

Ivana Miladinović Prica*

University of Arts in Belgrade
Faculty of Music, Department of Musicology

**VIRTUAL *ROUND-TABLE* TO MARK THE 70TH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSICOLOGY AT
THE FACULTY OF MUSIC IN BELGRADE
(Vesna Mikić, Leon Stefanija, Ivana Perković, Dario Martinelli)**

The Department of Musicology at the Faculty of Music in Belgrade is recognised in today's international academic circles. Closely linking its pedagogical activity with scientific research, in recent years and decades the Department has considerably diversified its sphere of musicological investigation and formed strong connections with the European and global musicological communities: as the organiser of a biannual conference, which has at once been the most long-standing form of connecting and bringing together musicologists from all over the world in our country; as the publisher of the *New Sound International Journal of Music*, our first international journal dedicated to musicology, which has been included in the ERIH list; as a participant in numerous international projects (as part of the Tempus or Erasmus+ programmes,¹ to name a few) and various lecturer and student exchange programmes.²

* Author contact information: ivanamila@gmail.com

¹ The Jean Monnet module *Music Identities and European Perspective – an Interdisciplinary Approach* (2014–2017), aimed at promoting EU studies in the fields of music and arts, was recently brought to a successful completion under the management of Prof. Dr Mirjana Veselinović-Hofman. A new Jean Monnet module *Music and Art in the Shaping of the European Cultural Identity* (2017–2020), headed by Prof. Dr Marija Masnikosa, was launched in the academic year of 2017/2018. Both modules are intended for MA and PhD students of Musicology.

² Evidence of the increasingly intense international cooperation with guest lectures of such leading experts as Richard Taruskin (2017, 2018), Nick Zangwill (2017), Philip Tagg (2016), Albrecht Riethmüller (2016), Rima Povilionienė (2016), Lawrence Kramer (2014), Antonio

In the year in which the Department of Musicology marks its 70th anniversary, issues of the institutional life and future of musicology have gained in relevance in a very specific way. This was exactly what prompted us to steer our “Conversations” section towards a (self-)examination of the recent state of affairs in musicology as an academic discipline and a musicological vocation, which is ‘nurtured’ and becomes ‘fully-fledged’ precisely at the Department of Musicology. This singular round table gathers together some of our foreign colleagues who have been involved in the teaching process itself – Prof. Dr. Leon Stefanija from the Faculty of Philosophy in Ljubljana and Prof. Dr. Dario Martinelli from Kaunas University of Technology.³ Unfortunately, not all invitees have been able to participate due to their busy schedules. The domestic musicologists taking part are members of the Department who hold positions key to

Baldassarre (2012), Eero Tarasti (2010), Adam Krims (2010), Kyle Gann (2010), Peter Wicke (2009) and Brandon LaBelle (2009), to mention a few. Members of the Department of Musicology are involved in intense international activity as guest lecturers at scientific and academic institutions all over the world. The long-standing Head of the Department of Musicology, Mirjana Veselinović-Hofman, has worked in close cooperation with the Rostock University of Music and Drama and the Erasmus University Rotterdam, and lectured at the University of Pretoria (2003–2006); Vesna Mikić was guest lecturer at the Humboldt University of Berlin (2012); Sonja Marinković at the Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre (2013); Dragana Stojanović-Novičić gave a series of lectures (2009) and worked as a Fulbright professor and researcher (2016) at Bard College; Tijana Popović Mladjenović was a visiting lecturer at the Jerusalem Academy of Music and Dance (2018)... The Faculty of Music’s first student and lecturer exchanges within the Erasmus+ programme were realised precisely at the Department of Musicology. There is an ongoing intense cooperation with the Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre (in September 2016, the Academy welcomed Mirjana Veselinović-Hofman, Ivana Perković, Tijana Popović Mladjenović and teaching assistants Marina Marković and Ivana Petković Lozo; doctoral students Neda Kolić and Maša Spajić attended summer-semester courses at this institution in 2016/2017), with the Zhejiang Conservatory of Music from Hangzhou (Ivana Perković was a visiting lecturer in 2017), as well as with the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Dragana Stojanović-Novičić delivered a series of guest lectures in November 2018; undergraduate student Aleksandra Dašić attended winter-semester courses in 2016/17). As part of the Erasmus+ exchange programme, three foreign students did their Master Studies in Musicology – two of them from the Lithuanian, Paulina Nalivaikaitė (summer semester 2015/16) and Ieva Gelžinytė (winter semester 2016/17), and Yuanning Zhang from China (winter semester 2018/19).

³ In addition to taking part in conferences organised by the Department, Leon Stefanija also gave a course in Baroque Music in the second year of Undergraduate Studies of Musicology in the summer semester of the 2008/2009 academic year, while Dario Martinelli gave an intensive course entitled *Popular Music, Politics and Ideology* in March 2013. This course was realized with the aim of developing the interdisciplinary character of Master Studies of Musicology as part of the Tempus programme.

formulating and developing the concept of its work – Prof. Dr. Vesna Mikić, Head of the Department, and Prof. Dr. Ivana Perković, Vice Dean for Research and International Relations. We wish to give our heartfelt thanks to all the participants for providing answers that have shed light on the framework of their personal 'workshops', the scholarly and pedagogical paradigms which they continue to pursue, as well as the challenges, tensions and registers in which musicological life unfolds today (albeit in places apart).

1. In your opinion, what are the biggest challenges facing present-day musicology?

Vesna Mikić: It seems to me that the main challenges are 'external'. When I say 'external' I am thinking of the global crisis we are living in and in which, whether we like it or not, we are 'participants'. In that respect, the issues of one (however big or small) discipline are somehow necessarily directed towards the everyday/existential, economic, and the (cultural) political. If, for the sake of this conversation, I would 'think' about musicology as an 'autonomous' discipline, I would say that the challenges it faces in (its) contemporaneity are 'challenging' in the best possible sense. To be more precise, neither am I concerned about the profession, nor the discipline, given that I am not concerned about the music. Since music for me is a lot of things, actually, everything that has anything to do with the sound, consequently musicology – as the 'science of music' – will always have the right to deal with the subject it deals with, and furthermore enjoy the challenges that its subject presents.



Leon Stefanija: It depends on the perspective. With its specialisation, ethno/musicology consists of several layers. One of the two that I would like to point out here is the *technology* and probably the main epistemological challenge tied to it, *interdisciplinarity*. Not only music re/production, but also musicology has changed its course. Moving the musical venues from classical stores to the Internet coincides with the music information retrieval movement and big-data analysis: the computer-scientists approach to music analysis



with rather powerful mechanisms that were exceptional in the classical, 'formal' music analysis. Much of the most serious music analysis is being done in connection with the new, computer-aided media: from different magically huge online databases with different layers of different musical practices, to the audio and video streaming services. In other words, besides the Society for Music Analysis, there is another, parallel music-analytical agenda behind the International Society for Music Information Retrieval.

Of course, they are complementary, not rival phenomena, yet one may say the same for the second issue I see quite challenging, the issue of the *applied* knowledge of ethno/musicology, where both fields of expertise have been dealing with the same issue with certain scotoma regarding each other. The age-old issue of 'usefulness' has been a permanent challenge to more or less all the arts and sciences, yet the new difficulty seems to me the academic ramification of the foci: one might welcome it as democratization while the other may see a fair amount of ignorance. The landscape which is branching out of 'study groups' within the IMS and ICTM is but a formal indication of a scholarly dispersed, heterogeneous and heteronomous community of music research. Yet the diversity seems only provisional: the aim of the sciences and arts is to widen knowledge (distribution), yet that knowledge (distribution) is becoming oriented toward more and more specialized groups that eventually end up promoting *their* results, rarely connecting them in the wider community. It might be beneficial for music research to leave the door open for a constant reflection about its basic premises. The perplexing interdisciplinary issues, inevitably connected also to the applicability of any science or art, would probably make much more sense also for those who do not share the scruple about the above-indicated view.



Ivana Perković: The difficulties musicology is encountering at the end of the 21st century's second decade come from various domains. We might label them, let's say, external and internal. Every day, we are faced with dilemmas regarding the nature of scientific cognition in contemporary times. Should one (and how?) react to the fundamental shifts that are irreversibly changing the way we do musicology? What is the position of the humanities in contemporary scholarly thought?

Observing it from without, there is no doubt that musicology today shares the problems of contemporary scholarship in general. We are still short of an answer to the challenges of neoliberalism, of chasing to make a quick profit, and the 'free market' mode of

thinking in academic work *en générale*. Sometimes I'm under the impression that not even academia is far from an Aldous Huxley dystopia, a brave new world 'freed' from all pursuits that do not stimulate consumption and spending. A world where even listening to music, reading literary works, and looking at paintings is supposed to boil down to a facile entertainment, churned out at the 'propaganda bureau'.

The lack of jobs, precarity, and stress are everywhere around us, not only in academia. Admittedly, the scientific-technological revolutions of the 20th and 21st century also brought improvements in the quality of life, means of communication, and, generally speaking, an impressive progress in terms of technology. But the pace of development of ethical awareness is not even close to that of technology, and perhaps that is precisely one of the reasons behind the vulgarization of scholarship. That disparity has resulted in paying lip service to creativity and originality as the cognitive paradigm of the present epoch, whereas we're drifting farther and farther away from authenticity.

On the other hand, internal challenges are not always easy to spot, especially when you're looking from the perspective of your own discipline. In recent years, there's been a lot of focus on self-reflection in musicology and redefinition of its boundaries as an academic field, introducing new scholarly positions, objects of study, methodologies, and strategies of research. And yet, it seems we are still too slow when it comes to tapping into the resources that our present digital era is offering us. There is an inertia in the 'institutionalized discourses' when it comes to this topic, as well as in some other areas. I also see challenges in the instrumentalization of musicology, as well as in the (rising) demand to measure and quantify every result.

Dario Martinelli: I would possibly identify three areas of challenges. The first one overlaps with the general crisis that humanities as a whole are experiencing: decreased interest, decreased institutional support... basically, the fact that, like all the humanities, musicology too is perceived as producing future unemployed citizens.

The second one concerns a certain breakdown between academic musicology and applied musicology: music critics, for instance, are less and less interested in doing reviews and essays that have a real musicological value, but tend to treat musical material as 'events'. A sense of anticipation, mundanity, gossip and the like have taken the place



Photo by Giedre Rein

of pondered reviews of the music. When a new pop album is released, it looks like critics are more interested in the pop star's new girlfriend than in the music.

The third problem is that, after the 1970's and 1980's brought an important emancipation of non-classical repertoires within the musicological discourse (folk and popular music in particular), it looks like there is still a lot of work to do, in order to create an acceptable 'fairness' in treating all these repertoires. For instance, popular music is very rarely the object of the serious analysis of the music as such, but tends to be more a domain of sociomusicology, as if all that matters is the social aspect, while the music is somehow secondary.

2. Has the widely evident multiplicity of relations between musicology and many scientific disciplines today generally changed the methodology of musicological work itself and, if you believe it has, in what way and in what sense?

V. M.: The changes or rather 'fine tunings' of the methodology were due mainly to the changes of the cultural model, the transition to media culture, the permeation of our daily lives with technology. Certainly, we listen to and hear music differently, so it is possible that the musicological work 'works' differently. Other disciplines have just 'sharpened' our sense of hearing by temporarily shifting our 'auditory perspectives'. However, the basic method – proceeding from music (from whichever position), remains specifically a musicological one.

L. S.: The branching out of the sciences, ethno/musicology is no exception, has constantly been changing methodologies. At the moment, three especially strong streams of thought seem to propel the major portion of music research. On the one side, there is a huge consciousness about music as a sociological phenomenon; this empowers the empirical (ethnographic-oriented) methods. On the other side, there are many interesting, technology-connected, interdisciplinary studies that differ in content; from music cognition and neuroscientific music research to big-data or music information retrieval analysis. The third, I would say, most classical premise, combines the history, phenomenology, hermeneutics, and/or semiotics of a musical work or compositional theory with different kinds of pragmatic aims.

As I experience the influences of all the operational modes in music research, many 'classical' ethno/musicologists seem to stay outside of the second above-mentioned stream. It certainly does not hold true for all the institutions, but the pragmatic competitiveness for the survival of a department or an institute prevents the music-research community from a profound discussion regarding the teleological and methodological 'links' between different scholarly interests. This is nothing new for ethno/musicology; the field still consists, as it

did since its formal inception in the 19th century, of a draught from different scholarly winds.

I. P.: In short – no. If we take our cue from the status of musicology in the system of *artes liberales* and do not lose sight of the ways that other scholarly disciplines have developed, changed, combined, and separated over the course of history, then adjusting the study of music to the nature of new kinds of knowledge in various areas is hardly surprising. After all, as in any interdisciplinary relation, adopting the methodology of a scholarly discipline entails flexibility and adjusting the concepts that are being transferred, as well as a sensitive approach to their nuances and contexts.

D. M.: Certainly important novelties have been introduced. To mention one, the fact that new media have changed and diversified the way people listen to and share music has 'forced' musicologists to become acquainted with fields like ICT and topics like algorithms.

Some colleagues are worried that processes like this generate a 'loss of identity' within musicology, but I am not particularly worried, because this is a natural, organic I shall say, phenomenon that every discipline goes through, if it keeps up with the pace of the general innovations within societies.

Having said that, I do not think that the historical epoch we are living in is absolutely the most revolutionary and game-changing for musicology. I still think that the biggest innovations were brought in the second half of the 20th century, when – as I mentioned before – musicology opened up to non-classical repertoires, when we realized that the score is not the exclusive point of reference for analysis, when we became emancipated from the notion of the Romantic genius and started exploring creativity also in non-compositional processes (e.g., interpretation), and also when we realized that music is not only an end to itself, but it conveys meanings and significance that go outside it as well.

3. To what extent and in what direction has the postmodernist intensification of 'musicology in context' generally influenced the pedagogical approach to this science and its position as a university discipline, and particularly at your faculty/university?

V. M.: For my pedagogical work that 'intensification' was crucial. It enabled me, as a musicologist and teacher, not only to introduce and teach some new subjects (such as: Popular Music – Theories, Popular Music – Genres, Music and Politics, History and Theory of Film and Television Music) in the curricula of the faculty where I work, but also to teach and shape for almost a

decade (till 2014) at the interdisciplinary postgraduate studies of the University of Arts, as a relatively young teacher, 'non-musicological' theoretical subjects derived from my doctoral thesis as the specific musicological appropriation of the concepts of cultural studies (such as: Introduction to the theories of popular culture; New media/New art theories; Arts and politics, etc.)

L. S.: I think that 'musicology in context' has exerted rather important steps toward a certain freedom of thought. It may be felt more in the growing interest for the ethnomusicological repertoire of my department than in the musicological. Although I find the "musicology in context" to be a prevalent mode of educational activities in different fields of knowledge, emphasizing the significance of the national/regional/local 'lore' does not have to mean confinement to the *individuality* (either of the phenomenon or the scholar's approach). Although it is important to think in context, I believe that also the context may benefit from adding itself to a process of contextualization or another, let's call it a *secondary* context in which the context is but a series of partial incisions that might have also been done differently. This process of contextualization – the embedding of the decisions of the context – seems to me rarely noticed although I find it important.

I. P.: I belong to the generations whose student days were marked by musicology's turn to contextualism and I consider that one of the happier circumstances of my scholarly path. As someone who chose to prepare for the written part of the entrance exam in musicology by writing about temporality in Schoenberg's oeuvre and Kafka's *The Metamorphosis*, I was a bit taken aback by the sheer heat of the debates about 'musicology in context'. In my opinion, opening the 'disciplinary door' to music, which had hitherto been out of focus, contributed to some necessary methodological and epistemological enrichments that musicology had not seen before. However, I see no reason to forfeit the study of complex issues related to music filled with meaning or 'guilty' on account of the contents it offers to its listeners, composers, devotees, performers, audiences, all those who are not indifferent about its singularity.

D. M.: Well, the time we are living in nowadays is already post-postmodern, so I would say that we are now going through a revisionist stage where scholars and educators are questioning, rather than embracing, postmodern approaches. But of course, that has just started, so postmodernism in pedagogy is still rather popular. It is always a question of the 'golden mean', I guess. Contextualizing music has helped us enormously to get rid of the obsolete idea that musicology starts and finishes with the score, and with the exclusive exploration of the composer's mind. On the other hand, as I mentioned before in rela-

tion to popular music, it may happen that the preoccupation to underline social and cultural processes implied in a given musical event/occurrence makes us forget that there is still music in it.

In my university we do musicology under the label of 'music technologies', which means that a particular accent is placed on the technical and business side of musical practices. In that sense, the influence of specific philosophical trends is not overwhelming, as the work of educators remains focused on the practical sides.

4. How has the period of globalisation and now, post-globalisation, affected the position of musicology in the systems of higher education, and even musicology as a branch of science? And what, in your opinion, are its 'expectations' from our pedagogical and scientific practice?

V. M.: I have already mentioned contemporaneity as the existential challenge. If globalization could be, in its 'positive' effects, seen as something that has led to firmer global connectedness, primarily via the Internet, I must say that for musicological (pedagogical) practice, especially in relatively financially unstable environments such as ours, really a 'new era' has begun. On the other hand, the paradoxes of globalization and post-globalization in respect of national musicological practices are directly inscribed in the 'expectations' you have mentioned. It is a real 'art' to find the right measure of the discourse through which you will remain yourself in meeting the 'expectations'. Yet, language is a 'strange' thing, musicology even 'stranger' so you can, if you like and want to, practice on a 'daily level' small experiments in subversion or fulfillment – preferably both – of the 'expectations'.

L. S.: Personally, I believe we live in an era of globalization, not in a 'post' or 'global' era. Also, the sciences and arts are valued according to their local/regional practices although the idea of an universal knowledge and universal values persists. Both practices grow important frictions, antinomies: the growth of DIY culture, self-promotion ranging from the social platforms to the streaming services, and seeming freedom of choice go hand in hand with the global market (such as cultural and academic tourism), the culture of a massive propaganda industry and practically a very limited freedom of choice (are there many choices for the young musicologist to get a job?).

Ethno/musicology is opened to different professional challenges, such as interdisciplinarity or applied sciences. However, each national context seems to dwell in its own stories, each segment of the music-research community cherishes its garden. And I believe that it is difficult to get a clear notion about how

to use the common potential of these fragmented, parallel worlds. Perhaps we may benefit from a system-theoretical analysis of our field.

I.P.: The traditional approach to university education is changing and the postmodernist demands for a 'competitive university', using concepts such as "skills", "competence", and "results", are conditioned by the neoliberal conversion of knowledge into a commodity.

In such conditions, teaching music history is meant to serve 'the university of the future' or 'professional musicians in a world of change'. Provided they already know enough about the future of the university and the musical profession so that they might define the necessary results – I can't resist thinking here of that famous line by Niels Bohr: "It's very difficult to predict, especially the future" – university professors of music history keep struggling to create efficient and pedagogically sustainable 'curricula'.

My first ten years of working as a teacher of music history, in adherence to the "Bologna" programmes implemented at the Faculty of Music in Belgrade (2006/2007–2016/2017), was marked by similar questions, even though I did not pursue issues in higher education and its future as much as the everyday reality of working with first- and second-year undergraduate students. And yet, whenever I had to write down the phrase "skills and competences", I felt a certain unease. If skills are all that takes to qualify an academic musician as competent, what is that saying about our approach to his or her abilities as an artist and human being? To creativity? My pedagogical work in the field of music history has been marked by an intense and still ongoing quest for the most suitable methods for understanding meaningful relations, applying lessons from music history, and teaching students how to speak, write, and think about music. "Knowing what" goes without saying, especially today, when information is 'one click away', but "knowing why" is something that requires systematicity, sensitivity, and constant fine tunings in the conditions of academia.

D. M.: Well, for instance, musicology has been in the frontline of developing and promoting post-colonialist discourses within the humanities, and that is certainly a great merit. However, more to the point, I find that different cultures/schools/institutions/countries have produced different approaches and established different practices, so it's difficult to say. As I said, my university has established its priorities within the 'practical' domain of music studies. If I literally cross the street and go to another university in the same city I will find a rather different approach.

5. How, in that time, have your personal musicological poetics reflected on your own pedagogical work, especially on your approach to teaching the main subject (the history of music, musicology)?

V. M.: There are no 'reflections' – there are as there were always, 'interactions'. As is usually expected from us to 'do both jobs', being teachers and scholars, it would be impossible, and certainly 'wrong' to separate the scholarly from the teaching job, and vice versa.

L. S.: I can say that my personal 'musicological poetics' is founded on a fairly ambivalent experience, almost always evident also in my teaching. My personal musical taste is that of a 'musical omnivore' with many periods of fascinations with different musical styles and phenomena. My musicological logic is, to the contrary, is always in-between three different levers of knowledge: the appearances of music have always two faces, one pertains to the 'producers' of certain phenomenon, the other may be perhaps best compared to the 'avatars' of that phenomenon as detected and interpreted by different epistemologies. Both faces actually constitute what J.-J. Nattiez has called the 'neutral', 'formal' appearance of a music phenomenon. And this is the reason why I feel necessary to point to music phenomena from both sides – in both fields of my teaching activities, the historically as well as systematically oriented classes (I teach modern, especially Slovenian music history, sociology of music and methods of music analysis). And this view also persuades me to think of an 'ethno/musicology' or compound music research rather than in terms of the current academic institutional divisions.

I. P.: That's a tough question. Sometimes, especially if you're in the heat of working on your book, it's not easy to resist the urge to infect your students with your obsession with the topic you're studying. But regardless of the complementarity between scholarly and pedagogical work, which I perceive, on a daily basis, as an exceptional privilege, and regardless of the precious gift I receive from my students – the opportunity to learn and mature together – I would argue that pedagogy demands a certain dose of brutal honesty whenever the looks in the eyes of the students you're talking to become disinterested. Then you need to come out of your scholarly and pedagogical 'comfort zone', in order to build an interactive relationship with your students, the kind of relationship that, in my experience so far, benefits them the most.

Also, there is another place where my work in musicology and teaching come together: I strive to develop in my students a meta-awareness of our discipline, as well as the teaching process and the process of learning. In that way I

try to stimulate every student's individual development as well as a deeper understanding of the phenomena or processes we're discussing.

D. M.: This is a rather complex question, because I am not sure how good an assessor of my own work I can be. The main change that I certainly can recognize and acknowledge is that in the last 10 years or so, I had to increasingly adapt to the institutional innovations that have been taking place in my university (as well as in all others), and that – I am afraid – had little to do with the impact of given intellectual and cultural trends, and much to do with the transformation of the concept itself of 'university' into a corporate business where students are 'customers' to whom we sell a 'product' called BA or MA degree. One very distinctive change in my work, in this respect, is that I have to make my courses easier and easier, knowing that by now even an assignment like reading 5 pages of a very easy article may be a challenge.

6. Thanks to international exchange programs you have taken part in the different activities of the Department of Musicology of the FoM. Based on that experience and work with students, how do you assess the profile of our musicology studies in comparison with the profile at your own, domicile department, and do you suggest changes of any kind to our concept of studies?

L. S.: I must say again how grateful I am to have been able, several times, to be a part of your activities! You have a great variety of excellent experts and students that come out with substantial knowledge about music (research), not only with the paper (which is not always the case with the Bologna system of education). As I see it, my best experiences are connected with the contacts with different profiles of expertise in music from your international conferences. Without mentioning any names, some musicologists fascinated me equally as some composers, ethnomusicologists, music theoreticians, aestheticians, music editors and music educators. I do find the wide palette of experts (even when they do not tend to cooperate on a daily basis) as a very powerful quality of your entire department as well as the Faculty of Music (Fakultet muzičke umetnosti). I am grateful especially for being able to get closer to this variety of expertise, it was a thought-provoking and invigorating experience.

D. M.: I have fond memories of my time in your faculty. I remember attentive students and very smart colleagues interested in smart topics. While being there, it was possible to set the tones of my teaching in a more theoretical ground, and that of course is more my 'natural element' than the teaching I get to do now. The general impression was that at your faculty it is still possible to treat musicology as 'intellectual material', so to speak.

7. How would you describe and qualify the effect of the Bologna reforms on the current scientific-pedagogical principles which the Department of Musicology at the Faculty of Music in Belgrade has applied, and in what segments of that reform do you believe it should persevere?

V. M.: It would be hard to describe and qualify the effect of the reforms since we are still in the process of its implementation. Namely, it was pretty hard to explain the specificities of arts' studies, as well as the study of the science of those 'arts', even in the 'old' system. It seems that with the 'rules' and 'key words' of the Bologna system that has become even more difficult. Our reality is such that we simply cannot, in many instances, meet the demands of the reform that, of course as every (legal-administrative) system, can hardly deal with 'small' and 'specific' cases. We, on the other hand, have a hard time dealing and accepting the marginal position we obviously have in the context of 'big' universities and 'hard' sciences. Adapt and survive – it is the only formula, for we hardly have any choice.

L. S.: I am not that well acquainted with the current situation, but perhaps my view might be useful for whatever you are planning to do. The general idea of the Bologna Process is great: to open-up the exchange of students and staff as well as to offer a flow of knowledge-sharing, vertically as well as horizontally. The Bologna Process offers a lot to the rare students that have a clear idea about what to choose, it is possible to specialize in certain domains. Yet, at the same time, it enables ignorance about the other subfields that are also important for the profession. It is founded ethically on freedom of choice, but the choice is debatable. It enables the free choice of knowledge, excluding it at the same time because of the limited possibilities of choosing. However, as with any other system, Bologna Process has its pros and cons, the pros are the knowledge-and-people flow, and the cons are the 'formal' limits of the flow and the creating of a competitive, not complementary environment.

I. P.: Actually, I already discussed that in my preceding answer.

D. M.: I am afraid I have been in your institution too short a time to be able to give a credible reply to this question. In general, my opinion of the Bologna process is that of a pretty controversial reform: I basically agree with the criticism that it was mostly an economic move to cut down costs, that did not really bring an improvement in quality. I can only say that my university seems to have embraced the process in its entirety, and this turned out not to be a very good idea (still, in my humble opinion). In this sense, my hope is that your institution has been more eager to develop, here and there, symbolic forms of intellectual resistance to the process.

8. *How do you see the future of musicology as a university discipline in your country and, generally speaking, the position of the musicological profession in the European/world artistic-scientific community?*

V. M.: As I pointed out in the beginning – I do not worry about the future of the discipline. As for the position of the profession it will, as was always the case, depend on the market (in all its shapes and guises).

L. S.: Generally, musicology as a discipline dealing with music has a great potential. Never before has music been such a big enterprise. However, never before has music experienced so many parallel worlds competing with each other: especially in some milieus, different musics are seen as entirely delimited, even mutually hostile cultures.

Anyway, the future depends simply on whether and to which extent the local communities and academia, in general, will find the wisdom to make out of music a sustainable, long-term benefit or what Max Weber has called *communitarization*.

I. P.: I don't know what kind of future awaits us, but I believe it will depend on our ability to work together, as allies or partners. (Inter)disciplinary sociability is not a threat to our scholarly positions, but one of the prerequisites for development in the future.

In my opinion, it is the only way to strengthen musicology's authority at a time that idolizes the quantification of scholarly results, counting points, impact factors, the visibility and invisibility of publications on the ISI or AHCI list, and the negative imperatives of globalization.

D. M.: I think that the future of musicology will go hand in hand with the future of music. The music industry has radically changed in the last couple of decades, with the digitalization of the market, the replacement of certain modes of consumption with others (e.g., the Spotify culture replacing radios), the progressive disappearance of certain practices/contexts (e.g. there are fewer and fewer CD shops), the democratization, for better and for worse, of music-making (everybody can both produce and disseminate music from home by now: that means a greater offer, but also more confusion and an overall decline of quality and quality standards)... Musicology will have to keep up with all these changes, contributing to create adequate professional profiles, otherwise it will become a beautiful, but altogether useless, souvenir from the past.

On the other hand, we are humanists, aren't we? We still dream of doing our job in order to make the world a better place. In that sense, I hope that a bit of this utopia remains, and that our work will still be that of educating the new generations to the beauty of music, of fighting the trivialization of taste, igno-

rance of interpretation, lack of motivation to really understand what we are listening to, etc. There is less and less 'space' to do such things in our daily teaching practices. We have to be especially good in sneaking them in, between one lecture and another, in order to make sure that we are not only creating music operators, but also music thinkers.