I. Introduction

The origin of the term ‘ethnomusicology’ is attributed to the Dutch scholar Jaap Kunst (1950), who used it in the subtitle of his book *Musicologica: a Study of the Nature of Ethno-musicology, its Problems, Methods, and Representative Personalities* (Amsterdam, 1950). In European languages it is equated with French *ethnomusicologie*, Italian *ethnomusicologia*, German *Ethnomusikologie* or *Musikethnologie* and Polish *etnografia muzyczna*. The term ‘ethnomusicology’ has also been adopted by specialists in the Czech Republic and Slovakia and the Netherlands. In Germany and Austria some scholars continue to use the phrase *Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft* (‘comparative musicology’) to stress affiliation with the work of Stumpf, Hornbostel (Berlin) and Lach (Vienna) (see Wiora, 1975, Graf, 1974). Russian, Bulgarian and Ukrainian scholars distinguish *etnomuzikal'naya* (the study of the music) from *etnografiya muzikal'naya* (‘musical ethnography’) in turn equated with *muzikal'naya fol'kloristika*. Since the early 1980s, the term *minze yinyuexue* has been adopted in China to denote ‘ethnomusicology’ (see China §I). There are regional interpretations of the term. For instance, in Indonesia, both Western scholars and indigenous scholars trained in the West equate ethnomusicology with the study of Indonesian art music, while for scholars in the Academy of Central Java it is used to denote the study of the music of other Indonesian islands.

Historically ethnomusicology has been a scholarly discipline primarily within universities in the USA, Canada and Europe (see §II). Its specialists are trained in music or in anthropology, sometimes in both. Research is undertaken in university departments of music or anthropology, in ethnographic museums and in research institutes of national academies of science, found particularly in Eastern Europe. As the following survey of musical activities illustrates (§II below), a multitude of musical research was being undertaken by a range of people from many Western countries prior to World War II including ethnologists, anthropologists, sociologists, comparative musicologists,
folklorists, psychologists, physicists, missionaries, clerics, explorers, civil servants and enthusiasts, forming multiple influences both inside and outside the academy that affected contemporary thinking. This melting pot includes distinctive figures who have been simultaneously co-opted into the lineages of different disciplines. Ethnomusicologists and scholars in Folk Life Studies or Folkloristics, for instance, lay equal claim in their disciplinary ancestry to the English folksong collector cecil j. Sharp (see also Folk music, England, §II), the American charles Seeger or the Hungarians béla Bartók and zoltan Kodály, despite these individuals’ own perceptions of their affiliations. Similarly, a single geneological line is difficult to create for any single country, since these will vary individually according to a combination of personal interest and professional and cultural orientations. For instance, the myth of origin of the American discipline may be projected back to ‘founding fathers’ such as erich moritz von Hornbostel (1877–1935), who taught a heady interdisciplinary mix of music psychology, comparative musicology and music ethnology (Musikalische Völkerkunde, Musikethnologie) in Berlin supported by his mentor carl Stumpf; franz Boas (1858–1942) who, after moving to North America from Berlin in the 1880s, established fieldwork as a prerequisite of American anthropology and through his students influenced the anthropological strand of ethnomusicology; to george Herzog (1901–84), Hornbostel’s student, who moved to Columbia University to study anthropology with Boas and established a consistent methodology for comparative musicological study and archival work; Charles Seeger (1886–1979) with his interest in vernacular musics and linguistics; and eventually to the musicological methods of mantle Hood and the anthropological methods of alan p. Merriam which exacerbated the theoretical and methodological ‘great divide’. Alternative lineages might point to the work of ‘founding mothers’, such as Alice Cunningham Fletcher (1838–1923), who collaborated with the Omaha Indian Francis La Flesche (1857–1932) throughout her life, and Frances Densmore (1867–1957), author of over a dozen monographs on different Amerindian groups. Or they might draw upon figures from different disciplines relevant to the multiple approaches that have traditionally contributed to our understanding of music, such as Musicology, sociology, social and cultural anthropology, linguistics, psychology, folklore, political science and economics.
In Britain, the ‘father of Ethnomusicology’ is perceived generally as the British physicist and phonetician, **alexander john Ellis** (1814–90) who suggested that ‘acoustical phenomena’ should be studied by scientists rather than musicians, since those who had been trained in particular musical systems tended to consider ‘familiar’ sounds as ‘natural’ (1885). That the conceptualization of music – the way we listen to and evaluate musical sounds – is not value free was later to be developed in the British context by **john Blacking** in his theories on music as ‘humanly organized sound’. An anthropologist and ethnomusicologist from Cambridge is bound to point out the term ‘fieldwork’ was appropriated from natural science for anthropology by the ethnologist Alfréd Cort Haddon, who led the ‘Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Strait’ in 1898. This multidisciplinary project, which included the physician and musician Charles Myers and photographer Anthony Wilkin, was equipped with the high technology of the day: two phonographs with recording and playback facility, a cine camera, still cameras and a magic lantern projector. Recordings of music on wax cylinders, some of which were transcribed using Ellis’s system of ‘cents’ (division of the equal-tempered semitone into 100 equal parts), are now housed in the British Library National Sound Archives in the UK (Clayton, 1996) and Australia. The film – the first piece of ethnographic film made in the field – which depicts dance sequences performed at re-enactments of the Malu-Bomai ceremonies – is now in the National Film Archives in the UK and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies in Canberra. Several hundred field photographs including some of the masked dances of the Malu-Bomai cult are in the collections of the Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. The emphasis on direct field research on this expedition provided the basis for the development of intensive fieldwork as the essential methodology of British anthropology: ‘the ethnographic method’. Haddon’s evocative description of the dance emphasizes ‘performance’ and ‘experience’ both of which are very much to the fore in contemporary ethnomusicological writings. From these origins, then, the anthropological lineage proceeds through the theoretical developments of Bronislaw Malinowski’s strategizing Trobriand performer constantly reshaping tradition, through Radcliffe-Brown’s elucidation of the power of the Andaman Islanders’ music and dance to act as a moral force on the individual (1922) and the parallel developments in; comparative musicology
(e.g. Fox Strangways, 1914) and folk music research (Cecil Sharp and his descendants) before proceeding through Hamish Henderson at the School of Scottish Studies and John Blacking who moved from Cambridge to Paris then Belfast.

In addition to cropping up in different disciplinary lineages, certain personages appear in the national lineages of the same discipline. For instance, Constantin Brăiloiu who, following the Romanian Sociological School shaped by Dimitrie Gusti argued that music was indissolubly attached to social phenomena, is important for French, Romanian and Swiss ethnomusicology.

Not for the first time, ethnomusicology is faced with the need to reassess its perceptions of history (compare, for instance, the historical methodologies of §II and §III below), its subject matter, methods and ethics (see §IV). The subject matter of ethnomusicology has been constantly debated since its inception. Initially, it was perceived as all music outside the Western European art tradition and intended to exclude Western art and popular musics. It concerned itself with the musics of non-literate peoples; the orally transmitted music of cultures then perceived to be ‘high’ such as the traditional court and urban musics of China, Japan, Korea, Indonesia, India, Iran and other Arabic-speaking countries; and ‘folk music’, which Nettl (1964) tentatively defined as the music in oral tradition found in those areas dominated by high cultures. At the beginning of the 21st century, ethnomusicology embraces the study of all musics in local and global contexts.

Concerned primarily with living music (including music, song, dance and instruments), recent studies have also investigated music history (Blum, Bohlman and Neuman, 1991). A discipline that first examined music ‘in culture’ (Merriam, 1964) and then ‘as culture’, and has had ‘fieldwork’ as integral to its methodology now presents both ‘culture’ and ‘fieldwork’ as problematics rather than givens (see §IV).

Since its inception, ethnomusicology has always seen connections between itself and other disciplines, as outlined above. It never fitted happily into the modernist dichotomization between ‘us’ and ‘them’; the contemporary hot debate on whether musicology is part of ethnomusicology or vice versa therefore becomes irrelevant. Musicology is one of many theoretical and methodological interweaving strands in a discipline that recently moved in the West from concentrating on the traditional musics of the exotically removed ‘other’ to Popular music, both local and global, (e.g. Manuel,
1988; Waterman, 1990; Berliner, 1994; Mitchell, 1996; Schade-Poulsen, 1999), World music (e.g. Keil and Feld, 1994) and Western ‘art’ music (e.g. Born, 1995); from traditional interdisciplinary relationships to contemporary interactions with disciplines such as cultural studies (e.g. Lloyd, 1993; Straw, 1994) and performance studies (e.g. Schechner and Appel, 1990; Schieffelin, 1994; Pegg 2001); and from homogeneous, structural and interpretative perspectives to those of experience (e.g. Rice, 1994; Blacking, 1995). Ethnomusicology as a discipline is not homogeneous and, clearly, is no longer confined to the West or to Europe. It is now well placed to take on board the diverse national ethnomusicologies represented in this dictionary which include those who recently emerged from the former Soviet Union, non-European scholars and musicians untrained in the Western system.

See individual country articles for details of national archives and histoires as well as entries on cultural regions, concepts, genres, instruments and individual musicians. See also Ethnochoreology; Transcription; Notation, §II; Society for ethnomusicology (SEM); International council for traditional music (ICTM); and British forum for ethnomusicology (BFE).
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