of prestige.⁵²

In the immediate Austrian context, the narrative also helps to demarcate, claim, and valorize a specific and exclusive epistemic territory, i.e. the overarching synthesis of all other

⁵⁰ Tony Becher and Paul R. Trowler, *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines*, 2nd ed. (Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press, 2006), 23.

⁵¹ See in this regard the functional aspects of historical narratives described by Ächtler, “Was ist ein Narrativ?” 258–259.

⁵² One is reminded, for example, of the Vienna School of Art History, the Vienna School of Ethnology, or the first and second Vienna Schools in music. The term “Vienna School of Comparative Musicology” resonates especially with the idea of a historically oriented and style-critical Vienna School of Musicology founded by Guido Adler; see Knud Jeppesen, “Guido Adler in Memoriam,” *Acta Musicologica* 13, no. 1–4 (1941): 1–2; Rudolf von Ficker, “Guido Adler und die Wiener Schule der Musikwissenschaft,” *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 1, no. 6 (1946): 185–187. It is worth noting that this idea of an Adlerian Vienna School of Musicology is not discussed by Graf and Fördermayr.

musicological research. This in turn justifies institutional representation – in the form of professorships, courses in degree programs, etc. – and access to resources. Since the validity of the Vienna School’s approach is of course not presented as regionally limited, the narrative also serves to discursively challenge or contain the claims of more dominant and more visible competing contemporary conceptions of comparative or ethnomusicological research in international contexts, which in the case of Graf and Födermayr means German-speaking academia in particular.

Conclusion

Let me conclude with some remarks and thoughts on the present life and possible future of the Vienna School narrative. Through Graf’s and Födermayr’s historiographical work, the narrative is inscribed in authoritative accounts of the history of Austrian musicology, such as the *Oesterreichische Musiklexikon*, the chapter on musicology in the multi-volume *Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften*, or even the current (2024) account of the history of German and Austrian musicology in the *New Grove*’s online successor *Grove Music Online*.⁵³ The notion of the Vienna School is also invoked by other authors in recent discourse as an established standard concept.⁵⁴

But without going into details, it seems that this narrative no longer plays a strong role in the self-conception of any current musicologist in or from Austria, although former students of Födermayr are still active in research. Furthermore, after Födermayr’s retirement in 1999, the

⁵³ See Födermayr, “Ethnomusikologie,” 400–402; Födermayr, “Musikwissenschaft, Vergleichende (Vergleichend-Systematische),” 1567–1568; Gruber and Födermayr, “Musikwissenschaft,” 386–401; Vincent Duckles et al., “Musicology,” in *Grove Music Online*, updated May 29, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.46710>.

⁵⁴ See, for example, Michael Fuhr, “Das Gute, das Schöne und das Andere: Von populärer Musik, dem Unbehagen (an) der Musikästhetik und der Musikethnologie als Kulturkritik,” in *Kulturkritik und das Populäre in der Musik*, ed. Fernand Hörner (Münster: Waxmann, 2016), 283–302; Gerd Grupe, “Ethnomusikologie: Einführung und Standortbestimmung,” in *Musikwissenschaft studieren*, ed. Kordula Knaus and Andrea Zedler (Munich: Utz, 2012), 195–202; Ursula Hemetek, “The Past and the Present: Ethnomusicology in Vienna: Some Considerations,” *Muzyka* 54, no. 1 (2009): 57–68; Hemetek, “Music of Minorities – ‘The Others from Within’? On Terminology and the History of Research in Austria,” *Musicalogica Austriaca* (2015), accessed October 26, 2024, <https://www.musau.org/parts/neue-article-page/view/18>; Mervyn McLean, *Pioneers of Ethnomusicology* (Coral Springs: Llumina Press, 2006).

chair of comparative-systematic musicology was finally divided into two professorships, one for comparative musicology and one for systematic musicology.⁵⁵ Födermayr's successors all come from scholarly traditions other than that of Viennese comparative-systematic musicology. Thus, if the term "Vienna School of Comparative-Systematic Musicology" is intended to refer to a genuine inter-generational collective of scholars that fulfills sociological criteria of scientific schools, as conceptualized, for example, by Edward A. Tiryakian,⁵⁶ it seems to refer to a phenomenon of the past.

The regionalized narrative of the Vienna School and its counterpart in Berlin has, of course, never been without alternative, nor has it remained unchallenged within existing accounts of the history of comparative musicology. Not only are there accounts that recognize the special role of the scholars and institutions in Berlin without making specific reference to Vienna in this regard,⁵⁷ but the limitation to one or both of these cities is also questioned. For example, in a review of Walter Wiora's *Ergebnisse und Aufgaben vergleichender Musikforschung*, Edith Gerson-Kiwi speaks more generally of a European School alongside an American School. Although she acknowledges that the European School has its roots in Berlin and Vienna, she does not, unlike Wiora, identify separate schools in Berlin and Vienna.⁵⁸ Similarly, Bruno Nettl distinguishes between a German School (under which he subsumes Wallaschek, Lach, and the Vienna Phonogrammarchiv) and an American School.⁵⁹ In discussing Nettl's distinction, Alan P. Merriam expresses skepticism about the usefulness of such an account. In his analysis, one

⁵⁵ Regine Allgayer-Kaufmann became professor of comparative musicology in 2002, and Christoph Reuter became professor of systematic musicology in 2008. After Allgayer-Kaufmann's retirement in 2015, the chair of comparative musicology was renamed to "comparative musicology (ethnomusicology)."

⁵⁶ See Edward A. Tiryakian, "The Significance of Schools in the Development of Sociology," in *Contemporary Issues in Theory and Research: A Metasociological Perspective*, ed. William E. Snizer, Ellsworth R. Fuhrman, and Michael K. Miller (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1979), 211–233; see also Dayé, "Schools in the Social and Behavioral Sciences," 130–131.

⁵⁷ See, for example, Timothy Rice, "Comparative Musicology," in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., ed. Stanley Sadie (London: Macmillan, 2001), 6:178–179.

⁵⁸ See Wiora, *Ergebnisse und Aufgaben vergleichender Musikforschung*, 19–21; Edith Gerson-Kiwi, review of *Ergebnisse und Aufgaben vergleichender Musikforschung*, by Walter Wiora, *Die Musikforschung* 30, no. 4 (1977): 108.

⁵⁹ See Bruno Nettl, *Music in Primitive Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956), 27–32.

can distinguish differences in “theory, method, approach, and emphasis” within the historical development of ethnomusicology, but these differences cannot be clearly mapped onto a geographical divide.⁶⁰

Notwithstanding such divergent accounts and concerns, I believe that the notion of a Vienna School can still be useful and meaningful from a historiographical perspective when used in the sociological sense mentioned above, referring to a particular kind of collective of scholars. But I would argue that the validity of its continued use depends on a thorough revision of the established narrative. In contrast to the relatively autonomous account of the established narrative, such a critical revision should be thoroughly grounded in an understanding of scholarship as a field of social practice that is intrinsically and interdependently embedded in larger socio-historical contexts.⁶¹ This would also mean acknowledging the uncomfortable aspects of the history of the Vienna School and integrating them more thoroughly into the historiographic account. Likewise, a more sober and multi-faceted assessment of the progress present in the scholarly work of the Vienna School and its impact on the larger scholarly community would be in order. Some work has already been done on which such a revision of the narrative could build, especially with regard to Lach,⁶² but many aspects and interrelationships are yet to be thoroughly examined.

⁶⁰ See Alan P. Merriam, *The Anthropology of Music* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964), 4.

⁶¹ For a social practice conception of scholarship in general, the locus classicus is Michael Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958). For reviews of relevant theoretical strands in the sociology and history of science, see also Ulrike Felt, Helga Nowotny, and Klaus Taschwer, *Wissenschaftsforschung: Eine Einführung* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1995); Peter Weingart, *Wissenschaftssoziologie* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2003). More specifically, musicology as a social practice has been eloquently theorized by Charles Seeger; see his concept of the “musicological juncture” in, for example, Charles Seeger, *Studies in Musicology, 1935–1975* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), 45–63; Seeger, “The Musicological Juncture: 1976,” *Ethnomusicology* 21, no. 2 (1977): 179–188; see also the discussion in Malik Sharif, *Speech about Music: Charles Seeger’s Meta-Musicology* (Vienna: Hollitzer, 2019), 172–182). For other, differently focused theoretical discussions of musicology as a social practice see also Stephen Blum, “Towards a Social History of Musicological Technique,” *Ethnomusicology* 19, no. 2 (1975): 207–231; Kenneth A. Gourelay, “Towards a Reassessment of the Ethnomusicologist’s Role in Research,” *Ethnomusicology* 22, no. 1 (1978): 1–35; Sebastian Bolz et al., “Wissenskulturen der Musikwissenschaft: Eine Einleitung,” in *Wissenskulturen der Musikwissenschaft: Generationen – Netzwerke – Denkstrukturen*, ed. Sebastian Bolz et al. (Bielefeld: transcript, 2016), 9–19; Michael Custodis, “Traditionswege der Musikwissenschaft – Personelle und institutionelle Netzwerke: Eine Methodenskizze,” in *Wissenskulturen der Musikwissenschaft: Generationen – Netzwerke – Denkstrukturen*, ed. Sebastian Bolz et al. (Bielefeld: transcript, 2016), 23–39.

⁶² See, among others, Johann Heiss and Johannes Feichtinger, “Der Orient als Metapher: Wie Österreichs Osten vor, während und nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg vorgestellt wurde,” in *Orient und Okzident: Begegnungen und*

Wahrnehmungen aus fünf Jahrhunderten, ed. Barbara Haider-Wilson and Maximilian Graf (Vienna: Neue Welt Verlag, 2016), 53–77; Lange, *Die Wiener Forschungen an Kriegsgefangenen 1915–1918*; Gerhard Oberkofler, “Über das musikwissenschaftliche Studium von Georg Knepler an der Wiener Universität,” *Mitteilungen der Alfred Klahr Gesellschaft* 3 (2006):11–14; Potter, *Most German of the Arts*; Taschwer, *Hochburg des Anti-Semitismus: Der Niedergang der Universität Wien im 20. Jahrhundert*; as well as the literature cited in footnote 35.