The Function of Sociability in the Sociology of Music and Music Education

JOHANNES RIEDEL

Sociability

MUSIC is, as Sir Jack Westrup puts it,[1] not something which comes out of the blue; it is man-made. It is a conscious social phenomenon created by man to fulfill an individual and collective need. Man is considered here as a social being whose music is a form of social behavior that enables him to identify himself both as a culturally motivated individual and as a collective member whose characteristic is socio-cultural interaction with other members of his cultural community.

The basic assumption, then, is that music is a form of social behavior that gives rise to various types of sociability.[2] For the purpose of this paper, sociability is divided into three categories: (a) that which embraces the feeling of belonging to a group—a family, a community, or a nation; (b) that which embraces the feeling of togetherness through the performance of music, be it religious, classical, popular, or folk; and (c) that which promotes the formation of interest groups, of organizations, and of societies. These three types refer to all persons engaged in any way with music: as listeners, as performers, as teachers, as commentators, and as composers.

The first type of sociability is group awareness. These groups are not fixed

and static. Indeed, fluidity—dynamic fluidity—created by the social context within which the group develops, gives rise to the size, structure and function of the socio-musical group. Groups may be small and membership restricted by the cultural concept the small group membership has of itself. Or, a group may be of tremendous size, with more comprehensive social orientation, leading ultimately to the mass audience.

In addition to groups formed on the basis of a community of interests in the social interaction of music activity, we find group-concepts developing musical identifications on the following levels: local, regional, national, international, religious, ethnic, historical periods of musical excellence in the past, or the historical developments of contemporary music.

Perhaps a few examples will clarify this position. The Burgundian chanson composer of the fifteenth century created the delightfully intimate three-part miniature chanson solely to identify himself with the leisure ideal of the self-contained feudal class: the adoration of woman. The composition of chansons was the culturally accepted medium through which he made himself attractive in the eyes of woman. The American Moravian composer of the eighteenth and nineteenth century, for example, identified himself with a select group whose purpose was to resist amalgamation with the American community for fear the members of the immigrant group would lose their identity. Music, in this case,

---

[1] Sir Jack Westrup, *An Introduction to Musical History* (London: Hutchinson House, 1955), p. 66.

[2] For a discussion on sociability and music in general, see Alphons Silbermann, *Wovon lebt die Musik* (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1957), p. 42ff.

served an ethnic and anthropological need because it enabled the composers to defend and justify the continued existence of the group as individual and collective missionaries of the Moravian musical gospel. The intensity with which the Moravian maintained his individual and group identity may be seen in the comparison between the Moravian choral anthems and instrumental compositions, and the surrounding musical culture that characterized America at the time. Yet a third example may be found in the group of the "bohemian"[3] composer of any time, of any country, who finds—yes, even demands—the pleasure of being culturally boycotted by the "bourgeois" society and appreciated by only his follower-friends. Many of the avant-garde, *ars nova* composers of all periods (Philippe de Vitry, Nicolas Gombert, Claudio Monteverdi, and Arnold Schönberg) fall into this group. The "bohemians" shun contact with the mainstream of musical development, of musical appreciation of the corresponding mass audience of their time, because they cannot find identification with the formation of a musical idiom that will provide the opportunity for individual creativity within the context of a social group bound together by common and felt needs and desires to be satisfied through music. They will create a musical idiom ahead of their time, a true *artem novam*. This does not imply, however, that this avant-garde composer is not aware of the knowledge of human social nature and the importance of sociability in general. Arnold Schonberg, in a little known article, wrote:

It is wonderful that American students—

to my knowledge more than in other countries—earn their living while going through college. The advantage of this is evident: depending upon himself he becomes mature; he gains respect for the value of money and knows what it means to have none; he becomes acquainted with people, acquires an understanding of their psychology and social relations; he learns what to expect from them if he treats them right and how one can fail if one does not.[4]

When the withdrawal of individuals from the mainstream of sociability is too severe and too prolonged, a negative reaction occurs. An "ivory tower" attitude develops which results in conflicting aims, desires, and goals of the social community.

A final example must suffice. Consider the "sophisticated" listener whose aim is *not* to listen to the music of those he considers musically naive and musically "unsophisticated." Here is a sociability of a peculiar kind: a small and select group operating as a part of a larger group, both groups seeking to satisfy needs through music. Yet music is capable of serving as the cohesive spirit of diverse groups.

In contrast to the listener who can discriminate between what he likes and dislikes, between what satisfies him or dissatisfies him, is the sociability aroused by music among that group of listeners who find comfort and satisfaction in listening in the real or imaginary presence of other people, the group which makes up what is commonly called the mass audience. Music is the means through which a sense of belonging, an intellectually subdued, but strongly emotional kind of self-identification is achieved. The listener feels that he is able to share in the social experiences that characterize

---

[3] Paul Honigsheim, "Musikformen und Gesellschaftsformen," *Die Einheit der Sozialwissenschaften.* Wilhelm Bernsdorf and Gottfried Eisermann, eds. (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke Verlag, 1955), p. 216.

[4] Arnold Schoenberg, "How Can a Music Student Earn a Living?" *Proceedings of the Music Teachers National Association,* thirty-fourth series, edited by Theodore M. Finney (Pittsburgh: MTNA, 1940), p. 251.

mass audiences. Present cultural musical exchange programs work from the hypothesis that there are certain experiences common to all human beings which, if understood and appreciated, would lead to a greater degree of international awareness and understanding. Such commonly shared mass experiences are present when people listen to or sing or play the national anthem or a favorite hymn.

Totalitarian governments use this power which music exercises on the sociability of people. To enforce a unilaterally streamlined feeling toward a symbol, an idea, a creed, a social and economic order, a mass-pleasing and mass-educating type of vocal, instrumental, classical, popular, or folk music is presented and adjusted to the ideology of the regime. Wagner's music was performed to an abusively extensive degree by the Nazis in order to instill in people the desire to belong to the group of warriors and barbarians as portrayed in his "Ring of the Nibelungs." Stalin's and Khrushchev's preference for the ballet creates the image of Russia, paradise of the workers. Under a different political regime Beethoven's "Alle Menschen werden Brüder" is used to arouse in the listener a warm feeling of brotherhood and reconciliation, not amongst all men, but amongst Americans, Germans, Russians, proletarians, and middle class people as individual groups.

The second type of sociability embraces the feeling of a community of togetherness through the performance of music. This may occur with all types of music. The feeling of belonging to a community is propagated by open air sings in recreation centers all over America during the summer time or at the hymn sings in revival meetings. The practice of lining-out in seventeenth and eighteenth century American group singing stressed by its very antiphonal effect the element of togetherness. The fact that the congregation repeated each phrase as dictated by the leader made the congregation more group conscious. The feeling of togetherness is furthermore stressed in work and campaign songs, in the chain gang songs of prison camps.

People form organizations in order to have a good time socially and musically. Ever since the sixteenth century a great many societies of socio-cultural musical intentions have made their appearances. Sixteenth century Germany saw the *Meistersinger,* the *Kaland* and *Kantorei;* in the seventeenth century the Italian and French *Academies* originated. In Germany the *Collegia Musica* survived into the eighteenth century. All these organizations were made up of amateurs and professionals united in the task of cultivating sociability through music. It is noteworthy to mention that Johann Sebastian Bach directed the *Collegium Musicum* in Leipzig from 1729 to 1740.[5] He appeared in public with this group. During the summer they played every Wednesday from four to six in Zimmermann's garden; during the winter every Friday from eight to ten in the evening in Zimmermann's café, and during the famous Leipzig Fair every Tuesday and Friday. Bach's adventures in togetherness through music were supposedly rewarded by the performances of works by Locatelli and Lotti.[6] Most of the music by the *Academies* or *Collegia Musica* was performed in the homes. Music in and for the homes was of greatest significance in the eighteenth century, which

[5] Arnold Schering, *Die Musikgeschichte Leipzigs, II, von 1650 bis 1723* (Leipzig: Kistner & Siegel, 1926), p. 17ff.

[6] Hans Engel, *Musik und Gesellschaft* (Berlin-Halensee: Max Hesse, 1960), p. 236.

saw the rise of familiar music societies, some of which have survived into our own time.

The third type of sociability is the best known to us. It gives rise to the many choral organizations which sing in praise of God, of a certain country, a certain composer (consider the long list of Bach, Händel, Haydn, Schütz societies, just to mention a few), a certain period (Renaissance, Baroque singers), or a certain type of music (madrigal, motet, cantata, passion, oratorio choirs). It prompts the formation of the great number of instrumental organizations, professional and non-professional, in grade and in high schools, in colleges and in universities, in factories and other business establishments, in hospitals and armed forces camps. It is also responsible for the great number of organizations and clubs desirous of a better understanding of music. In one sense it includes also the concert, radio and television audiences.

Music Education and Sociability

The major objective of music education must be the satisfaction of the intellectual and emotional needs of the general student in the primary and secondary school, the college, and the university. The major areas of study, however, must be related to the historical period, the type of civilization, and the specific society for which the music was created. Some of these major areas are as follows:

1. *Music theory* familiarizes the student with the elements of music.

2. *Applied music* teaches the student how to perform according to his abilities and desires.

3. *Music composition* permits the student to develop his latent creative talents.

4. *Music history* transmits to the student the musical heritage of past generations.

5. *Music literature* develops the student's aesthetic discrimination through familiarity with various styles and types of music.

6. *Music and culture relationship* emphasizes the dynamic, non-static, ever-changing world of music as a part of a larger world-wide cultural unit.

The above objectives of music education are not restricted to the school itself, but are designed to transfer into the musico-social life of the human being, thereby enhancing and expanding his sociability. Would it not be a pity if the student, for example, were to learn the fundamentals of music theory merely for the sake of acquiring knowledge? Beyond the mere acquisition of knowledge, the student wants to acquire the amount of knowledge that permits him to share the musical and social experiences of his fellow students. Moreover he wants that kind of knowledge that permits him to identify himself with the level occupied by his preferred teacher, composer, performer, or conductor; or, possibly, knowledge which permits him to distinguish himself from his family.

The student who practices his instrument assiduously does so not only because he wants to learn how to play the instrument, but also because he wants to acquire some skill with which to please his friends, to gain acceptance by a group, to impress his parents, real or imaginary adversaries, or members of the opposite sex.

The study of composition will give the student an opportunity to assimilate the knowledge of past composers. Composition has an added function, one that is important both for the music educator and the student. There are periods in which the energy of the human being needs new well-springs if

the person is to maintain and project his individual and collective identity to the greatest extent possible. He must grow or become stale. It is during such periods of intellectual and emotional stress that composition becomes a refuge—a means by which a self-imposed isolation permits the student to withdraw from the group for purposes of self-fulfillment.

The study of music history gives the student an opportunity to identify and orient himself in relation to the musical heritage of his ancestors. The orderliness of history which assigns to every recognized composer a definite place and role is in direct contrast to the unsettled world of musical experimentation and may provide a feeling of security for the student. Finally, music history demonstrates the trends and innovations that inevitably contribute to the change of musical style. Music then becomes a dynamic, not a static aspect of social behavior. Sociability does not take place by itself; it requires the active participation that is a basic assumption of music education.

The Sociology of Music Education

Since sociabiilty is one of the major objectives of music education, music education itself should be examined from a musico-sociological point of view. Unfortunately, not too many works on the sociology of music are available. Very few on the sociological implications of music education have been attempted. Although still in the formative stage of debate and controversy, the sociology of music has been firmly established by the following sociologists: Georg Simmel,[7] Max

Weber,[8] Paul Honigsheim,[9] Theodor W. Adorno,[10] John H. Mueller,[11] Max

[7] Georg Simmel, "Psychologische und Ethnologische Studien über Musik," *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft,* Vol. 13, 1882, p. 261-305.

[8] Max Weber, *Die rationalen und soziologischen Grundlagen der Musik* (München: Drei Masken Verlag, 1921); *The Rational and Social Foundations of Music,* edited and translated by Don Martindale, Johannes Riedel, Gertrude Neuwirth (Southern Illinois University Press, 1958).

[9] Paul Honigsheim, "Soziologie der Kunst, Musik und Literatur," *Die Lehre von der Gesellschaft: Ein Lehrbuch der Soziologie,* Gottfried Eisermann, ed. (Stuttgart: Enke, 1958), pp. 338-373; "Musikformen und Gesellschaftsformen," *Die Einheit der Sozialwissenschaften,* Bernsdorf and Eisermann, eds. (Stuttgart: Enke, 1955), pp. 214-255; *An Outline for the Study of Sociology and Religion, Knowledge, and the Arts* (East Lansing: Michigan State College, 1940, mimeographed); "Soziologie der Kunst," *Verhandlungen des 7. Deutschen Soziologentages* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1931), pp. 179-181; "Die soziologischen und sozio-psychologischen Grundlagen des Rundfunks und der Radiomusik," *Discours au Congrès de Musique radiogénigue Göttingen* (Berlin: not published, 1929); Discussion of R. Thurnwald's paper "Anfänge der Kunst," *Verhandlungen des 6. Deutschen Soziologentages* (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr), pp. 279-281.

[10] Theodore W. Adorno, "Zur Musikpädogogik," *Junge Musik* 6: 218-229, 1957; *Prismen, Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1955); "Die gegängelte Musik," *Der Monat* V No. 56: 177-183, 1953; "Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft," *Soziologische Forschung in unserer Zeit* (Köln: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1951), 352 p., pp. 228-340; "A Social Critique of Radio Music," *Kenyon Review VII* (1945), reprinted in *Reader in Public Opinion and Communication,* Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz, eds. (Glencoe: Free Press, 1950), pp. 309-316; *Philosophie der neuen Musik* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949); "The Radio Symphony," *Radio Research* 1941, Paul E. Lazarsfeld and Frank N. Stanton, eds. (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1941), pp. 110-139; "On Popular Music," *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* 9:17-49, (1941); "Uber den Fetischcharakter der Musik und die Regression des Hörens," *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* 7:321-356 (1939); *Klangfiguren. Musikalische Schriften I* (Berlin & Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1959); *Dissonanzen. Musik in der verwalteten Welt,* 2nd revised edition (Göttingen: Vandenoeck & Rupprecht, 1958); T. W. Adorno und Max Horkheimer, "Kunst- und Musiksoziologie," *Soziologische Exkurse* (Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1956), pp. 93-105.

[11] John H. Mueller, "Baroque—Is It Datum, Hypothesis, or Tautology? A Critique in Musical Aesthetics," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* XII:421-437 (1954); *The American Symphony Orchestra: A Social History of*

Kaplan,[12] Alphons Silbermann,[13] and Kurt Blaukopf.[14] Others, of course, could be listed, but these men have laid the fundamental positions.

Although we posesss, in the studies of John H. Mueller and Alphons Silbermann, two excellent and very informative works on the sociology of music, it is appalling to see how little progress has been made in understand-

ing the importance of this particular field since Max Weber published his tentative and explorative essay on the rational and sociological foundations of music in 1921. While sociologists have so far made the major contributions in the field of investigation, musicologists look at it with caution. Mersmann likes to call it an auxiliary science,[15] Curt Sachs considers it an additive science,[16] and Blaukopf looks upon it as a transitional science.[17] Music educators, on the other hand, have taken advantage of the writings of the American sociologists, Max Kaplan and John H. Mueller, to expand their own capabilities in the field of music education. A proper literature of the sociology of music education, however, does not presently exist.

Two questions are of the greatest importance for a successful launching of a sociology of music education. What method shall we develop that will best enable us to deal with this special field? Precisely what problems will we attempt to solve with the method of investigation that will be developed? A systematic study of this field can be reached if we accept what Blaukopf has said about research procedures in sociology of music in general. Blaukopf maintains the following:

1. Sociology of music deals specifically with the collection of all social facts relevant in music (education).

2. Sociology of music deals with the systematization of these facts according to their significance to music (education).

Musical Taste (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1951); "Methods of Aesthetic Measurement," *American Journal of Sociology*, (1946), 276-282; "The Folkway of Art: An Analysis of the Social Theories of Art," *American Journal of Sociology*, 44: 222-238 (September 1938); "Present Status of the Cultural Lag Hypothesis," *American Sociological Review*, III:320-327; "Is Art the Product of its Age?" *Social Forces*, (1935), 367-375; "Theories of Aesthetic Appreciation," *Studies in Appreciation of Art* (University of Oregon Publications, Vol. IV, No. 6 (1934), pp. 7-32; "Music and Education: A Sociological Approach," Chapter IV of *Basic Concepts of Music Education*, Nelson B. Henry, ed. The Fifty-seventh yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (University of Chicago Press, 1958), pp. 88-122.

[12] Max Kaplan, "Telepractice: A Symphony Orchestra as it Prepares for a Concert," *Social Forces* 33:352-359 (1955); *Music in the City* (Pueblo, Colorado: Pueblo City College Publications, 1944); *The Musician in America: A Study of His Social Roles: Introduction to a Sociology of Music* (Ph.D. Diss.: University of Illinois, 1951).

[13] Alphons Silbermann, *Wovon lebt die Musik* (Regensburg: Gustave Bosse, 1957); "Die Stellung der Musiksoziologie," *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 10:102-110 (1958); *Introduction à une sociologie de la musique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1955); *La musique, la radio et l'auditeur* (Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1954); "Sociological Aspect of Radio Music," *Transactions of the Second World Congress of Sociology 1933*, Vol. I, pp. 129-131.

[14] Kurt Blaukopf, "Musik," *Wörterbuch der Soziologie*, W. Bernsdorf and Fr. Bülow, eds., (Stuttgart: F. Enke Verlag, 1955), pp. 342-346; *Musiksoziologie: Eine Einführung in die Grundbegriffe mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Soziologie der Tonsysteme* (St. Gallen: Zollikefer, 1952); "Musiksoziologie, Bindung und Freiheit bei der Wahl von Tonsystemen," *Soziologie und Leben* (Tübingen: Rainer Wunderlich, 1952), pp. 237-257; "Tonalität und Soziologie," *Internationalen Musikkongress* (Wien 1952), p. 104-107.

[15] Hans Mersmann, "Soziologie als Hilfswissenschaft der Musikgeschichte," *Archiv für Musikgeschichte X* (1953), pp. 1-15.

[16] Curt Sachs in Alphons Silbermann, *Wovon lebt die Musik* (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1957), pp. 30-31.

[17] Kurt Blaukopf, "Musik," *Wörterbuch der Soziologie*, W. Bernsdorf & Fr. Bülow, eds. (Stuttgart: F. Enke Verlag, 1955), p. 342.

3. Sociology of music deals with the interpretation of those facts which may be of decisive importance for a change in the methodology of music (education).[18]

The above definitions of research procedure seem applicable to investigations in the field of the sociology of music education.

One immediately notices that most of the more important problems of the sociology of music education are of such a nature that the statistical analysis of data gathered by questionnaires would not even touch the basic issues. Before we can apply statistical analysis, we must, as stated previously, decide, "What are we going to work on?" The depth of perception we can develop depends on the social relationships and implications of the questions that we ask of a sociology of music education.

One of the immediate decisions needed is the isolation of and agreement upon a solid platform of basic problems. Thus attention should not only be given to the various points of the sociology of music education discussed above, but also to preliminary topics not yet mentioned. Such preliminary issues would entail the identification of the social position of the music educator throughout the ages, the social position of the general school as distinguished from that of the private, and the social position of the college or university music educator. One of the most crucial preliminary issues is the analysis of the social position of the music educator in relationship to other producers of music, such as the performer and the musicologist.

Research in the field of the sociology of music education should continue then with the problems proper

_____
[18] Blaukopf, *loc. cit.*

of sociability. What, for example, is the social function of school music organizations? How is that function different from that of the *schola cantorum,* the English cathedral schools, the French *maîtrises* and *psalettes,* the German *Kantoreien,* and the American singing school?

This probing and social orientation may be continued by a discussion of the social and cultural conditions that give rise to certain kinds of music education. What kind of music education, we may ask, is used to sustain the power of the church, of a feudal society, of a capitalistic society, or of the socialistic state? Furthermore, we may ask for studies on the effects of music education on social life, on the influences of music education on group formation, group controls and group conflicts, and for studies on the development of certain behavioral attitudes through music education.

The Social Position of the Music Educator

To single out one case in point of the many project possibilities in the research work of the sociology of music education, let us look quickly at the social position of the music educator in three major periods in which sociability was a dominant characteristic: Antiquity, Middle Ages, and the Reformation era. In the ancient high cultures (China, Japan, Egypt) the music educator is at the apex of all other musicians. He fulfills the function of priest or priest-singer. At the same time, he is the *musicus theoricus,* a music educator who is both priest and philosopher who has sole command over the secret knowledge of music. He shares this secret knowledge with a very restricted few. Subordinate to him are his deacon or assistant and the temple singer; subordinate to these are

the instrumentalists, such as the harpist, lutenist, and the trumpet or shofar players.

In such a society, sociability is determined by the music and music education appropriate to society of a "totalitarian" structure. Music functions in such a society (a) in praise of the establishment of a totalitarian social structure; (b) to consolidate the members of such a totalitarian social structure (c) in adoration of the God-Monarch who is sometimes the mythical originator of music itself as in the case of the two mythical Chinese emperors, Fu-Dhi and Hung-Shi.

The primary function of music and music education was to entertain and amuse the ruling class and to consolidate the lower classes' faith in the deity and the corresponding political structure.

The musical "ethos" systems of the ancient Chinese and the Greeks were used as tools to manipulate and regulate the emotions of the members of their particular societies. The societal function of music was to channel the emotions of the social group into activities which would develop and maintain a balance between rulers and ruled. Sociability, again, is a key concept that leads to increased awareness of the function of music and the position of the music educator.

Although the Greeks used music and "ethos" to channel the emotions of men, it is significant that Plato was skeptical of any art form which arouses the passions. This is not to say that he denied the necessity of music in the shaping of the society, making it rhythmical and harmonious, and in the training of the citizen so that he could be of greatest service to the state.[19] It

is of interest to notice that the theorist Quintilianus follows Aristoxenos when he views music as subdivided into theory and practice. Whereas acoustics, according to Quintilianus, is a part of music theory, music education is a part of music practice.

In the Middle Ages, the music educator still towers over all other musicians. Music, as the only art, is taught as one of the seven liberal arts at the universities. As was the case with Johannes de Muris, University of Paris, 1340, the function of music educators was to lecture in mathematics, astronomy and music theory. The practical side of music performance (i.e., of liturgical singing) was taught in the cathedral and town council schools by the *cantor*. The term *cantor* was sometimes also applied to the music theorist. We thus can distinguish two *cantorial* groups (a) the *cantor per usum* as a musician and music educator acquainted with music practice; and (b) the *cantor per artem* as a musician and theorist interested solely in mathematical, numerical and cosmological speculations.[20]

The characteristic social position and social function of the latter can be comprehended through the medieval theorist Odo's definition of music: *Musica est scientia veraciter canendi* (Music is the science of how to sing truthfully). This definition may be contrasted with another popular definition in effect at the same time: *Musica est ars recte canendi* (Music is the art of how to sing correctly).[21] Guido d'Arezzo, the greatest theorist-music educator of the Middle Ages,

[19] Nan Cooke Carpenter, *Music in the Medieval and Renaissance Universities* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1958), p. 5.

[20] Renate Federhofer-Königs and Hellmut Federhofer, "Musikerziehung," *Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1962), p. 1110.

[21] Heinrich Hüschen, "Musik," *Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, p. 977.

describes the great difference and function of the two types of music educators: *musicorum et cantorum magna est distantia isti dicunt, illi sciunt, quae composit musica* (Great is the difference between musicians — i.e., music theorists and practical music educators —these sing, those write of what music consists).[22]

Although the two types of music educators differ considerably in their class consciousness and in their position in society, both serve the same type of sociability. Both helped to sustain the power of the church through a skillful performance of the Gregorian repertory on the one hand and through a mostly retrospective allegiance to an abstract type of music theory inherited from the Greek theorists on the other. The medieval university professor of music theory favored the theory of a "sophisticated" ivory tower group who worked only for a few colleagues. The practical music educator favored the sociability of the medieval mass audience of monks, knights, and laymen. His concern was to reach the masses, to give them a proper rendition of the liturgy. By teaching the proper interpretation of the liturgy, the power, prestige, and social function of the church was perpetuated.

In the Reformation era the music educator no longer occupies that foremost academic position which he held during the medieval era. We read that Sethus Calvisius, one of the most famous Thomas cantors in Leipzig in the second half of the sixteenth century, was known for his achievements as a mathematician, theorist, composer, cantor, music historian, all in one, but music was not taught at the University

of Leipzig at the end of the century. The emphasis of music educational work shifted to the school. In their zeal to use music as a means of socio-congregational identification, school teachers taught music every day. The music lesson consisted of singing, ear training, fundamental musical theory, *musica plana*, and *musica figuralis*. The realignment of persons who had given up their traditional ties with the Roman church; i.e., with a traditional group, was made easy by the singing of the familiar Latin chants and their figural elaborations in addition to hymns in the vernacular tongue. At the same time the tremendous musical activity, in which the student body or the congregation could participate, in singing the chants of the old, the hymns of the new faith, was vital to their identification. Musical activity, congregational activity, and choral singing played a major cohesive role. As the congregations became firmly established, group protection gained importance. Attempts to resist new disruptive forces led to reliance on codified procedures for group singing and an increasing sophistication or "reform" of the musical activities. The sophistication occurred by allowing the members of the Protestant choral groups to sing the entire choral repertoire of the Renaissance era, compositions by Brumel, Févin, Isaac, Mouton, Richafort, and Willaert. The music educator of the Reformation era played an outstanding part in this.

Conclusions

Music does not, indeed cannot, exist in a vacuum. It must be recognized as existing in human society. It must be seen as a man-made social function that creates and serves sociability.

All aspects of music, therefore, are exposed to the concept of sociability:

---

[22] Walter Salmen, "Musiker," *Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* p. 1086.

music itself, music education, and musicology. Since sociability plays such an outstanding role in each, the sociology of these three fields should be studied more closely than it has been in the past.

In order for the sociology of music education to fulfill its own function of sociability, it would be advisable to learn from previous investigations in the sociology of music. The sociability of music then can profit from tentative explorations as done by such men as Max Weber, Max Kaplan, Alphons Silbermann, John H. Mueller. In other words, the sociology of music education should be applicable not only to music education as it served the past generations, as it affected the social function of the music educator serving past centuries and societies, but it should also be applied to the music of our own time.

Discussions that seek to expand our perception of the sociability and function of music education and musicology should be applied to such issues as the function of school organizations, the influence of music education on group formations, and group conflicts that are a part of our music today. One of the present group conflicts, for example, that might be resolved through a recognition of the function of sociability is that existing between the music educator and the musicologist. To be sure, there are differences of opinion between these two groups. What is essential is that both serve the same master. Both exist in order to serve basic needs of the human being, of humanity's need for and desire for sociability. The two groups best in a position to produce sociability through music are *music educators* and *musicologists*.

The plea of Charles Seeger in his essay on "Music Education and Musicology," written in 1947, provides us with a basic insight, ". . . as music education and musicology have much to gain by getting together, let us hasten the day, when, in our secure knowledge that they can depend upon each other, they will co-operate toward promoting the usefulness of music in the life of man."[23]

By becoming aware of the fact that sociability is the bond which unites music, music education, and musicology, this day of co-operative undertaking in both fields has arrived.[24]

University of Minnesota

---

[23] Charles Seeger, "Music Education and Musicology," H. N. Morgan, *Music Education Source Book* (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1947), p. 198.

[24] This essay was read at the 1962 biennial meeting of the MENC in Chicago, Illinois.