

VOL XXXI No 2

DEFINITIONS OF "COMPARATIVE MUSICOLOGY"
AND "ETHNOMUSICOLOGY":
AN HISTORICAL-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE¹

Alan P. Merriam

Readers of this, and other, journals hardly need be reminded of my persistent interest over the years in definitions of what ethnomusicology is and what it ought to be (e.g., Merriam 1960; 1969; 1975). It is now more than 25 years since, according to common belief, Jaap Kunst first put "ethno-musicology" into print (Kunst 1950), and we thus ought to be able now to look back with some objectivity at what has since happened to that word, and what happened to its predecessor—"comparative musicology"—before it. In other words, the points are now historic, though the end result is far from settled, and it is in this spirit that I wish to treat the materials to be discussed herein. While I have not gone through the literature with a fine-toothed comb in an attempt to find *all* definitions, I have located a substantial number of them, enough, I trust, to indicate fairly the overall trends and changes. Neither have I gone outside the United States for the most part, though some such definitions are included where they seemed especially pertinent. My major purpose, then, is to discuss what happened over time to these two terms in the United States, and what consequences occurred because of the changes that took place.

Problems of definition can, of course, be extremely sticky. When we define a concept, are we attempting to deal with what it is or with what it ought to be? The former, of course, is based upon the premise that a definition—in this case of ethnomusicology—can be based upon what it is that ethnomusicologists do; in other words, it is essentially descriptive and is drawn from observation of normative activity. The difficulty with this approach is that it is essentially uninformative, both because it is only descriptive, and because it is circular. That is, in order to know what ethnomusicology is, we must be able to identify the ethnomusicologist, but the latter is only definable in terms of the former.

On the other hand, if we are concerned with a definition which tells us what ethnomusicology ought to be, we enter into the debatable realm of advocacy. My own bias, however, is toward the latter type of definition since it attempts to set the standard for the field.

Another difficulty centers on the problem of whether the item to be defined is, in fact, definable. The answer of the strict positivist, of course, is

that it is, and that any phenomenon is susceptible of definition "by means of symbolic logic in empirical terms" (Ladd 1973:418). The answer of the Ordinary Language philosopher is different, however, in that his approach "gives full recognition to the fact that there are some valid, rational concepts that are not strictly definable in scientific terms . . .," these being "inexact, fuzzy concepts that are quite different from scientific concepts. . . ." Thus, for example:

Aesthetic and ethical concepts are distinct from purely descriptive, empirical concepts in that they a) are open-textured, b) are multi-functional, c) involve criteria, d) are essentially contestable, and e) employ persuasive definitions. (*loc. cit.*)

While examination of some definitions of ethnomusicology might well persuade the reader that they meet these criteria, and that, indeed, the term is not definable, I do not believe this to be true. By the very nature of the word itself, ethnomusicology is linked to science: "logy" as a root is a combining form which names sciences or bodies of knowledge. If our definitions frequently seem primarily persuasive, it is not the fault of the word form, but that of the definers!

We can also, in definition, find ourselves struggling with the very words we use. Thus, for example, Hood, in the Introduction to *The Ethnomusicologist*, writes that "One point is clear: The *subject* of study in the field of ethnomusicology is music" (1971:3). While surely almost all of us would agree that this is so, we have only to stop to wonder how to define "music" to discover ourselves in difficulty again. That is, if ethnomusicology is cross-cultural in its approach, which it certainly is, the problem of identifying the phenomenon "music" becomes crucial. Ethnomusicologists need hardly be told that people in some societies simply have no concept "music," and that others who do, view it in a sharply different light from what is implied in Hood's statement. The point here is not that the statement is incorrect, in the conventional sense of the word, but rather, that it is not cross-cultural, and that the difficulties inherent in making it cross-cultural are almost overwhelming in their magnitude. Perhaps in this case, we *are* dealing with a concept which does not lend itself to definition in the scientific sense, but this, in turn, leads us still further afield and is not of central concern to the present discussion.

Despite these, and other, problems, ethnomusicologists have defined their field of study over and over again, and rightly so, since definition is of primary importance, and for a number of reasons. In the first place, because we are professionals in a field of study, we wish to understand all we can about ethnomusicology; this is at the root both of intellectual curiosity and professional responsibility. Second, the most cursory examination of the content of our publications reveals an extraordinarily mixed bag of interests,

and this becomes a puzzle in itself, for what kind of field is it that can encompass such variety, and how can it possibly be defined?

More important are two further reasons for seeking definition of the field. The first is that theory, method, and data are inextricably intertwined: one simply does not exist without the others, and all three constantly interact in any intellectual enterprise. Without theory we can hardly have significant method, not only in the sense that no method *can* be theory-free, but also that no method *should* be theory-free. And without method, no significant gathering of data can occur, for the results will inevitably be random. Finally, both in inductive and deductive procedures, theory is based upon data. The point is not only that the three are interrelated, but that if one cannot define his field of study, he can have no theory in respect to it, for he is dealing with it as an amorphous area of concern which he can only treat in the most general terms.

Thus definition is of vital concern because we can face no other questions until this one has been faced; and once it has been faced, then we arrive at the absolutely necessary position of having to face all questions. In short, all disciplines must question all assumptions; all assumptions derive in one way or another from what its practitioners claim their field, or discipline, to be. Definition is crucial because it forces us to face the bases of our intellectual activities; lacking such honest confrontation, we can have little hope of changing ethnomusicology from the status of a variegated field of study to that of a real discipline. Such status in no way implies uniformity of view, study, or approach, but it does imply commonality of purposes and goals.

I

The earliest definition of "comparative musicology" *per se* was that proposed by Guido Adler in 1885 (see Appendix for definitional quotations), and his emphasis was laid upon "folksongs . . . of the various people of the earth," both for "ethnographical" and classificatory purposes. Hornbostel seems never to have put forward a definition as such, and perhaps the earlier days of the field were less marked by definitional concerns than the later, as, for example, those of Lachmann in 1935, and Roberts a year later. However, the summary definition of comparative musicology in the United States was made by Glen Haydon in 1941 in his *Introduction to Musicology*. Thus:

Non-European musical systems and folk music constitute the chief subjects of study; the songs of birds and phylogenetic-ontogenetic parallels are subordinate topics. (p. 218)

If *comparative musicology* means the study of extra-European musical systems, it is natural that the study of Chinese, Indian, Arabian, and other musical systems should fall to the lot of comparative musicology. (p. 235)

Comparative musicology has its characteristic subject matter chiefly in extra-European and folk music... (p. 237)

Most, if not all, of the music studied in comparative musicology is transmitted by oral tradition... (p. 219)

These statements carry two important messages, the first of which is advanced more forcefully than the second. They are that comparative musicology is the study of "extra-European and folk music," and that comparative musicology studies music which is "transmitted by oral tradition." Both themes had been foreshadowed, of course, and both were repeated over and over by subsequent authors, but it was the "non-European" aspect of the definition that received the greatest play; it is echoed by Sachs (1943), Apel (1946), Herzog (1946), Koole (1955: "exotic" is the term used), Bukofzer (1956), Nettl (1956), Rhodes (1956), Schaeffner (1956: but note the disclaimer as to whether comparative musicology should study these musics), Schneider (1957), Kunst (1959), and Seeger (1961), among many others.

By 1961, the use of "comparative musicology" as a label had disappeared except in historic references; while it reappeared later (Kolinski 1967), it was no longer applied to the field in general but rather, to a portion of it. Indeed, both Kunst and Seeger, in the citations immediately above, were already using the term historically, and from Nettl, in 1956, forward, the two terms "comparative musicology," and "ethnomusicology" were used together as synonyms. This period of overlap occurred roughly during the latter half of the decade of the 1950's.

Three major points can be made concerning these definitions. First, they are virtually identical and unanimous in what they stress. Second, they define comparative musicology unanimously in terms of certain musics to be studied, namely, either "non-Western" (or an equivalent term such as "exotic"), or "orally transmitted" musics. Third, they do not deal with what is meant by "comparative method" or what the aim of comparison is; indeed, they seldom stress anything comparative at all.

It was the question of the "comparative" in comparative musicology, however, which led ultimately to the abandonment of the term. While it has sometimes been suggested that the question of comparativism arose at the same time as, and as a consequence of, the introduction of the new term, "ethnomusicology," the evidence does not support the case. Two main arguments have been advanced for the inadequacy of the term.

The first can be expressed roughly in the statement: "Because we don't compare any more than anyone else does," and this kind of objection appeared almost as soon as the term itself (Hornbostel 1905). Haydon again provides us with a clear statement:

The term [comparative musicology] is not entirely satisfactory, however, for the comparative method is frequently used in the other fields of musicology, and studies in this field are often not directly comparative. (p. 216)

This point of view was expressed over and over again in essentially the same form, by, for example, Sachs (1943:29), Herzog (1946:11), Kunst (1950:7), Koole (1955:228), Rhodes (1956:459), List (1962:20), and others. The unanimity of the argument is notable in the following passage by Sachs, written twenty years after Haydon's statement:

But today 'comparative musicology' has lost its usefulness. For at the bottom every branch of knowledge is comparative; all our descriptions, in the humanities no less than in the sciences, state similarities and divergences. ... Walter Wiora is certainly right when he emphasizes that comparison can denote only a method, not a branch of learning. (1961:15)

The second objection came at a much later time, and was probably an outgrowth of factors other than those which motivated the scholars noted above. This is the view that comparison itself is not central to ethnomusicology's concern, and it has been expressed in two ways. The first is that comparison in ethnomusicology has been undertaken prematurely, and this has been emphasized by Hood, for example, who wrote in 1963:

...it seems a bit foolish in retrospect that the pioneers of our field became engrossed in the comparison of different musics before any real understanding of the musics being compared had been achieved. (p. 233).

Hood later expressed the point of view somewhat more strongly when he wrote in 1969:

An early concern with comparative method, before the subjects under comparison could be understood, led to some imaginative theories but provided very little accurate information. ... A vast number of musical cultures... are yet to be studied systematically... before comparative methods can 'give musicology a truly world-wide perspective.' (p. 299)

The second anti-comparative view was expressed earlier in time; it hinges on the idea that since meanings may differ from one culture to another, comparison of musics may be comparison of unlike things. One of the early statements of this objection is Meyer's opinion written in 1960.

Appearances are often deceptive. For instance, two cultures may appear to employ the same scale structure, but this structure might be interpreted differently by the members of each culture. Conversely, the music of two cultures may employ very different materials, but the underlying mechanism governing the organization of these materials might be the same for both. (pp. 49-50)

John Blacking was expressing the same point of view when he wrote:

Statistical analyses of intervals, ... are all very well, provided that we know that the same intervals have the same meanings in all the cultures whose music we are comparing. If this is not certain, we may be comparing incomparable phenomena. In other words, if we accept the view that patterns of music sound in any culture are the product of concepts and behaviours peculiar to that culture, we cannot compare them with similar

patterns in another culture unless we know that the latter are derived from similar concepts and behaviour. Conversely, statistical analyses may show that the music of 2 cultures is very different, but an analysis of the cultural 'origins' of the sound patterns may reveal that they have essentially the same meaning, which has been translated into the different 'languages' of the 2 cultures. (1966:218)

Other objections to comparison have been made, but they are not central to the present discussion. What is important is that the reaction against the term, "comparative musicology," was first expressed, in print, at least, in terms of the suppositions that its practitioners did not compare any more than anyone else, and that comparison was both premature and dangerous.

II

These objections bracket in time one of the most significant periods of development in the history of our field of study. This period occurred in the first half of the decade of the 1950's, and it was marked by the appearance for the first time in the United States of a small group of specially trained students who were disciples of older men in the field: I am thinking here of such persons as Mantle Hood, David McAllester, Bruno Nettl, myself, and others. It was also marked by the organization of a successor to the American Society for Comparative Musicology which had existed briefly in the 1930's. This effort was begun in 1953, and the formal organization of the Society for Ethnomusicology took place in 1955. And finally, the increase in activity in the field was marked by the introduction of the new term, "ethnomusicology."

It is unanimously agreed, so far as I know, that the first use of the term in print occurred in Jaap Kunst's little booklet, *Musicologica* (1950); it is interesting to note that Kunst was reacting against "comparative musicology" on precisely the grounds cited previously herein. He wrote: "The name of our science is, in fact, not quite characteristic; it does not 'compare' any more than any other science. A better name, therefore, is that appearing on the title page of this book: *ethno-musicology*" (p. 7). I do not know whether, in fact, this was the first printed appearance of the word, and it is quite possible that an industrious search would reveal an earlier citation, for certainly the word was in currency before 1950. Regardless of this possibility, the Kunst usage is the significant emotional one for students of the field, and will quite possibly always remain so.

Two important points must be made concerning the introduction of this new term. The first is that it was accepted virtually immediately, and undoubtedly the establishment of the Society for Ethnomusicology (without the hyphen) had a very substantial impact upon the new public convention.

By the second half of the decade of the 1950's the two terms were being used simultaneously as synonyms, and by the end of the same decade, "comparative musicology" had been reduced almost exclusively to the status of an historic term which only referred to something in the past. Thus within five years a significant change had occurred, and within ten, the earlier term had been almost completely replaced as a working symbol.

The second point is that the very speed of acceptance must have indicated a significant desire for change, and the assumption is strengthened when we recall that the first objections to the prior term had been raised at least as early as 1905! This in itself has certain implications:

- 1) something must have been lacking in the old term, i.e., it did not adequately express what the practitioners of comparative musicology felt they were doing, or ought to be doing;
- 2) something fresh must have been visualized in the new term, which better expressed the sense of the field and the ideas or ideals of its practitioners;
- 3) something must have changed in the minds of the persons involved in the field that required a change in its appellation.

The fact that these assumptions did not, for the most part, turn out to be true, does not affect them as reasonable hypotheses. A change of name of an entire field of study, coupled with its eager and virtually immediate acceptance, is not an event to be dismissed lightly.

A considerable amount of similarity was noted in the definitions of "comparative musicology"—in fact, they tended to be as alike as peas in a pod. The definitions of "ethnomusicology," however, do not follow quite the same pattern. Two major types can be distinguished in the twenty-odd years after Kunst's publication, of which the first can be subdivided into three related, but slightly different, approaches.

The first type consists of definitions which closely parallel, or are identical to, those which had been used for comparative musicology, and the first subtype includes those based upon the named kind of music being studied. Thus in 1950, Kunst included as the object of study, "mainly the music and the musical instruments of all non-European peoples, including both the so-called primitive peoples and the civilized Eastern nations" (1950:7), and in Third Edition of the same work, he spoke of "traditional music and musical instruments of all cultural strata of mankind," but specifically named "tribal and folk music," and "every kind of non-Western art music," while specifically excluding "Western art- and popular (entertainment-) music" (1959:1). This lead was followed by others, such as Nettl, who wrote "Ethnomusicology ... [is] ... the study of non-Western music and, to

an extent, . . . folk music . . ." (1961:2) and others, including, for example, Greenway (1962), Hood (1963), and Nettl again (1965).

The second subtype takes the second stressed aspect of the old comparative musicology definitions and makes it the central focus of the new definition; this concerns music as oral tradition, which Lachmann had emphasized as early as 1935, and which had been a part of Haydon's (1941) and Kunst's (1959) discussions. Characteristic here is List's statement that "ethnomusicology is to a great extent concerned with music transmitted by unwritten tradition" (1962), a position he has reiterated since (1963; 1969), and one which has also been suggested by others (Gillis 1969). More recently, Nettl has discussed the same matter, but from a rather different standpoint, noting that *all* music traditions employ a strong oral component. He writes:

I feel therefore that I should not devote myself simply to what we call orally transmitted music, or what we were once permitted to call folk music, but instead to the study of all music from the point of view of its oral tradition; and this, for me, is one of a number of acceptable definitions of the field of ethnomusicology. (1975:69)

The third subtype defines the field as showing primary concern with music "outside one's own society." Statements of this type are less frequent than the others, but they have been made by Nettl (1964:11; 1965), and perhaps most specifically in print by Wachsmann, who wrote: "... ethnomusicology is concerned with the music of other peoples" (1969).

These definitions of ethnomusicology are all of one essential type, for they approach the problem from the standpoint of what the supposed sphere of interest is, conceptualized in terms of things. Of the three subtypes, the first two represent essentially different emphases on the same point, and both are used today, though with decreasing frequency. The third has dropped almost completely out of the picture, under the criticism of Kolinski (1957) and Seeger (1961), among others, both of whom pointed out that such a statement is basically ethnocentric and that by its tenet, the definition of what ethnomusicology is depends at any given point on who is studying what.

In sum, the definitions discussed to this point parallel the prior definitions of "comparative musicology," for they are statements of what particular kinds of music should be studied. Further, they represent by far the largest proportion of definitions suggested for the new term, and, contrary to expectations, they do not represent a change in position or in thought. Instead, these majority definitions seem to indicate that for their proponents, ethnomusicology represented no significant break with comparative musicology.

χ The second kind of definition does indicate the beginnings of a sharp rupture with the past, for in this case, process is stressed over form: the kind of music to be studied is no longer central, and instead, the focus of attention

is placed upon the way it is to be studied. While these definitions are relatively rare, they become more common through time; and while the early examples are groping, and perhaps even accidental, they do represent a new feeling about the field of study.

Early in the field was McAllester's report of the organizational meeting of the Society for Ethnomusicology, in which he spoke of the "general concensus" as favoring the idea that ethnomusicology "is by no means limited to so-called 'primitive music,' and is defined more by the orientation of the student than by any rigid boundaries of discourse" (1956). A year later, Hood borrowed a definition of ethnomusicology from musicology which mentioned no types of music to be studied, but instead emphasized "the investigation of the art of music. . ." (1957). In 1960, I suggested a flatly processual definition of ethnomusicology as "... the study of music in culture" (1960), and two years later Nketia wrote that "the study of music as a universal aspect of human behavior is becoming increasingly recognized as the focus of ethnomusicology" (1962). Hood's well-known definition in the *Harvard Dictionary* spoke of ethnomusicology as "an approach" (1969), and others have followed with variations on the same general theme, including Seeger (1970), List (1971), Chase (1972), and Merriam (ca. 1973).

These definitions represent a qualitative difference from others in that they stress process rather than form. By defining ethnomusicology in terms of "things," the scholar is constantly forced into making taxonomies, into cutting and splitting, drawing boundaries, differentiating between one thing and another: the conclusion must always be that a significant difference exists, as Hood (1969) and others (Seeger 1961, for example) insist, between music sound and the context of music sound, and that both for practical and analytic purposes, never the twain shall meet.

On the other hand, definitions which stress process force the investigator to focus on a totality rather than a set of component parts, to view description as a beginning in the course of study, and to conceptualize music sound not as separate from, but as a part of the totality of society and culture. The debate between the two views is a continuing, and healthy one which represents a hoary division of intellectual domains in Western thought: it is sharply reflected in the definitions put forward for the word, "ethnomusicology."

III

In the 1970's, definitions of the field have declined in number, presumably either because ethnomusicologists tired of the subject or because they felt that definitional problems had been solved and that they could operate comfortably with one or another of the formulations previously

suggested. Further, most of the more recent definitions have been very broad and general, almost as if whatever battles had been fought were no longer appropriate, or as if the problem did not require further sharp and precise thinking. Thus Chenoweth says only that "ethnomusicology is the study of the musical practices of a particular people" (1972), and Blacking writes that "Ethnomusicology is a comparatively new word which is widely used to refer to the study of the different musical systems of the world" (1973; see also Blacking 1974). Nettl has recently suggested a broadly encompassing working definition which he regards as descriptive of most study currently being done in the field.

Ethnomusicology is the comparative study of musical cultures, particularly as total systems including sound and behavior with the use of field research. (1974)

At the same time, a few definitions have recently appeared which represent either idiosyncratic ideas of what ethnomusicology is, or new directions in which it may be going. Thus it has been suggested that the primary task of ethnomusicology may be to seek correlations between music sound structure, on the one hand, and society and culture, on the other. I have recently commented that if we do "define" ethnomusicology in terms of "what ethnomusicologists do," and given the significant expansion of "world music performance groups," ethnomusicology might well be forced into such a definition as "the performance and dissemination of ethnic music" (1975:56). This suggestion goes against my own strong conviction that no field of study can be defined on such a basis. Most recently, the growing concern manifested by students and professors around the world with the problems of logical positivism and the scientific method, have been reflected in yet another definition, one which stresses, perhaps, things to come: "Ethnomusicology is the hermeneutic science of human musical behavior" (Elizabeth Helser 1976).

The definitions of comparative musicology and ethnomusicology cited here reflect their eras and the thinking of their proponents, as is to be expected. But by looking at them in historic perspective, we learn something not only of the history of our field of study *per se*, but of its intellectual development as well. I have no doubt that new definitions of ethnomusicology will continue to be proposed and that they, too, will reflect the growing maturity of the field and its practitioners.

NOTE

¹I wish to express my deep appreciation to Frank Gillis, Elizabeth Helser, and Bruno Nettl, each of whom has given me permission to quote his or her unpublished definition of ethnomusicology. I trust I have not distorted any of these friends' views in so doing.

REFERENCES NOT CITED IN APPENDIX

- Blacking, John
1966 Review of *The Anthropology of Music*. *Current Anthropology* 7:218.
- Hood, Mantle
1971 *The ethnomusicologist*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hornbostel, Erich M von
1905 Die Probleme der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft. *Zeitschrift der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft* 7:85-97.
- Kolinski, Mieczyslaw
1957 Ethnomusicology, its problems and methods. *Ethnomusicology Newsletter* No. 11:2-8.
- Ladd, John
1973 Conceptual problems relating to the comparative study of art. In Warren L. d'Azevedo (Ed). *The traditional artist in African societies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 417-24.
- Merriam, Alan P.
1969 Ethnomusicology revisited. *ETHNOMUSICOLOGY* 13:213-29.
1975 Ethnomusicology today. *Current Musicology* No. 20:50-66.
- Meyer, Leonard B.
1960 Universalism and relativism in the study of ethnic music. *ETHNOMUSICOLOGY* 4:49-54.
- Sachs, Curt (Edited by Jaap Kunst)
1962 *The wellsprings of music*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

APPENDIX

References are cited in chronological, rather than alphabetical, order.

- Adler, Guido
1885 Umfang, Methode und Zeit der Musikwissenschaft. *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 1:5-20.
p. 14: "... die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft, die sich zur Aufgabe macht, die Tonproducte, insbesondere die Volksgesänge verschiedener Völker, Länder und Territorien behufs ethnographischer Zwecke zu vergleichen und nach der Verschiedenheit ihrer Beschaffenheit zu gruppieren und sondern." ("... comparative musicology has as its task the comparison of the musical works—especially the folksongs—of the various peoples of the earth for ethnographical purposes, and the classification of them according to their various forms.")
- Lachmann, Robert
1935 Musiksysteme und Musikauffassung. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft* 3:1-23.
p. 1: By implication "non-European music," as in the following: "Ausser-europäische Musik wird ohne das Mittel der Schrift überliefert; ihre Untersuchung erfordert daher andere Methoden als die der abendländischen Kunstmusik." ("Non-European music is handed down without the means of writing; its investigation demands, therefore, other methods than those for Western art music.")
- Roberts, Helen H.
1937 The viewpoint of comparative musicology. *Proceedings of the Music Teachers National Association for 1936*, pp. 233-38.

p. 233: "... the kind of studies that are now coming to be classified under the term 'comparative musicology' deal with exotic musics as compared with one another and with that classical European system under which most of us were brought up."

Haydon, Glen

1941 Introduction to musicology. New York: Prentice-Hall.

p. 218: "Non-European musical systems and folk music constitute the chief subjects of study; the songs of birds and phylogenetic-ontogenetic parallels are subordinate topics."

p. 235: "If *comparative musicology* means the study of extra-European musical systems, it is natural that the study of Chinese, Indian, Arabian, and other musical systems should fall to the lot of comparative musicology."

p. 237: "Comparative musicology has its characteristic subject matter chiefly in extra-European and folk music..."

p. 219: "Most, if not all, of the music studied in comparative musicology is transmitted by oral tradition..."

Sachs, Curt

1943 The rise of music in the ancient world east and west. New York: W. W. Norton.

p. 29: "comparative Musicology ... [is] ... the primitive and Oriental branch of music history."

Apel, Willi

1946 Harvard dictionary of music. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

p. 167: "Comparative musicology ... [is] ... the study of exotic music."

p. 250: "Exotic music ... [is comprised of] ... the musical cultures outside the European tradition."

Herzog, George

1946 Comparative musicology. The Music Journal 4 (Nov.-Dec.): 11 et seq.

p. 11: "There are many other musical languages, employed by Oriental and primitive—preliterate—peoples. The study of these bodies of music is Comparative Musicology, which aims to discover all the variety of musical expression and construction that is to be found within the wide array of types of cultural development all over the world. Comparative Musicology embraces also folk music..."

Kunst, Jaap

1950 Musicologica. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Vereeniging Indisch Instituut.

p. 7: "To the question: what is the study-object of comparative musicology, the answer must be: mainly the music and the musical instruments of all non-European peoples, including both the so-called primitive peoples and the civilized Eastern nations. Although this science naturally makes repeated excursions into the field of European music, the latter is, in itself, only an indirect object of its study."

Koole, A. J. C.

1955 The history, study, aims and problems of comparative musicology. South African Journal of Science 51:227-30.

p. 227: "The Englishman Alexander John Ellis ... is rightly considered to be the founder of this branch of science [comparative musicology], for although a few studies of exotic music had been published..."

Bukofzer, Manfred F.

1956 Observations on the study of non-Western music. In Paul Collaer (Ed). Les colloques de Wégimont. Bruxelles: Elsevier, pp. 33-36.

p. 33: "From the beginning [musicology] has included also the study of oriental and primitive music or what can best be summarized as non-western

music. This special branch is known by the somewhat clumsy name 'comparative musicology' or 'ethnomusicology'.... The study is supposed to include also the musical folklore of western nations." (See remarks in opposition by Constantin Brailoiu, pp. 35-36.)

[McAllester, David P.]

1956 The organizational meeting in Boston: Ethno-musicology Newsletter No. 6:3-5.

p. 5: "The proper subject matter for the society was discussed at length. The general consensus favored the view that 'ethno-musicology' is by no means limited to so-called 'primitive music,' and is defined more by the orientation of the student than by any rigid boundaries of discourse.... It was further felt that the term, 'ethno-musicology' is more accurate and descriptive of this discipline and its field of investigation than the older term, 'comparative musicology.'"

Nettl, Bruno

1956 Music in primitive culture. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

p. 1: "The study of primitive music falls within the scope of comparative musicology, or, as it is often termed, ethnomusicology, the science that deals with the music of peoples outside of Western civilization."

Rhodes, Willard

1956 Toward a definition of ethnomusicology. American Anthropologist 58:457-63.

p. 460-61: "Here, under the imprint of comparative musicology, are bound together studies of the music of the Near East, the Far East, Indonesia, Africa, the North American Indians, and European folk music. Of those ethnomusicologists whose interests are confined solely to primitive music I ask, 'Can we refuse our inheritance?' Let us not be provincial in the pursuit of our discipline. Oriental art music, the folk music of the world, and primitive music, all await our serious study."

Schaeffner, André

1956 Ethnologie musicale ou musicologie comparée? In Paul Collaer (Ed). Les colloques de Wégimont. Bruxelles: Elsevier, pp. 18-32.

p. 24: "J'ai dit... que rien dans son nom ne spécifiait que la musicologie comparée étudierait plutôt les musiques non-européennes. Or elle s'est intéressée essentiellement à celles-ci." ("I said that nothing in its name specified that comparative musicology must study non-European musics. But it is interested essentially in these.")

Hood, Mantle

1957 Training and research methods in ethnomusicology. Ethnomusicology Newsletter No. 11:2-8.

p. 2: "[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."

Schneider, Marius

1957 Primitive music. In Egon Wellesz (Ed). Ancient and Oriental music. London: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-82.

p. 1: "This new discipline was called 'comparative musicology', its primary aim being the comparative study of all the characteristics, normal or otherwise, of non-European art."

Kunst, Jaap

1959 Ethnomusicology. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, Third Edition.

p. 1: "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 does not belong to its field."

Merriam, Alan P.

- 1960 Ethnomusicology: discussion and definition of the field. *ETHNOMUSICOLOGY* 4:107-14.
p. 109: "... the study of music in culture."

Nettl, Bruno

- 1961 Reference materials in ethnomusicology. Detroit: Information Service, Inc., Detroit Studies in Music Bibliography Number 1.
p. 2: "Ethnomusicology ... [is] ... the study of non-Western music and, to an extent, ... folk music. ..."

Seeger, Charles

- 1961 Semantic, logical and political considerations bearing upon research in ethnomusicology. *ETHNOMUSICOLOGY* 5:77-80.
p. 79: "The study of non-European musics was launched in 1900 ... and was eventually given the name 'comparative musicology.'"

Greenway, John

- 1962 Primitive music. Boulder: University of Colorado.
p. 1: "... the systematic study of music as it is manifested among the more primitive and unfamiliar peoples of the world. ..."

List, George

- 1962 Ethnomusicology in higher education. *Music Journal* 20:20 *et seq.*
p. 24: "Ethnomusicology is to a great extent concerned with music transmitted by unwritten tradition."

Nketia, J. H. Kwabena

- 1962 The problem of meaning in African music. *ETHNOMUSICOLOGY* 6:1-7.
p. 1: "The study of music as a universal aspect of human behavior is becoming increasingly recognized as the focus of Ethnomusicology."

Hood, Mantle

- 1963 Music, the unknown. In Frank L. Harrison, Mantle Hood, and Claude V. Palisca. *Musicology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, pp. 215-326.
p. 217: "The discipline is directed toward an understanding of music studied in terms of itself and also toward the comprehension of music within the context of its society. Ethnomusicology is concerned with the music of all non-European peoples ... and includes within its purview the tribal, folk, and popular music of the Western world, as well as hybridizations of these forms. It frequently crosses into the field of European art music, although such material is only an indirect object of concern. In other words, ethnomusicology embraces all kinds of music not included by studies in historical musicology, i.e., the study of cultivated music in the western European tradition."

List, George

- 1963 Ethnomusicology and the phonograph. In Kurt Reinhard and George List. The demonstration collection of E. M. von Hornbostel and the Berlin Phonogramm-Archiv. New York: Ethnic Folkways Library, album notes for FE 4175, pp. 2-5.
p. 2: by implication: "[Ethnomusicology is] the study of aurally transmitted music. ..."

Nettl, Bruno

- 1964 Theory and method in ethnomusicology. Glencoe: Free Press.

p. 1: "... ethnomusicologists in the past have been students of the music outside Western civilization and, to a smaller extent, of European folk music."
p. 11: "We can summarize the consensus in stating that ethnomusicology is, in fact as well as theory, the field which pursues knowledge of the world's music, with emphasis on that music outside the researcher's own culture, from a descriptive and comparative viewpoint."

Nettl, Bruno

- 1965 Folk and traditional music of the western continents. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
p. 26: "The field that provides research in ... [folk and non-Western music] ... is now known as ethnomusicology. Before about 1950 it was commonly called comparative musicology, and it is a sort of borderline area between musicology (the study of all aspects of music in a scholarly fashion) and anthropology (the study of man, his culture, and especially the cultures outside the investigator's own background)."

Kolinski, Mieczyslaw

- 1967 Recent trends in ethnomusicology. *ETHNOMUSICOLOGY* 11:1-24.
p. 5: "One of the most ambitious objectives of musicological research is the comparative analysis of the known musical styles of the world's peoples designed to establish their distinguishing features and, ultimately, to search for universals providing a common basis for the immense variety of musical creations. The most appropriate term for this field of study appears to be *comparative musicology*."

Gillis, Frank

- 1969 Personal communication.
"[Ethnomusicology is] the study of those world musics which are aurally transmitted."

Hood, Mantle

- 1969 Ethnomusicology. In Willi Apel (Ed). *Harvard dictionary of music*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Second Edition, pp. 298-300.
p. 298: "Ethnomusicology is an approach to the study of *any* music, not only in terms of itself but also in relation to its cultural context."

Wachsmann, K. P.

- 1969 Music. *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 6:164-91.
p. 165: "... ethnomusicology is concerned with the music of other peoples. ... The prefix 'ethno' draws attention to the fact that this musicology operates essentially across cultural boundaries of one sort or another, and that, generally, the observer does not share directly the musical tradition that he studies. ... Thus it cannot surprise us that in the early stages the emphasis was on comparison, and the field was known as comparative musicology until, in the 1960's, it was renamed."

List, George

- 1969 Discussion of K. P. Wachsmann's paper. *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 6:192-99.
p. 195: "A third definition (and one to which I subscribe) defines ethnomusicology in the broadest sense as the study of traditional music. What does the term 'traditional music' mean? It refers to music which has two specific characteristics: it is transmitted and diffused by memory rather than through the use of writing, and it is music which is always in flux, in which a second performance of the same item differs from the first."

Seeger, Charles

- 1970 Toward a unitary field theory for musicology. *Selected Reports* 1(3):172-210.
In reading the following, one should recall that Seeger holds "ethnomusicology" to be the proper term for what is now called "musicology."
p. 179: "... musicology is (1) a *speech study*, systematic as well as

historical, critical as well as scientific or scientific; whose field is (2) *the total music* of man, both in itself and in its relationships to what is not itself; whose cultivation is (3) *by individual students* who can view its field as musicians as well as in the terms devised by nonmusical specialists of whose fields some aspects of music are data; whose aim is to contribute to *the understanding of man*, in terms both (4) of human culture and (5) of his relationships with the *physical universe*."

List, George

- 1971 Inter-American program in ethnomusicology. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications.
n.p.: "Ethnomusicology is conceived as an interdisciplinary study in which approaches derived from many disciplines can be usefully applied."

Chenoweth, Vida

- 1972 Melodic perception and analysis. Ukarumpa, Papua New Guinea: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
p. 9: "Ethnomusicology is the study of the musical practices of a particular people."
Repeated in Second Edition, 1974.

Chase, Gilbert

- 1972 American musicology and the social sciences. In Barry S. Brook, Edward O. D. Downes, and Sherman Van Solkema (Eds). *Perspectives in Musicology*. New York: W. W. Norton, pp. 202-26.
p. 220: "I favor the *idea* of an 'ethnomusicology'... but I do not favor the terminology.... What we need is a term of larger scope.... For this I propose the term 'cultural musicology' [the task of which is] 'to study the similarities and differences in musical behavior among human groups, to depict the character of the various musical cultures of the world and the processes of stability, change, and development that are characteristic to them.'"

Blacking, John

- 1973 How musical is man? Seattle: University of Washington Press.
p. 3: "Ethnomusicology is a comparatively new word which is widely used to refer to the study of the different musical systems of the world."

Merriam, Alan P.

- ca 1973 Unpublished thoughts.
"Ethnomusicology is the study of music as culture."

Blacking, John

- 1974 In memoriam António Jorge Dias. Lisboa, Vol. III, pp. 71-93.
p. 74: "The discipline is concerned chiefly with 'ethnic' or 'folk' music and thus tends to be an area study. The methods used are generally anthropological and sociological, or musicological: thus scholars are concerned with either the rules of a particular society or culture, of which music-making is a feature, or the rules of a particular society's musical system."

Nettl, Bruno

- 1974 Personal communication.
"Ethnomusicology is the comparative study of musical cultures, particularly as total systems including sound and behavior with the use of field research."

Nettl, Bruno

- 1975 The state of research in ethnomusicology, and recent developments. *Current Musicology* No. 20:67-78.
p. 69: "[Ethnomusicology is] the study of all music from the point of view of its oral tradition;..."

Helser, Elizabeth

- 1976 Personal communication.
"Ethnomusicology is the hermeneutic science of human musical behavior."