

Comparative (Ethno)Musicology.

On the cross-cultural comparison of musical concepts and performance practices

GERD GRUPE

In a paper dealing with the challenges of understanding musics across cultural boundaries Regine Allgayer-Kaufmann addressed the epistemological significance of comparing musics:

The hermeneutic process [...] is a method enabling us to find out whether apart from inevitable differences [between various musics; G.G.] there are also similarities, i.e. “overlappings”. (Allgayer-Kaufmann 2004, 526-527; translation G.G.)¹

Does this statement, which echoes a well-known formulation by Erich von Hornbostel on the advantages of comparison as a fundamental musicological tool (see below), signal a remnant or comeback of an outdated “old school” approach some 100 years after its original appearance in 1905? In this paper I will argue that comparison is both inevitable and useful in the study of musics of the world. First, I will look at the relationship between musicology and ethnography and the role assigned to comparison at various stages of the development of our discipline. Then I will briefly discuss variation, a characteristic feature of many musics, in order to highlight the heuristic potential of a comparative approach for the study of music.

Guido Adler in his famous outline of musicology (“Musikwissenschaft”) as an academic discipline (1885) listed “Musikologie”, i.e. the “examination and comparison for ethnographic purposes” (cited after Mugglestone 1981, 15), as a special branch of the “systematic” section of music studies. “This takes as its task the

¹ “Der hermeneutische Prozess [...] bezeichnet eine Methode, mittels derer wir herausfinden können, ob es neben den unweigerlichen Unterschieden [zwischen verschiedenen Musiken; G.G.] auch Gleiches gibt, ob es also [...] ‘Überlappungen’ gibt.” (Allgayer-Kaufmann 2004, 526-527)

comparing of tonal products, in particular the folk songs of various peoples, countries, and territories” (cited after Mugglestone 1981, 13). He strayed from the common term “Musikwissenschaft”, which in German can be used as an umbrella term for music studies in general, but considered “Musikologie” to be synonymous with “comparative musicology”, a term highlighting the specific approach of “Musikologie” which he claimed aims at “grouping and ordering” (cited after Mugglestone 1981, 13) the characteristic features of the various musics under investigation.²

In his seminal paper on “Die Probleme der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft” (1905; cf. the English translation “The Problems of Comparative Musicology”, 1975) Erich von Hornbostel established the term “comparative musicology” and outlined its aims. Regarding comparison he maintained:

Comparison is the principal means by which the quest for knowledge is pursued. Comparison makes possible the analysis and the exact description of an individual phenomenon by comparing it with other phenomena and by emphasizing [sic!] its distinctive qualities. (1975, 249-250; for “emphasing” read “emphasizing”, G.G.)³

After World War II, a certain skepticism towards the approach of comparative musicology had developed among some leading scholars. As early as 1930, Curt Sachs had claimed that “its name is misleading, however. It does not ‘compare’ any more or less than any other science” (Sachs 1930, 1; translation G.G.).⁴ Jaap Kunst took up this critique, without however explicitly referring to Sachs, in an often quoted statement when he wrote: “It does not ‘compare’ any more than any other science” (1959, 1). Later, Mantle Hood (1971, 47) restated this view: “There

² “Ein neues und sehr dankenswertes Nebengebiet dieses systematischen Theiles ist die Musikologie, d.i. 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.“ (Adler 1885, 14)

³ “Das vornehmste Mittel wissenschaftlicher Erkenntnis ist die Vergleichung. Sie ermöglicht die Analyse und genaue Beschreibung der Einzelercheinung, indem diese anderen Erscheinungen gegenübergestellt und ihre unterscheidenden Eigentümlichkeiten hervorgehoben werden“ (Hornbostel 1905, 85).

⁴ “Die vergleichende Musikwissenschaft handelt von den [...]. Ihr Name führt freilich irre. Sie ‘vergleicht’ nicht weniger und nicht mehr als jede andre Wissenschaft“. (Sachs 1930, 1)

was a great preoccupation in comparing [...] every kind of music with every other kind of music long before the things being compared were understood.” However, early scholars such as Hornbostel did not always construct grand comparative schemes in the way that for example Mieczyslaw Kolinski (1961; 1965) and Alan Lomax (1968) did later; but there is a comparative approach in Hornbostel’s general outline of small studies, which are all organized along the same lines: often they are entitled “... melodies recorded on the phonograph” and are based on a few samples (“Stichproben”) of phonograph recordings of a particular kind of music which are analyzed according to standard (Western) musical parameters such as tonal system, melody, rhythm, multipart performance, and form.

Nonetheless, the uneasiness with the designation “comparative musicology” met with the shift – due to the exodus of prominent scholars because of the Nazi regime – from the German-speaking countries to the United States with its well-established tradition of anthropology. Thus, the new term “ethnomusicology” usually attributed to Jaap Kunst was introduced. Interestingly the first edition (1950) of his *Ethnomusicology* (1959) was entitled *Musicologica*. Kunst may have intended to reinstall Adler’s designation “Musikologie” for which there is no parallel in English since translating it as “musicology” might be mistaken for either the umbrella term mentioned above or for the study of Western music history. However, “ethnography” had already been part of Adler’s original definition and as early as 1922 the phrase “musikalisch-ethnologische Forschung” (musical-ethnological research) originally used in a contribution by Otto Abraham and Erich von Hornbostel to the *Boas Anniversary Volume* (1906, 447) was replaced by “musikethnologische Forschung”⁵ (music-ethnological research) in the reprinted – and obviously slightly revised – version that appeared in volume one of the *Sammelbände für vergleichende Musikwissenschaft* (1922, 293). In the introduction to that volume, written in 1921, the editors Carl Stumpf and Erich von Hornbostel call the field “musikalische Ethnologie” (1922, v). This conveys a different attitude than the one expressed in Hornbostel’s programmatic text of 1905 mentioned above, where ethnology/anthropology seems to be viewed as an ancillary science fulfilling a supplemental role to comparative musicology. In his 1905 paper he referred to “the ethnologist’s task of collecting” and complained that “the musicologist who looked for assistance from the ethnologist was badly

⁵ This is the earliest mention of this term in German that I am aware of. Today the two terms “Ethnomusikologie” (ethnomusicology) and “Musikethnologie” (music-ethnology or anthropology of music) are usually used interchangeably in German.

off" (cited after Hornbostel 1975, 251) before the phonograph became available. He obviously had had ethnologists in mind when considering the role of "the researcher in the field" (1975, 252), not musicologists. After dealing with issues such as tonal system, tuning, rhythm, and melody he continued:

So far we have attempted to outline a brief survey of music - theoretical questions which should be taken into consideration in comparative studies; we will now view the problems that arise from comparisons of the musical practices of the various peoples: here at least part of the collection and the digest of the material falls more under the competence of the ethnologist than the musicologist. [...] also the occasion for which music is performed deserves comparative study. K. Bücher (1902) has presented us with an ethnography of work songs; monographic studies by capable ethnologists on cult music, music of secular feasts, theatre, and in particular, dance music would be most desirable. (cited after Hornbostel 1975, 267-268)⁶

During the following years, however, this distinction between musicology and ethnology had become less clear. Equating comparative musicology with "musical ethnology" ("musikalische Ethnologie") sounds rather modern for the early 1920s. Surely the mere use of this term should not be overrated as it does not yet imply anything near Merriam's concept of ethnomusicology as being based on two equally important pillars, musicology and anthropology (Merriam 1964, 3). Yet Hornbostel and his colleagues seem to have gradually taken up the view of regarding both disciplines to be on a par vis-à-vis the study of music. This paradigmatic shift is also evident in publications such as the textbook-like monograph *Musik des Orients* by Robert Lachmann (1929). Instead of analyzing phonograph recordings he compiled the findings of studies by a considerable number of scholars and presented them in a cross-cultural arrangement according to musical parameters and added a chapter on "Musikpflege und Musikauffassung" where he

⁶ "Wir haben bisher eine kurze Übersicht über die musiktheoretischen Fragen zu gewinnen versucht, die bei vergleichenden Studien in Betracht kommen; wir wollen nun einen Blick auf die Probleme werfen, die sich bei der Vergleichung der *praktischen* Musik verschiedener Völker ergeben; die Sammlung und Verarbeitung des Materials fällt hier zum Teil mehr in die Kompetenz des Ethnologen als des Musikforschers. [...] Eine vergleichende Betrachtung verdienen ferner [...] die *Gelegenheiten, bei denen musiziert wird* [...]. Eine Ethnographie des Arbeitsliedes hat uns K. Bücher [*Arbeit und Rhythmus*, 1902] geschenkt, für die Kultmusik, die Musik bei weltlichen Festen, die Theater- und namentlich die Tanzmusik wären monographische Zusammenfassungen von berufener ethnologischer Seite sehr zu wünschen." (1905, 95-96; emphasis in the original).

deals with concepts and uses of music in the respective countries as well as the relationship to other arts. Such a terminological and theoretical shift is also noticeable in unpublished documents put forth by Jan Stęszewski indicating that even the form “etno-muzykologicznych” (ethno-musicological) seems to have been used in Poland as early as the 1930s (Stęszewski 1992, 529) although at the time it did not appear in print.

Changing the designation from comparative musicology to ethnomusicology evidently was not such an abrupt step as it may seem. However, books such as Lachmann’s were considered to be premature due to the thus far insufficient knowledge of individual music cultures. While disciplines such as comparative linguistics or comparative literary studies and the like are well-established fields, in music research not only was the designation replaced – by “ethnomusicology” – but the whole notion of comparison as a useful methodological tool fell into disrepute. However, it would be advisable not to equate what Artur Simon (1978, 12) has called a “naïve” way of comparing as practiced during the early 20th century with comparison in general. Eminent ethnomusicologists such as Bruno Nettl have always encouraged a comparative approach in ethnomusicology⁷, and more recently comparison seems to have lost most of its bad reputation. Thus, Jonathan Stock (2008, 204-205) has stated: “Much criticised at certain times, comparison has certainly remained a central part of the ethnomusicological approach.” And Martin Clayton (2012, 90) has argued:

What features of the sound energy can be specified in a way that permits meaningful comparison? More productive than a retreat from comparison (or indeed a headlong rush toward it) would be an acknowledgment of comparison’s inevitability, and a concerted attempt to deal with the epistemological and ontological questions that inevitably arise (what kind of things are we comparing, and how do we know?).

He comes to the conclusion “that comparison is inevitable in musicology” (2012, 94) and even published a book on *Music, Time, and Place* (2007) with the somewhat provocative subtitle *Essays in Comparative Musicology*.

Comparison always includes coming to grips with choosing an appropriate set of terms (cf. Clayton 2012, 88-89). In this context the notion that any music

⁷ In the first edition of his book *The Study of Ethnomusicology* a whole section comprising nine chapters is entitled “The Comparative Study of Musics” (1983, 13-127) and he postulates here and again in the revised second edition “that comparative study, properly carried out, provides important insights” (1983, 9; 2005, 13).

should be approached in its own terms (cf. Nettl 2005, 13, 217) is sometimes questioned and we must be aware of John Blacking's (1973, 25) caveat that "no musical style has 'its own terms': its terms are the terms of its society and culture". Certainly, any specific vocabulary in discourse of local experts about music constitutes a first-rate source to be tapped in order to reconstruct local knowledge and emic views about music; it must not be ignored. However, no matter whether we "merely" want to communicate findings on one particular kind of music or actually attempt any explicitly cross-cultural comparisons we need to find ways of expressing concepts in languages different from the original. As ethnomusicologists we do not subscribe to the opinion that a musical system can only be understood by somebody born into the culture or somebody who has carried out long-term participant observation in the field. Rather, it must be possible to explain what we have learned to others. In spite of the extensive use of pertinent indigenous terms that can be compiled in a glossary, we still need to find a way to explicate these terms and the musical concepts they imply. Thus, we will have to translate notions and conceptualizations from one musical and language system to another one. Today this will not only be the currently dominant language of scholarship, English, but also numerous other languages in which ethnomusicology is taught and findings are published.

This is where terms such as "melody" and "rhythm" but also "variation", "interpretation", "improvisation" etc. come in. Although they surely cannot be considered culturally neutral (Clayton 2012, 88-89), they can nevertheless serve as means for translingual communication. In an essay entitled "Do Javanese Gamelan Musicians Really Improvise?" R. Anderson Sutton comes to the oxymoronic conclusion "that Javanese musicians improvise, but that Javanese music is not improvisatory" (1998, 87). If we merely remain within the framework of one music tradition such as Central Javanese *karawitan*, we will encounter words like "*garap*" or terms for specific performance practices. They may be translated literally (e.g. "*mipil*" = "picking") and explained regarding their musical meaning, but still a cross-cultural approach will give deeper insights concerning the range of options available and used in various musical systems. Of course, terms such as "improvisation" may be specifically related to certain phenomena in Western music history and it will be useful to reconsider any misunderstandings this may provoke (cf. Feld 1988, 81 on the use of the terms "hocket", "canon", and others for certain multi-part performance practices). On the other hand, employing indigenous terms exclusively will seriously impede any understanding by people not themselves familiar with the phenomena through their own extended exposure.

Concerning practices of variation, it will be particularly instructive to consider aspects such as predictability, originality, surprise, as well as the range and the rate of musical decisions.⁸ In *karawitan* there is a continuum of predictability implying a certain range of idiomatically available choices. While some musical parts are completely fixed, others can be explained as predominantly rule-based, and still others may exhibit an amount of variation that is determined by decisions according to personal taste or local “schools” so that this practice leads to results which are predictable within a range of options limited by idiomatic constraints. Idiosyncratic, unpredictable phrases or passages occurring only in individual cases and defying any generalization also exist. Should the term “improvisation” be applied in the case of *karawitan*? According to Sutton improvisation entails spontaneity, originality, surprise, and taking risks and these only play a minor role in *karawitan*, if at all (1998, 87).

If we define improvisation as implying that a musician makes decisions concerning primary musical parameters such as pitch and duration as opposed to more interpretative parameters such as tempo, phrasing, accentuation, timbre, etc. the extent to which such decisions may be made by some members of a gamelan ensemble, and thus the issue of their would-be “improvisatory” nature, can best be understood by comparing it to another musical system where improvisational practices form a central part of (most) performances, i.e. “modern”⁹ jazz (cf. Grupe 2009). Creating new melodic lines over given chord progressions has not always been a feature of jazz. It was only rudimentary present in early jazz when the main melody of a piece often merely used to be rendered in various versions during the performance.¹⁰ From the end of the 1920s until about the early 1940s, i.e. during the era of the swing big bands, many parts were pre-arranged and improvisation was mainly restricted to soloists; but it has become a hallmark of jazz in the second half of the 20th century with its predominance of smaller ensembles and the growing importance of interaction among band members as compared to a soloist-plus-accompaniment approach. The stylistic development of jazz eventually led to a considerable extension of the range of choices available to an improviser when the tonal and metric constraints of jazz were more and more

⁸ On improvisation cf. Grupe 2004, 231-250 with further references.

⁹ By “modern” I mean mainstream jazz of the second half of the 20th century, i.e. outside free jazz.

¹⁰ On the difference between constructing a solo by paraphrasing the melody versus improvisation on chord progressions see Gushee 1998 (especially p. 300).

loosened during the 1960s (free jazz). Originality and taking risks which reduce predictability in favor of (sometimes) surprising results characterize a mature jazz improviser (cf. Levine 1995, 185).

The constraints of an improviser in “modern” jazz can be explained in part by an application of the so-called “chord/scale theory” (Levine 1995, 31) and by analyzing melodic lines according to a classification of the notes being used, i.e. chord tone, scale tone, chromatic approach.¹¹ However, the option of playing “outside” (Levine 1995, 183), i.e. temporarily digressing from the given tonality of a chord or scale, is also available to a contemporary jazz musician. These features lend themselves to be compared with similar or differing practices in other musics. In the classical music of North India we encounter a similarly elaborate classification of tones in the context of a specific *rāg* (cf. Jairazbhoy 1971, 42-45). In spite of the notion of certain notes which should be “avoided” (cf. Levine 1995, 37) in some musical contexts, however, the melodic flexibility of a jazz improviser is definitely much larger than that of a Hindustani musician who is primarily expected to bring out the melodic essence (*rāga bhāva*) of a specific *rāg*.

It is particularly instructive to compare the reaction towards comparatively fewer constraints than is usually the case in a given idiom. Toward the end of the 1950s, a fast harmonic rhythm of two different chords per measure, implying an often rapid change of tonal material to be used by the improviser, had become well established (cf. compositions such as “Giant Steps” and others; Levine 1995, 203). In “modal jazz” (cf. Levine 1995, 29-30) based on a very slow harmonic rhythm, i.e. long sections based on one chord/scale, a contemporary jazz musician would usually employ “outside” playing, yielding a bitonal result in order not to sound boring due to a restricted set of scale tones from which to build melodies over an extended period of time (Levine 1995, 184, 192). Concerning *rāg Yaman* which is said to be “one of the few ragas which permits the performer comparative freedom” (Kaufmann 1968, 62), Moutal (1991, 54; italics in the original) has the following advice:

If an infinity of combinations can be created on *Yamana*, it does not mean that it is devoid of rules and original form. The danger, while performing such a vast *Rāga*, is to fall in the “scale-trap”: It is so easy to get lost in the improvisations, that one may end-up playing on the scale instead of unfolding its true *Rāga* form.

¹¹ Slightly different categories are used by Dobbins (1986, 26): passing tone, neighbor tone, appoggiatura, escape tone, embellishment, and anticipation.

In cases where many constraints apply, an acceptable musical result can be expected if they are technically mastered. In the case of few such constraints more creativity on behalf of the performer is required. A jazz musician can temporarily leave the prescribed tonality and thus eventually “play any note on any chord” (Levine 1995, 184); a Hindustani musician needs to keep from merely playing scalar passages instead of bringing out the *rāga bhāva*.

In comparing the melodic elements available in the performance practice of *karawitan*, Hindustani music, and jazz we encounter different options. *Karawitan* usually focuses on rendering a version of a given piece employing various levels of variation from paraphrase to creative melodic gestures, i.e. personal versions (*wiletan*) of generally acknowledged standard phrases (*céngkok*; cf. Sutton 1998, 76), but passages such as *pathetan* invoking the mood of a particular mode (*pathet*) also exist. This latter concept is extended beyond merely distinguishing modal scales in the presentation of a Hindustani *rāg* where “catch phrases” (*pakar*) identify a specific *rāg* (Jairazbhoy 1971, 38). There are also typical melodic phrases (“licks”) in “modern” jazz but they are often attributed to specific musicians or serve only as stepping stones for more individual melodic lines which should not be too stereotyped and predictable. Although improvisation is based on scales here, it is not restricted to their tonal content (cf. “outside” playing). Particularly in free jazz, the improviser has all the tones and sounds possible on a given musical instrument (e.g. clusters on a piano, “false” fingerings and the altissimo register on saxophones, etc.) at her/his disposal.

Thus, we may look at the process and the result of the performance and disclose the pertinent musical norms in each case. The three options, i.e. (1) rendering a (version of a) composition, (2) realizing a model, and (3) scale-based melodic invention, cannot be attributed exclusively to the musical idioms we have discussed. Within just one of them, several such options usually exist: *pathetan* vs. *gendhing* compositions in *karawitan*, melodic outline of a *rāg* in the *alāp* section of a performance vs. *gat* compositions in Hindustani music, big band arrangements with written out parts vs. compositions mainly serving as vehicles for extended improvised solos in jazz. A comparative perspective enables us to see where these options are present and to what extent. Thus we find that a *gendhing* includes improvisation in certain parts while a free jazz performance might include pre-composed elements; and Sutton’s oxymoron can be resolved: Javanese musicians – depending on their musical part in the ensemble – do improvise, but *karawitan* is not predominantly oriented towards realizing melodic models or putting together melodic elements in ever new, surprising, largely unpredictable ways as jazz improvisers are

expected to do. Although they can be said to be restricted by fewer constraints than gamelan or Hindustani musicians, even they are bound to norms (cf. “avoid notes” in mainstream jazz, disapproval of melodic clichés associated with earlier jazz styles in a free jazz setting, etc.).

This kind of insight can only be achieved by placing one phenomenon in relationship with another one, thus corroborating Hornbostel’s praise of comparison mentioned above. In spite of his gradual turn towards adopting the designation “musical ethnology” which is pretty close to “anthropology of music” the comparative method seems to be at the heart of our discipline, and today we have reached a level where a considerable number of in-depth studies of various musics of the world exist and their findings can be compared in relation to specific research questions (cf. Nettl and Russell 1998). Should we, therefore, reinstall the original designation comparative musicology? Maybe so, but if we were to give up the now fairly well-established label “ethnomusicology” we had better make that move on the basis of a sound and consensual decision by as many ethnomusicologists as possible.

References cited

- Abraham, O[tto] and E[rich] M[oritz] v[on] Hornbostel. 1906. “Phonographirte Indianermelodien aus British Columbia.” In *Boas Anniversary Volume: Anthropological Papers Written in Honor of Franz Boas*, edited by Berthold Laufer, 447-474. New York: Stechert.
- . 1922. “Phonographierte Indianermelodien aus Britisch-Columbia.” In *Sammelbände für vergleichende Musikwissenschaft* 1: 291-310. München: Drei Masken.
- Adler, Guido. 1885. “Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft.” In *Vierteljahresschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 1: 5-20.
- Allgayer-Kaufmann, Regine. 2004. “‘You will never understand this music’ – Chancen und Grenzen des interkulturellen (Nicht) Verstehens.” In *Musikgeschichte als Verstehensgeschichte: Festschrift für Gernot Gruber zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Joachim Brüggel, Franz Födermayr, Wolfgang Gratzner, Thomas Hochradner, and Siegfried Mauser, 525-536. Tutzing: Schneider.

- Blacking, John. 1973. *How Musical is Man?* Seattle, London: University of Washington Press.
- Clayton, Martin. 2007. *Music, Time, and Place: Essays in Comparative Musicology*. Delhi: B.R. Rhythms.
- . 2012. "Comparing Music, Comparing Musicology." In *The Cultural Study of Music: A Critical Introduction*, 2nd edition, edited by Martin Clayton, Trevor Herbert, and Richard Middleton, 86-95. London, New York: Routledge.
- Dobbins, Bill. 1986. *Jazz Arranging and Composing: A Linear Approach*. n.p.: Advance Music.
- Feld, Steven. 1988. "Aesthetics as Iconicity of Style, or 'Lift-up-over Sounding': Getting into the Kaluli Groove." *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 20: 74-113.
- Grupe, Gerd. 2004. *Die Kunst des mbira-Spiels (The Art of Mbira Playing)*. *Harmonische Struktur und Patternbildung in der Lamellophonmusik der Shona in Zimbabwe*. Tutzing: Schneider.
- . 2009. "Ethnomusikologische Ansätze in der neueren Jazzforschung und Perspektiven eines interkulturellen Vergleichs am Beispiel Jazz und Gamelan." *Jazzforschung/Jazz Research* 40: 157-174.
- Gushee, Lawrence. 1998. "The Improvisation of Louis Armstrong." In *In the Course of Performance: Studies in the World of Musical Improvisation*, edited by Bruno Nettl and Melinda Russell, 291-334. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hood, Mantle. 1971. *The Ethnomusicologist*. New York, San Francisco: McGraw-Hill.
- Hornbostel, Erich M[oritz] von. 1905. "Die Probleme der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft." *Zeitschrift der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft* 7(3): 85-97 (1905-1906).
- . 1975. "The Problems of Comparative Musicology." In *Hornbostel Opera Omnia* 1, edited by Klaus P. Wachsmann, Dieter Christensen, and Hans-Peter Reinicke, 247-270. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Jairazbhoy, N[azir] A[li]. 1971. *The Rāgs of North Indian Music: Their Structure and Evolution*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
- Kaufmann, Walter. 1968. *The Ragas of North India*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Kolinski, Mieczysław. 1961. "Classification of Tonal Structures." *Studies in Ethnomusicology* 1: 38-76.
- . 1965. "The Structure of Melodic Movement: A New Method of Analysis (Revised Version)." *Studies in Ethnomusicology* 2: 95-120.
- Kunst, Jaap. 1950. *Musicologica*. Amsterdam: Royal Tropical Institute.

- Kunst, Jaap. 1959. *Ethnomusicology: A Study of its Nature, its Problems, Methods and Representative Personalities to which is Added a Bibliography*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Lachmann, Robert. 1929. *Musik des Orients*. Breslau: Ferdinand Hirt.
- Levine, Mark. 1995. *The Jazz Theory Book*. Petaluma: Sher Music.
- Lomax, Alan. 1968. *Folk Song Style and Culture*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Merriam, Alan P. 1964. *The Anthropology of Music*. Evanston/Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- Moutal, Patrick. 1991. *A Comparative Study of Selected Hindustani Raga-s Based on Contemporary Practice*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Muggleston, Erica. 1981. "Guido Adler's 'The Scope, Method, and Aim of Musicology' (1885): An English Translation with an Historico-Analytical Commentary." *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 13: 1-21.
- Nettl, Bruno. 1983. *The Study of Ethnomusicology. Twenty-nine Issues and Concepts*. Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- . 2005. *The Study of Ethnomusicology. Thirty-one Issues and Concepts*. Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Nettl, Bruno and Melinda Russell (eds.). 1998. *In the Course of Performance: Studies in the World of Musical Improvisation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sachs, Curt. 1930. *Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft in ihren Grundzügen*. Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer.
- Simon, Artur. 1978. "Probleme, Methoden und Ziele der Ethnomusikologie." *Jahrbuch für musikalische Volks- und Völkerkunde* 9: 8-52.
- Stęszewski, Jan. 1992. "Zur Geschichte des Terminus 'Ethnomusicology'". In *Von der Vielfalt musikalischer Kultur: Festschrift für Josef Kuckertz*, edited by Rüdiger Schumacher, 527-534. Anif/Salzburg: Müller-Speiser.
- Stock, Jonathan P. J. 2008. "New Directions in Ethnomusicology: Seven Themes toward Disciplinary Renewal." In *The New (Ethno)musicologies*, edited by Henry Stobart, 188-215. Lanham: Scarecrow Press.
- Stumpf, Carl and Erich M[oritz] v[on] Hornbostel. 1922. "Zur Einführung." In *Sammelbände für vergleichende Musikwissenschaft* 1: v-vi. München: Drei Masken.
- Sutton, R. Anderson. 1998. "Do Javanese Gamelan Musicians Really Improvise?" In *In the Course of Performance: Studies in the World of Musical Improvisation*, edited by Bruno Nettl and Melinda Russell, 69-92. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.