

THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF MUSIC¹

ALAN P. MERRIAM

Chapter I - The study of ethnomusicology

Ethnomusicology today is an area of study caught up in a fascination with itself. Although its roots can be traced back some eighty years, and its origin perhaps even earlier, it is only within the past ten or fifteen years that, under the impetus of younger scholars who had brought to it new concepts of theory, method, and application, it has taken a sudden forward surge. The result has been a new awareness of its obligations and an internal probing for a real understanding of what it is and does and the purposes toward which it is directed.

Ethnomusicology carries within itself the seeds of its own division, for it has always been compounded of two distinct parts, the musicological and the ethnological, and perhaps its major problem is the blending of the two in a unique fashion which emphasizes neither but takes into account both. This dual nature of the field is marked by its literature, for where one scholar writes technically upon the structure of music sound as a system in itself, another chooses to treat music as a functioning part of human culture and as an integral part of a wider whole.

The roots of ethnomusicology are usually traced back to the 1880's and 1890's when activity in the field began with studies conducted primarily in Germany and America and the two aspects of ethnomusicology appeared almost at once. On the one hand was a group of scholars who devoted much of their attention to the study of music sound and who tended to treat sound as an isolate, that is, as a system which operates according to its own internal laws. To this was added the search for the ultimate origins of music which arose partially from the theoretical thinking of the time, primarily in connection with the concept of classic

3

social evolution. As social evolutionary thinking changed gradually, and the concept of world wide diffusion began to emerge in the thinking of the British neolithic school, and later in the Austrian *Kulturhistorische Schule*, the search for ultimate origins continued, but added to it was an equally intense search for specific origins in geographically defined areas.

At approximately the same time, other scholars, influenced in considerable part by American anthropology, which tended to assume an aura of intense reaction against the evolutionary and diffusionist schools, began to study music in its ethnologic context. Here the emphasis was placed not so much upon the structural components of music sound as upon the part music plays in culture and its functions in the wider social and cultural organization of man.

It has been tentatively suggested by Nettl (1956:26-39) that it is possible to characterize German and American "schools" of ethnomusicology, but the designations do not seem quite apt. The distinction to be made is not so much one of geography as it is one of theory, method, approach, and emphasis, for many provocative studies were made by early German scholars in problems not at all concerned with music structure, while many American studies have been devoted to technical analysis of music sound.

While ethnomusicology has inevitably been affected by the two aspects of its own study, it has also received the impact of historic event. Ethnomusicology and anthropology both began to develop as disciplines at a time when man's knowledge of man was in general restricted to

¹ Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1964.

Western and, to some extent, Far Eastern cultures. Anthropology emerged, partly at least, in response to a felt need of Western scholars concerned with human society and behavior to broaden their knowledge by extending the range of data available to assemble comparative information which would give them facts about the world beyond the boundaries of the classic civilizations of Europe and Asia. To anthropology was left almost the entire study of so-called "primitive" men, and the anthropologist was forced to assume responsibility for an aspects of the cultures of these people - the technologic and economic, the social and political, the religious, the artistic, and the linguistic. Early ethnomusicologists, recognizing as well the need for broader comparative materials, assumed responsibility for studying the music of the hitherto unknown areas of the world, and thus an emphasis came to be placed upon the study of music in the non-Western world.

Partly, at least, because anthropology and ethnomusicology grew up at almost precisely the same time, each influenced the other, although the impact of the former upon the latter was the greater. Ethnomusicology tended to be shaped by the same theoretical currents which shaped

4

anthropology, and indeed there is evidence to indicate that Erich M. Von Hornbostel, widely regarded as the outstanding historic figure in the field, considered the two disciplines to be in the closest sort of relationship (1905); other early scholars held the same view.

In view of the dual nature of the content of ethnomusicology, it is not surprising to find that definitions of the field, as well as more general discussions of its proper boundaries, have differed widely and have tended to take polar extremes, depending upon the emphasis desired by the individual scholar.

Early in its history, ethnomusicology, or comparative musicology, or exotic music as it was then called, was most often defined in terms which stressed both the descriptive character of the study and the geographic areas to be covered. Thus Benjamin Gilman, in 1909, put forward the idea that the study of "exotic music properly comprised primitive and Oriental forms (1909), while V. Bingham added to this the music of Dalmatian peasants (1914). His general point of view has carried forward into contemporary definitions as well, where geographic areas are stressed rather than the kinds of studies to be made. Marius J. C. Hill says that the "primary aim [of ethnomusicology comparative study of all the characteristics, normal or otherwise, of non-European [music]" (1957:1); and he defines ethnomusicology as "the science that deals with the music of peoples outside of Western civilization" (1956:1).

The difficulty with this kind of definition is that it tends to treat ethnomusicology not as a process of study, but rather as a discipline which has importance only because of the implied uniqueness of the area it studies. The emphasis placed upon the area rather than upon the process. Why, and if this be the aim of ethnomusicology when it is indeed difficult to see how its contribution differs either from musicology, in the sense that its techniques are implied to be identical, or ethnology, in that a similar area of the world is stressed.

Other definitions of ethnomusicology have tended to broaden its scope and to approach, at least, a processual rather than a static geographic distinctiveness. Irving Rhodes, for example, took a step in this direction, albeit a tentative one, when he added to the music of "the Near East, the Far East, Indonesia, Africa, North American Indians and European folk music," the study of "popular music and dance" (1956:3-4). Later, Kolinski objected to the definition of ethnomusicology as "the science of non-European music" and noted that "it is not so much the difference in the geographical areas under analysis as the difference in the general approach which distinguishes ethnomusicology from ordinary musicology" (1957:1-2).

Jaap Kunst added a further dimension, although qualifying the types of music to be studied, when he wrote:

The study-object of ethnomusicology, or, as it originally was called: comparative musicology, is the traditional music and musical instruments of all cultural strata of mankind, from the so-called primitive peoples to the civilized nations. Our science, therefore, investigates all tribal and folk music and every kind of non-Western art music. Besides, it studies as well the sociological aspects of music, as the phenomena of musical acculturation, i.e. the hybridizing influence of alien musical elements. Western art- and popular (entertainment-) music do not belong to its field. (1959:1)

Mantle Hood took his definition from that proposed by the American Musicological Society, but inserted the prefix "ethno" in suggesting that [Ethno] musicology is a field of knowledge, having as its object the investigation of the art of music as a physical, psychological, aesthetic, and cultural phenomenon. The [ethno] musicologist is a research scholar, and he aims primarily at knowledge about music" (1957 :2). Finally, Gilbert S-ha~indicated that 'the present emphasis ...is on the musical study of~ontemporary man, to whatever society he may belong, whether primitive or complex, Eastern or Western" (1958:7).

To these various definitions, I have elsewhere added my own, stating that for me ~hnomu~s to be defined as 'the study of music in ~culture" (Merriam, 1960)" ~t it is important that this definition be thoroughly explained if it is to be properly understood. Implicit in it is the assumption that ethnomusicology is made up both of the musicological and the ethnological, and that music sound is the result of human b~r~al processes that are shaped by the values, attitudes, and beliefs of the people who comprise a particular culture. Music sound cannot be produced except~y people for other pe~lel and although we can separate the two aspects conceptually, one is not really complete without the other. Human behavior produces music, but the process is one of continuity; the behavior itself is shaped to produce music sound, and thus the study of one flows into the other.

The distinction between musicology and ethnomusicology has most often been made in terms of what the former encompasses, though what the latter encompasses is not often made explicit. Gilbert Chase suggests that the "line" between the two be drawn on this basis: 'Might not these two allied and complementary disciplines divide the universe of music - between them, the one taking the past as its domain, the other the present?" (1958:7) Charles Seeger makes a suggestion along the same lines. while arguing that it is only a divisive one and not to be tolerated: 'But

prerequisite ...is more general recognition of the fact that continuation of the custom of regarding musicology and ethnomusicology as two separate disciplines, pursued by two distinct types of students with two widely different-even mutually antipathetic-aims is no longer to be tolerated as worthy of Occidental scholarship" (1961b:80)

While in theory Seeger's aim is both admirable and proper, the fact remains that scholarship in the two fields is divided in intent and area of concentration; even more to the point, ethnomusicology itself has seldom come to grips with its own problem of where its interests lie. Whereas the dual nature of the discipline can be, and unfortunately often is, a divisive factor, it is also indubitably a strength, and I venture to suggest that it is perhaps the major strength of ethnomusicology. Music is a product of man and has structure, but its structure cannot have an existence of its own divorced from the behavior which produces it as it is, and

how and why the concepts which underlie that behavior are ordered in such a way as to produce the particularly desired form of organized sound.

Ethnomusicology, then, makes its unique contribution in welding, together aspects of the social sciences and aspects of the humanities in such a way that each complements the other and leads to a fuller understanding of both. Neither should be considered as an end in itself; the two must be joined into a wider understanding.

All this is implicit in the definition of ethnomusicology as the study of music in culture. There is no denial of the basic aim, which is to understand music; but neither is there an acceptance of a point of view which has long taken ascendancy in ethnomusicology, that the ultimate aim of our discipline is the understanding of music sound alone. As in any other field of study, the first of the ethnomusicologist's tasks is the planning and preparation of the project at hand. The first of these lies in the collection of data, and in the case of ethnomusicology this has most often meant work in the field outside Europe and America, though there have been exceptions to this general rule. The collection of field data involves the complex and multiple problems of the relation of theory to method, research design, methodology, and technique, as well as other problems existing in any discipline which follow patterns of research more rigorous than intuitive.

Second, once the data have been collected, the ethnomusicologist subjects them to analysis. The first is the collation of field notes and ethnographic materials into a coherent body of knowledge about music practice, behavior, and concepts in the society being studied, as these are relevant to the hypotheses and design of the research

7

problem. The second is the technical laboratory analysis of the sound materials collected, and this requires special techniques and sometimes special equipment for the transcription and structural analysis of music.

Third the data analyzed and the results obtained are applied to problems, specifically in ethnomusicology and more broadly in the social sciences and the humanities. In this overall procedure, ethnomusicology does not differ significantly from other disciplines. Rather, it is in the use of its special techniques, and perhaps particularly in the necessity for welding together two kinds of data—the anthropological and the musicological—that ethnomusicology is unique. Since a discipline can be defined, and since it can also be described in terms of what its practitioners do, then at least by implication it is shown to have specific aims and purposes. This question has not been widely discussed in the ethnomusicological literature, though it can be discerned.

The first of these is probably the most widespread in the discipline; and it is one which is common in anthropology as well. This is the point of view, popularized in the 1930s, that the music of other peoples of the world is much abused and maligned; that such music is, in fact, fine and worthy both of study and appreciation; that most Westerners do not give it its due; and that therefore it is up to the ethnomusicologist to protect it from the scorn of others and to explain and champion it wherever possible. In a sense this is the outcome of the historical fact that ethnomusicology, like anthropology, takes the world as its field of study and reacts against more specialized disciplines which concentrate attention only upon phenomena of the West. This point of view has appeared frequently in ethnomusicology either through direct statement or by implication. Jaap Kunst, for example, reacts with some intensity to the Western view that the music of other peoples is "nothing more than either expressions of inferior, more primitive civilizations, or as a kind of musical perversion" (1959:1).

This kind of argument implies that the purpose of ethnomusicology is to disabuse

ethnocentrism of the notion that the music of other peoples is inferior. One unworthy of study and appreciation, and this must indeed be considered one of the aims of the discipline, for ethnocentrism must be attacked wherever it is found. Yet this is but one of several purposes which can be subsumed under a broader heading.

A second approach to the problem of purpose in ethnomusicology is found in the frequently expressed fear that the music of the "folk" is fast disappearing and that it must be recorded and studied before it is gone. This point of view was taken as early as 1905 by Hombostel, and perhaps

8

earlier by others; it has been expressed over and over again in the literature. Hugh Tracey, for example, in his first real editorial in the African Music Society Newsletter, commented on the problems of working against time in studying the receding natural art forms of [Africa's] people," a theme which he has since consistently stressed (1949:2). Many others have taken this approach. Some have stated specifically that it is the duty of ethnomusicology to preserve materials; thus in writing about tribal, folk, and Oriental music, Curt Sachs comments:

Such music cannot be bought in stores, but comes from faithful tradition or from personal contributions of tribesmen. It is never soulless or thoughtless, never passive, but always vital, or an active function in life, it is always dignified. This is more than we can say of music in the West.

As an indispensable and precious part of culture, it commands respect. And respect implies the duty to help in preserving it. (1962:3)

While this aim of ethnomusicology is an acceptable one, the fears for the destruction of the music of the "folk" often tend to be overemphasized, and there is implied a failure to consider the inevitability of change. It has been held in ethnomusicology that music is among the most tenacious elements of culture, but those who espouse this view frequently turn in the next breath to overemphatic laments for the passing scene. Music does seem to be tenacious, though varying social and cultural situations clearly influence the degree to which this is possible. Among the Flathead Indians, whose contact with the West first took place over a century and a half ago, the traditional music system still flourishes; indeed, Western and Flathead styles have not merged but rather stand as two separate systems useful in different contexts. An even more striking example can be drawn from the Negro in the New World; in Brazil, where the first African slaves were imported about 1525, African music continues in strength and, indeed, does so in urban areas where we would expect the greatest change to take place.

So far as change as a constant factor in human experience is concerned, there is little to add to the statement itself. No matter what the efforts to retard or impede it, change does occur. This is not, of course, intended as a brief for neglecting the recording and study of any music, for what is done today will assume greater importance with the added perspective of time. But energy which is poured into lament for the inevitability of change is energy wasted. It is important that we record as widely and as swiftly as possible, but it is even more important that we study the very

9

processes of change that are being decried. The preservation of contemporary music is undeniably important, but given the inevitability of change, it cannot be the only aim of ethnomusicology.

A third viewpoint of the purpose of ethnomusicology considers music as a means of communication which can be used to further world understanding. In support of this view, Mantle Hood has written:

In the latter half of the Twentieth Century it may well be that the very existence of man depends on the accuracy of his communications. Communication among people is a two-way street: speaking and listening, informing and being informed, constructively evaluating and welcoming constructive criticism. Communication is accurate to the extent that it is founded on a sure knowledge of the man with whom we would hold intercourse. (1961:n.p.)

Hood emphasizes the point that music is a neglected means of communication which can be used more widely for such purposes than has been the case in the past.

There is a sharp distinction to be made between music as a communicative device, which is Hood's view, and as a so-called "universal language" which is an approach ethnomusicologists have consistently rejected. As early as 1941, Seeger wrote:

We must, of course, be careful to avoid the fallacy that music is a "universal language." There are many music-communities in the world, though not, probably, as many as there are speech communities. Many of them are mutually unintelligible. (1941: 122)

Five years later, Herzog took a similar view:

We indulge in a surprising number of beliefs that are fittingly called popular myths. One of them is the notion that music is a "universal language." ...[But] our music ...consists of a number of dialects, some of them as mutually unintelligible as are found in language. (1946:11)

A sharp difference thus exists between music as communication and music as a "universal language." But the question remains as to what we mean by "communication." ~ similarly. it can be said that music communication is a communication. but if this is true, it is equally true that there is little understanding of how this communication is carried on. The most obvious possibility is that communication is effectuated through the investiture of music with symbolic meanings which are tacitly agreed upon by the members of the community. There is

also verbal communication about music which seems to be most characteristic of complex societies in which a self-conscious theory of music has developed. But little is known of these processes, and without such knowledge it is difficult to talk intelligently about music as communication.

On the cross-cultural level, it may be possible to say that the very fact that people make music may communicate certain limited things to members of markedly different music communities, but certainly little is known about such problems. More specifically, Meyer argues that all musics have certain things in common, though it is not clear whether he assumes that this makes music intelligible cross-culturally. He notes:

Yet, while recognizing the diversity of musical languages, we must also admit that these languages have important characteristics in common. The most important of these, and the one to which least attention has been paid, is the syntactical nature of different musical styles. The organization of sound terms into a system of probability relationships, the limitations imposed upon the combining of sounds, and so forth, are all common characteristics of musical language...

But different musical languages may also have certain sounds in common. Certain musical relationships appear to be well-nigh universal. In almost all cultures, for example,

the octave and the fifth or fourth are treated as stable, focal tones toward which other terms of the system tend to move. (1956:62-3)

It seems doubtful that such "universal" aspects of music contribute to cross-cultural communication through music, and in any case what evidence is available tends to stress the barriers rather than the communicability of diverse styles. Robert Morey (1940) , for example, working with the problem of what he defined as "upset" in emotions, devised an experiment ". ..to learn the reactions of native West Africans to musical expressions of Western emotions ..." Selecting pieces from Schubert, Davies, Handel, and Wagner which expressed fear, reverence, rage, and love respectively, as well as a control selection from Beethoven, chosen because it did not express a generally acknowledged emotion, Morey recorded the emotional responses of "students and teachers in the Holy Cross Mission School at Bolahun in the hinterland of Liberia." His conclusions are as follows:

Western music is not recognized by the Loma of Liberia as expressing emotion ...(p. 342)

Musical expressions of Western emotions do not elicit in Liberian

11

boys any patterns of responses common to all or most of the groups responding.

Forty-three answers were given by 11 subjects to four different pieces of music which express ...typical western-civilization emotions. (p. 343)

Typical western musical expressions of emotions were not judged either as (a) signs of upset, or (b) as being produced by upseteliciting situations by members of a society who had never previously perceived similar symptoms of western emotions.

Music, said to express emotion to an expert in music and emotion in western society, does not express emotion to auditors whose musical and social training is different from that of the composer of the music. (p. 354)

Although it is not made clear in the text, it seems probable that Morey's subjects were at least cognizant of Western attitudes and values since they were chosen from a mission school; despite this, the music did not convey Western emotions. When Morey presented his materials to twenty Zealua Loma villagers whose contact with the West was virtually nonexistent, he reports that they were restless; half of them left, especially women, during the music" (p. 338).

My own experience in introducing Western music to peoples in Africa has been similar, and I would suggest that the problem of cross-cultural music communication depends both upon understanding and, more important, receptivity to understanding. In another context, Hood has written in regard to the former point:

Today, as never before, governmental agencies of the nations of the world are recognizing the fact that international understanding and goodwill is possible only when the cultural expressions of the peoples involved are comprehended.. To this end the ethnomusicologist must set for himself exacting standards worthy of his responsibility. (1957:8)

This problem of understanding has not always been well understood. Carleton Sprague Smith, for example, in 1941 called for intercultural understanding through music, but it is significant that he spoke specifically about intercultural understanding between America and Europe and between North and South America, and that he limited his discussion to popular and art music (1941) .But in these musics, Europe, South and North America form what is essentially a single music commu-

nity within which it is to be expected that understanding would be most easily achieved.

It is evident that another factor operates in this connection, i.e., the factor of receptivity to understanding. Whereas it is to be expected that members of an academic community in the West will be receptive, at least to a certain point, to listening to and searching for the values in the music of another culture, it is not so certain that the introduction of Chinese opera into a hillbilly bar in Kentucky will meet with enthusiastic acceptance. What is important here is the desire on the part of the potential receptors to receive the material presented, and this is a factor which seems to have been overlooked in discussion of intercultural music understanding.

The problem of understanding can be taken to a further level of analysis, however, in that it is possible that music may be useful as a means of understanding other things about other cultures. In music, as in the other arts, basic attitudes, sanctions, and values are often stripped to their essentials; music is also symbolic in some ways, and it reflects the organization of society. In this sense, music is a means of understanding peoples and behavior and as such is a valuable tool in the analysis of culture and society.

The study of music as a means of communication, then, is far more complex than it might appear, for we do not know what precisely music communicates, or how it communicates it. Communication also involves both understanding and receptivity to understanding. To view music as a communicative device is clearly one of the purposes of ethnomusicology, though it has been little investigated.

The literature of the discipline reveals a fourth approach to the question of the aims of ethnomusicology in that scholars have sometimes tended to throw all possible reasons into a common pot, leading to an approach in which catholicity is substituted for direction. Nettl, for example, speaking not specifically of ethnomusicology but rather of what he calls "primitive music," follows this pattern. Such music, he says, "is a new, rich source of experience for Western musicians" and composers. It "widens and enriches the experience of the listener as well as the composer." "Used as an educational medium, primitive music tends to make a student more tolerant of diverse styles and idioms." "The music historian may use it in his efforts to determine the origin of music." "A knowledge of primitive musical styles is ...helpful to the psychologist of music." "The anthropologist and the historian of culture may find through examination of primitive music a substantiation of their theories; the folklorist may see its relationship to the music of rural European

populations and be able to trace the latter to its origins; the historian of musical instruments often finds prototypes of European forms in some of the simpler ones in primitive cultures. And the linguist uncovers ethnolinguistic materials" (1956:2-3).

While each of these statements expresses one of the aims of ethnomusicology, together they do not seem to form a coherent conclusion. Nettl adds: "In summary, then, to all people interested in music and to all interested in primitive culture, the study of this music offers new fields for exploration and a wider range for reflection" (p. 3). This is, of course, true and is a broad aim of ethnomusicology; we search for broader horizons, but we search for more than this.

Perhaps the aims of ethnomusicology can be expressed in terms of the three responsibilities which the ethnomusicologist carries to his studies. The first of these is technical; it is part of the "internal" study of the discipline. What the student wants to know is what music is, how it is constructed, what its structure is. The ethnomusicologist must be able to notate music, analyze it in terms of its component parts, and understand how these parts fit together to

form a coherent and cohesive entity. This kind of study is essentially descriptive; it is, as well, highly technical and thus outside the competence of those not trained in music.

Any technical study brings with it difficulties of understanding and comprehension on the part of those who do not possess the requisite technical competence. This problem has plagued ethnomusicology from the start, for the "outsider" tends to see it only in this single light and to view its subject matter as so esoteric and technical in nature that it cannot be understood by the non-specialist. The result is that non-specialists often dismiss ethnomusicology as technical, impossible, and of no use to them because the materials can be handled only by the specialist.

The technical side of ethnomusicology, however, represents but one of the aims and responsibilities of the discipline. Equally important, and coming to be more and more understood, is the view that music involves not only sound but the human behavior which is a prerequisite for producing sound. Music cannot exist on a level outside the control and behavior of people, and several kinds of behavior are involved. One of these is physical behavior represented by bodily attitudes and postures as well as the use of specific muscles in placing the fingers on the keyboard of an instrument or tensing the vocal cords and the muscles of the diaphragm in singing. Conceptual behavior, ideation, or cultural behavior involves the concepts about music which must be translated into physical behavior in order to produce sound. Here lies the entire process of determination of the system of musts and shoulds of music, as well as the system of normative and existential concepts. Social behavior must also be con

14

sidered. Some individuals behave in certain ways because they are musicians and because the society stereotypes musicianly behavior. Those who are not musicians are influenced in certain ways because music has emotional and even physical impact, and the behavior at one musical event differs from that at another musical event because of the conventions of the cultural system. Finally, there is the learning behavior which goes into becoming a musician, into being an intelligent listener, and into being someone who participates in musical events though not as a professional.

All these considerations are part of the study of ethnomusicology, and almost any one of them can be studied profitably by the trained social scientist without requiring an intimate knowledge of the technical aspects of music structure. Indeed, the concept of ethnomusicology as totally inaccessible to the non-music specialist, and the concomitant disregard for the behavioral problems which must inevitably be a part of music study, have been damaging to the discipline as a whole.

The third responsibility for the ethnomusicologist is one which appeared strongly in the early history of the discipline, fell somewhat into neglect, and has only recently re-emerged; i.e., the responsibility to indicate the relationships between the study of ethnomusicology and studies in the humanities and social sciences in general. This is perhaps especially important because of the prevailing view that ethnomusicology is only a highly technical discipline, but the responsibility is still wider because knowledge, unless it is broadened and shared, has only restricted usefulness. Ethnomusicology has always, tentatively at least, reached out into other fields as a source of stimulation both to itself and to its sister disciplines, and there are many ways in which it is of value in solutions to other kinds of problems. Technical studies can tell us much about culture history. The functions and uses of music are as important as those of any other aspect of culture for understanding the workings of society. Music is interrelated with the rest of culture; it can and does shape, strengthen, and channel social, political, economic, linguistic, religious, and other kinds of behavior. Song texts reveal many things about a society, and music is extremely useful as a means of analysis of structural principles. The ethnomusicologist must inevitably concern himself with problems of

symbolism in music, questions of the interrelationships of the arts, and all the difficulties of understanding what an aesthetic is and how it is structured. In short, the problems of ethnomusicology are neither exclusively technical nor exclusively behavioral. Nor is ethnomusicology an isolated discipline concerned only with esoterica which cannot be understood by any save those who study it. Rather, it seeks to combine two kinds of study and to contribute the results of its research to the

15

solution of a broad spectrum of problems both in the humanities and in the social sciences.

In last analysis, the aims and purposes of ethnomusicology do not differ markedly from those of other disciplines. Music is, after all, a universal human phenomenon and thus in the Western philosophy of knowledge, deserving of study in its own right (Clough I 960) .The ultimate interest of man is man himself, and music is part of what he does and part of what he studies about himself. But equally important is the fact that music is also human behavior, and the ethnomusicologist shares both with the social sciences and the humanitics the search for an understanding of why men behave as they do.