Writing against Europe: On the Necessary Decline of Ethnomusicology

Martin Greve / Berlin, Germany

Translated by Férdia J. Stone-Davis / Independent Researcher

Manuscript Editors: Birgit Abels / George-August-Universität Göttingen and Richard Wolf / Harvard University

Peer Reviewer: Thomas Hilder / NTNU (Norwegian University of Science and Technology)

Abstract

In this appraisal of then-current German-speaking ethnomusicology, Martin Greve calls for much more critical acknowledgment and consideration of recent key debates in cultural studies and cultural anthropology. The essay and its provocative title, certainly written in a constructive spirit, hit a trouble spot, fueling the fear of losing ethnomusicology's disciplinary *raison d'être*. A short but telling discussion among German-speaking ethnomusicologists ensued.

Citation: Greve, Martin. *Writing against Europe: On the Necessary Decline of Ethnomusicology*. Translated by Férdia J. Stone-Davis. Ethnomusicology Translations, no. 3. Bloomington, IN: Society for Ethnomusicology, 2016.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14434/emt.v0i3.22461>

Originally published in German as “‘Writing against Europe’: Vom notwendigen Verschwinden der Musikethnologie,” *Musikforschung* 55 (2002): 239-250.

Férdia J. Stone-Davis is an interdisciplinary academic working at the intersection of music, philosophy, and theology, as well as a musician. Publications include the monograph *Musical Beauty: Negotiating the Boundary between Subject and Object* (Cascade, 2011); a co-edited volume titled *The Soundtrack of Conflict: The Role of Music in Radio Broadcasting in Wartime and in Conflict Situations* (Olms, 2013); an edited volume, *Music and Transcendence* (Ashgate, 2015); and an edited special issue of *Contemporary Music Review*, “Home: Creating and Inhabiting Place through Musical Activity” (2015).

Manuscript Editor's Introduction – Birgit Abels

When Martin Greve's text was published in 2004, ethnomusicology in Germany was facing a bleak future—or so many ethnomusicologists thought. Anxieties triggered by the prospect of serious job cutbacks in academia generally, and ethnomusicology especially, abounded. Such anxieties thrived well in a country that had only a handful of professorships in ethnomusicology.

With several of these professors nearing retirement age, visions of the field's future in a country that prides itself as the cradle of Comparative Musicology became increasingly pessimistic. If those few positions in ethnomusicology were to decrease, many thought, this

would soon result in the entire field's institutional extinction in Germany. All too aware of the thick sediment of long-standing mutual resentment between ethnomusicology and historical musicology in Germany, many ethnomusicologists suspected that ethnomusicology positions were going to be eliminated by historical musicology. The reaction to this situation was defensive: Rather than opening up and contributing to discussions that would relate to current international debates in musicology—e.g., issues brought up by the then-New Musicology or even cultural studies—most ethnomusicologists decided to play it safe and continue working along tried-and-true paths. Part of this was holding on to the silent agreement (or at least acceptance) that ethnomusicology was to be the study of European folk music as well as the music of extra-European peoples, inasmuch as they were “not part of high culture ('primitive peoples').”¹ The general opinion was that in the face of future cutbacks, the field had to stand united, no matter what. Hence, two things were not to be questioned—the field's name (ethnomusicology) and the general trajectory it had taken in twentieth-century Germany.

It is this ostrich-like attitude that Martin Greve addresses in his text, calling for critical acknowledgment and consideration of recent key debates in cultural studies and cultural anthropology/“Ethnologie” (a term still used in Germany to describe the field known in the U.S. as cultural anthropology). But his text and its provocative title, certainly written in a constructive spirit, hit a trouble spot, fueling the fear of losing ethnomusicology's disciplinary *raison d'être*. Accordingly, it was rejected quickly—with arguments centering mostly around the need to preserve ethnomusicology institutionally, not arguments addressing Greve's points (Brandl 2003; Klenke et al. 2003).

In the more than ten years since the text was published, a lot has changed in German musicology. For one thing, in 2016 there are more professors of the musics of the world than ever before in the country. Also, the name ethnomusicology no longer serves as a common denominator for the vast field we're discussing. While there are still professors of ethnomusicology (*Ethnomusikologie* or *Musikethnologie* in German), there are also professors of transcultural music studies (Weimar), cultural musicology (Göttingen), and—if we take the German-speaking academic world rather than solely Germany into account—the cultural anthropology of music (Bern, CH). And still, as German ethnomusicology's soul-searching continues, Greve's text remains as current as it was in 2004.

References

- Brandl, Rudolf M. 2003. “Si tacuisses Greve—der notwendige Erhalt der Musikethnologie.” *Die Musikforschung* 56(2):166-171.
- Klenke, Katrin, et al. 2003. “‘Totgesagte leben länger’—Überlegungen zur Relevanz der Musikethnologie.” *Die Musikforschung* 56(3):261-271.

Writing against Europe: On the Necessary Decline of Ethnomusicology

I.

The end of the 1990s awakened debate in Germany over the name of the sub-discipline ethnomusicology² at a time in which there were budgetary constraints on the public purse. The humanities were under pressure to justify themselves to the public while the silent struggle over research resources and institutional facilities within the humanities was increasing in severity. For this reason, there is currently a certain hesitance to argue publicly for a theoretical and practical reorganization of musicology in German ethnomusicology, which like many subjects and sub-disciplines feels especially threatened during such distribution battles. Long-established mutual animosities remain active, especially between ethnomusicologists and music historians. For decades ethnomusicologists felt that German music historians tended to be Eurocentric and arrogant; conversely, many music historians considered ethnomusicologists expendable and their discipline inferior. German ethnomusicologists therefore long demonstrated a need to justify themselves to music historians and compare their objects of study favorably to European art music. The title of this article actually refers to categorical problems which are to be mentioned later but may also be understood as an allusion to this attitude: many ethnomusicologists, unless they completely ignored European music, often wrote implicitly in some measure against it by emphasizing, for instance, the rhythmic richness of African or Indian music in comparison with European music.

By now, however, many former reservations about ethnomusicology have disappeared—a fact buried by the wrangling over finances and positions. Besides, awareness of the importance of interculturality has grown considerably in recent years and decades: since the collapse of east European socialism all major international conflicts have been fought in Asia and public discussion of these is strongly influenced by cultural issues (the Israel-Palestine conflict, the Gulf War, Afghanistan, Kashmir). Migrants from Asia, Africa, and Latin America today are conspicuous in the everyday life of all European metropolises and furthermore there is now a broad consensus that Germany has become a country of immigrants. Since the 1980s even so-called world music has developed from an elitist movement to an economically relevant part of popular music. The Algerian Rai star Cheb Khaled, for example, reached the top of the French pop charts—not only the “world music charts”—in 1996 with the song “Aïcha”; the Turkish pop singer Tarkan shared similar success in many European countries. With the publication of the *Rough Guide: World Music* (now in its second edition, two volumes each with over 700 pages), we find the first reliable and detailed presentation of the whole world’s popular music (in the widest sense) written not for musicologists, but for the popular press.³

Even if many music historians do not feel directly concerned with such contemporary developments in their own academic work, it should at least be acknowledged that the musicological study of globalization and intercultural interaction is inevitable, and that there is a public eager to read about it.

Recently, three main criticisms have been advanced against the term “ethnomusicology”: First, the debate dating back at least to the 1980s concerning the theoretical status of “ethnicity” as a category, and consequently the determination of its influence on music. Second, the frequently expressed claim that global musicology understood in terms of cultural anthropology is not a branch of historical musicology but is

instead a field that encompasses it: the study of European music history, in other words, is a sub-discipline of global musicology. Finally, third, in a post-colonial age there are fundamentally different power relations between Europeans and non-Europeans, between white intellectuals and ones of African, Latin American, and Asian origin. This seemingly inconsequential discussion of terminology actually arises from a series of profound changes within traditional ethnomusicology under the growing influence of “cultural studies” as well as social and cultural anthropology. Ultimately, these disciplinary developments raise questions about the fundamental consequences of globalization for the field of musicology as a whole.

II.

Despite the various elaborated and differentiated methodological attempts to define the field of ethnomusicology,⁴ the following simple formula has remained active in common understanding as well as in academic practice: the topics of study are non-European and non-Western musical traditions.

If we consider, however, the apparently determinable area of what is *not* within the scope of ethnomusicology, namely, European art music, then the problem of the former division becomes clear. Europe can be geographically demarcated by the Atlantic and the Mediterranean on three sides; however, the cultural borders of the East and the Southeast are yet unclear. Moreover, since the seventeenth century, the cultural boundaries of Western Europe no longer make sense: colonies of European settlers and later independent states came into being in North and South America, Asia, Australia, and in the East, from Siberia up to the Pacific coast. New significant artistic music centers did not develop everywhere; but such music centers had not existed everywhere in Europe either. Complex interactions existed between the colonies and the motherlands, and these were further compressed in the nineteenth century and finally in the post-colonial, global, cultural landscape.⁵ Ever since the twentieth century Western art music circulated further in practically all of the world’s big cities. European opera houses and orchestras exist today in Beijing as well as in Mexico City and Cairo; at the same time as the success, for example, of the Kronos Quartet with CDs including *Pieces of Africa* (Elektra Nonesuch, 1992) and *Night Prayers* (Elektra Nonesuch, 1994), African as well as central Asian composers of new music became popular in Europe.

Between predominantly European-oriented music history research and ethnomusicology, which has concentrated on traditional (or, more recently, popular) music forms, such post-colonial developments have hitherto largely fallen through the cracks of musicology.⁶ The extent to which they are overlooked especially in German-speaking countries and in practical musical life is clarified by a brief glance at literature and visual arts, where this is much less the case. What Indian composer, combining European genres with Indian or Arabic forms in art music, could have attained a prominence comparable to that of Indian-British writer Salman Rushdie, with his English-language novels repeatedly referencing Islamic discourse (and who would also be known and understood in the Islamic world)? Also, the awarding policies of the Nobel Prize in Literature have been characterized by post-colonial internationality for years. A similar scenario is evident in the international art scene. The artistic director of the most important German art exhibition this year, the Documenta 11 2002 in Kassel, is Okwui Enwezor, who was born in Kalaba (Nigeria) and trained in New York. The idea, for example, that the Salzburger Festival might in the distant future be hosted by a Nigerian appears meanwhile still quite utopic, but productions of Mozart’s *Einführung aus dem Serail* by the France-based Arab director Francois Abou Salem in Salzburg in 1997 or by the Baghdad-born Israeli director David Mouchtar-Samorai in the

Berlin State Opera 2000 show that in music, or at least in music theater, similar developments are conceivable.

When you shift the definition of “European” or “Western” art music away from geographical features to musical ones, the problems do not diminish. What, for instance, might the music of Beethoven, Cage’s music, and medieval chorales hold in common that would distinguish them from all non-Western music forms? At best one could limit the historical period from 1600 to the early twentieth century and arrive at a unit of some kind, albeit a vague one: polyphonic music that is professionally composed and recorded, shaped by major and minor tonalities, and performed after a series of rehearsals by musicians with a sense of artistic entitlement.⁷ Apart from the fact, however, that the exclusion of old as well as contemporary music for the division of the subject of musicology would hardly be justifiable, it is precisely these fundamental elements of “European,” “Western” musical thinking that have in the meantime entered into most music traditions of the world: consider, for instance, the simple polyphonic accompaniment that has been added to some kinds of traditional music, the staff notation now known almost worldwide, elements of Western music theory, and the aesthetic ideal of absolute music or the idea and the foundational methods of music history.

III.

Nowadays, it has become impossible to meaningfully delineate “Europe” or “the West.” This applies similarly to “other cultures.” “Chinese” music is today playable in all parts of the world: people of Chinese origin live outside of East Asia in many cities of South Asia, North America, and Europe—Chinese opera already has a 150-year history in the city of San Francisco.⁸ In almost all big cities of the world, especially in so-called “global cities” such as New York, London, Paris, Sydney, and Tokyo, complete neighborhoods are characterized today by migrants who have often come from far-flung countries. In many of these ever-growing metropolises a creeping “three-world”-ization is felt, a peripheralization of the center.

To all appearances, the contrast between center and periphery, which in the past referred to the difference between industrial countries and developing countries, can now also be seen within developed countries and especially in big cities.⁹

Extrapolations give reason to expect that towards the end of this century non-Hispanic whites in the USA will total only 40% of the population—that they will be the (for the moment) largest minority instead of the majority, in addition to African Americans (15%), Asians (13%), and Latinos (33%).¹⁰ In the big cities of the USA this situation will occur much earlier; in Los Angeles it is already a reality.

A comparison of the two articles “United States of America” and “USA” in the recently published editions of *Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* and the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* shows the consequent rethinking in musicology. In the *MGG* the treatment of Indian and African American music was fully outsourced, as was the treatment of all forms of popular music.¹¹ Following an account of the historical development of “Western” art music in the USA is a section on “folk music,” which considers almost exclusively the music of those with white European immigrant background.¹² The extent to which this account is constrained is clarified by a glance at the *Grove Music* revised a short time later. Even here, the history of Western art music in North America is summarized by the heading “Art Music.” The second part, “Traditional Music,” is divided as follows: (1)

European American; (2) African American; (3) Hispanic American; (4) Amerindian; (5) Asian American. Each of these divisions is further differentiated by ethnicity (e.g., for Europe: Armenian, Baltic, Bulgarian and Macedonian, Czech and Slovakian, Greek, etc.).¹³ Why is it, though, that this and the first part treat only the history of European-American art music and not Chinese-American art music? In the future this focus will become increasingly difficult to justify.

European societies have also been changed by the permanent establishment of numerically significant ethnic and cultural minorities in the second half of the twentieth century, although less so than the traditional countries of immigration, USA, Canada, and Australia. Some 18 million migrants (and their descendants) live in Europe today; in Germany the proportion of foreign population in urban centers such as Stuttgart, Munich, and Frankfurt is 25 %.

Since the 1960s ethnomusicologists in Germany were expected to travel to a more-or-less distant country, reside among its people and study their culture—typically in a traditional village. They were expected to learn the local language and become familiar with the place by taking part in and observing the everyday culture and musical life. The aim of such field research was the (partial or complete) description of the “music culture” of the respective ethnic group.¹⁴ The field research model developed along the lines of Bronislaw Malinowski’s ethnographic research on the Trobriand Islands (Papua New Guinea) in the 1920s. Malinowski had turned away from the older ethnology whose representatives, so-called armchair-ethnologists, were mainly to be found in their studies at home, analyzing information, artifacts, and recorded music delivered to them by travelers and other informants. These early scholars had never visited the countries of the peoples with whom their research was concerned. Since at least the mid-1950s American ethnomusicology was guided by these research principles and European ethnomusicology followed suit somewhat later. European researchers, in German-speaking countries especially, followed an older norm of fieldwork based on the model of Béla Bartók, whereby the researcher traveled from place to place and only stayed long enough to make musical recordings.

Toward the end of the 1980s, however, cultural anthropologists and ethnographers began to express doubt as to whether it was sufficient to limit one’s examination to the culture and society of a particular place given the contemporary conditions of globalization. In today’s “age of migration,”¹⁵ transnational discourse and “communities” linked by media and travel have a growing role to play. In order to meet the conditions of globalization, George Marcus pleaded for researchers to conduct “multi-sited ethnography” that would include migration paths, communication channels, and trade relations.¹⁶ Ethnomusicological fieldwork has been shifting increasingly to focus on modern, complex societies, especially in big cities.¹⁷

Members of modern diasporas today, unlike classic diasporas such as that of the Jews, are less oriented toward referencing their shared origins or attempting to reunite at some point in the future. Rather they tend to adapt particular cultural features of their imaginary homeland to the real local circumstances of their everyday lives. Diaspora in this sense “is defined, not by essence or purity, but by the recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity; by a conception of ‘identity’ which lives with and through, not despite, difference.”¹⁸ Gisela Welz used the phrase “Moving Targets,” following Arjun Appadurai and Carol Breckenridge, to refer to the shifting challenges in conducting ethnographic fieldwork.¹⁹

It is possible that a place still exists somewhere on the planet without radio, television, and cassette players, without considerable contact with neighboring villages and cities, and an orchestra somewhere in Europe that performs the music of local composers

exclusively without employing musicians from abroad. As a result of globalization both cases would be rare exceptions.

IV.

The core theoretical problem behind the developments outlined above is the dissolution of the holistic concept of culture. Traditional ethnologists (or ethnomusicologists) usually assumed that the villages they examined were typical of a specific culture, specific musicians more-or-less typical of particular musical cultures. Culture was thereby considered delimitable, historically more-or-less stable, principally a closed system, as relatively consistent and corresponding to a geographical space: “In this [holistic] view of ‘culture-as-an-integrated-whole,’ a deep logic is seen as linking the traits. Any disturbance in this unity is expected to result in crisis, breakdown or degeneration.”²⁰ In general, the borders of a specific culture were not thematized further, the spaces between cultures were interpreted as historically unstable exceptions or as a movement from one cultural system to another.²¹ This century-long taken-for-granted holistic concept of culture was increasingly brought into question in the 1990s—as was the de facto identification of ethnicity and (music) culture.

The term “ethnicity” was defined for decades in terms of presumed similarities in culture: language, tradition, religion, history, or race. But in 1969 Fredrik Barth shifted attention to boundaries between ethnic groups.²² For Barth ethnic identity was conceivable only in terms of one group interacting with others. According to Barth, what came to be the defining cultural characteristics of an “in” group emerged only through members of that group comparing themselves with groups they perceived as “different.” Ethnicities and other social groups such as nations and religious communities, then, are no longer understood today as unchanging almost natural facts, but rather as “imagined communities”²³ with situational and time-dependent identities. Even the emergence of new ethnicities, relatively conscious shifts of specific ethnicity or subsequent ethnic or cultural reinterpretations, can be accounted for with such situational concepts of social and cultural identity.²⁴

You go round the entire globe: when you know what everybody else is, then you are what they are not. Identity is always, in that sense, a structured representation which only achieves its positive through the narrow eye of the negative. It has to go through the eye of the needle of the other before it can construct itself.²⁵

In order to generate the idea of a particular community, a nation, a religious community, or an ethnic group, and to defend its importance over that of other imagined communities, a convincing representation of similarities of origin, language, culture, and history is required. Identities become operative mainly due to representation via distinctive cultural symbols: through, for instance, staging supposedly authentic traditions (“invented traditions”),²⁶ employing such new emblems as flags or logos that had been deliberately invented and institutionalized, and semi-conscious interpretations and instrumentalizations of costumes and other pre-existing artifacts. Music can also in this sense be used as an identity marker and means of drawing boundaries for all kinds of identity—individual, conscious and unconscious—most noticeably when music is used politically.²⁷ This political function is most evident in the case of national anthems, but even ideas of “folk songs,” “folk music,” and “national music style” more generally are unmistakably marked by identity discourses and their representations. The same is true for particular instruments considered to be typical for one or another genre, key melodic or singing

styles, and such stereotypical attitudes as “Italians love music” or “Africans dance well.”

Music is conceived either as an essential means for the establishment of “social order” and the developments of cultural identity, or as an important way through which members of rival groups (demarcated by social classes, gender, ethnic and linguistic affiliation, etc.) develop their sense of belonging and express their specificity.²⁸

The supposedly natural cohesion of cultures is now regarded ultimately as something imaginary: “Not cultural entities encountering each other, but people—each with their particular cultural references and associated discourses and practices.”²⁹ Culture is in this sense a dynamic process of social negotiation that expresses and marks an individual, but not necessarily consistent, identity patchwork.

It may be useful to think of culture as assemblages of traits, as long as we do not assume that these traits all need to be arranged in a given way or that they must make sense with each other. Many traits are packed together, new ones are borrowed, others abandoned, some traits become popular and spread over a wide area, while others remain localized.³⁰

Especially in the big metropolises of the world today the most diverse (ethnic, religious, regional, national, and cultural) identities encounter one another, often competing or overlapping with one another and forming a complex identity patchwork.³¹ Individual leeway in the design of the identity patchwork depends on personal origin, local and medial socio-cultural environments and identity discourses, and the mutual compatibility of these discourses; the uses of music in these senses, moreover, depends on the availability of music in a particular context and its previous location in other discourses of identity. The interaction among identity discourses, with their respective ideas about music and the concrete possibilities of musical life in a place—musical training, performance possibilities, etc.—are hugely diverse. Current examples of musical representations of post-colonial identity patchworks are British-Indian Bhangra and Asian Underground, French-Algerian Rai, assorted Turkish-German music mixes, East Asian Karaoke, and the diverse regional manifestations of global Hip Hop.³²

As scholars shifted away from holistic cultural concepts, they adopted new conceptions of cultural practice as “collage” (or “bricolage”).³³ In 1987 Ulf Hannerz spoke about Creole culture with a metaphor borrowed from linguistics: “Creole cultures like creole languages are those which draw in some way on two or more historical sources, often originally widely different.”³⁴ For several years, the by-and-large synonymous term “hybrid,” borrowed from biology, was particularly fashionable.³⁵ The problem with both terms, and also with unavoidably overused (also in the present text) hyphenated terms (such as Chinese-American) is that they likewise divide complex cultural practices into two entities, and thereby ultimately again imply a closed starting culture. An equally practical and theoretically satisfying way out of this ongoing terminological problem has not yet presented itself.³⁶

Instead of searching for music that might be typical of a particular ethnic group or culture, it seems more meaningful today to investigate the complex interaction of such different fields of discourse as religion, nationalism, aesthetics, and technical discussion of music, and the impact these discourses register locally,

regionally, and globally. Only very rarely today do musical differentiations of style actually coincide with ethnicities.

In recent ethnomusicology Appadurai's much quoted model, which replaces rigid, holistically understood cultures with overlapping "scapes" ("ethnoscapes," "ideoscapes," etc.) could, modified and expanded, point out new ways for a future overview of global music development.³⁷ However, the simple division of the world's music into a few tangible musical cultures seems to be irretrievably lost.

With the dissolution of the holistic concept of culture yet another feature of the traditional definition of ethnomusicology has become obsolete: the basic assumption of writing about the "other" from a culturally safer vantage point. Today, we can no longer clearly define either the "we" or the "other."³⁸ Since the beginning of the 1980s this crisis of representation was discussed in ethnology; the anthology *Writing Culture*, edited by James Clifford and George Marcus, was particularly influential.³⁹ Clifford criticized the overt discrepancy between the chaotic and profoundly individual experience of fieldwork and the subsequent claim that one could account for and describe a "foreign culture" in its entirety. Actually, in earlier days, ethnologists could simply describe "their people" with impartiality and without trouble, the way they personally considered appropriate; criticism, if any, was to be expected only from colleagues. Those who were researched did not know what image of them was distributed in the distant European world; they could not fight it anyway. In particular, Edward Said brought to light the extent to which such ethnological and orientalist representations were shaped by political, military, and economic European dominance. Increasingly, this attitude has been discredited as late colonialist and paternalistic.⁴⁰ Scholars of non-Western origin in particular, whom Lila Abu-Lughod has called "halfies," often stress the exclusionary character of ethnology, and especially holistic definitions of culture: "Culture is the essential tool for making other,"⁴¹ stated Abu-Lughod, and Werner Schiffauer observed:

The ethnologist no longer writes about "others" that are far away but those others who are present. . . . [They] read the representations of them written by cultural anthropologists . . . They give ethnologists immediate feedback and themselves take part in the discussion.⁴²

Not only is musicology now established in practically all countries of the world, but so also is ethnomusicology—even when not named as such. In the 1970s or 1980s the even more provocative-sounding question of whether or not a Mexican Beethoven scholar can be called an ethnomusicologist in the same way as can a Japanese researcher of Arabia (although perhaps less-so a Chinese researcher of China) sounds rather absurd today: with the background of the globalized present, such special cases long ago became the norm. Incidentally a church musician of the fifteenth century is from the perspective of the twenty-first century probably already at least as "other" as a Cuban rapper or a contemporary Chinese composer (of whichever style and whatever country of residence).

In the meantime, the mistrust of the paternalistic attitude of traditional ethnology has led to a general rejection of this production of images of "others" as an exclusionary practice, sometimes to the extent that the mere assumption of cultural difference would seem suspicious.⁴³ Abu-Lughod pleaded instead for an "ethnography of the particular";⁴⁴ she turned Clifford's more cautiously descriptive "writing culture" into the more proactive "writing against culture."

V.

The more that complex, modern cities replace traditional villages as the main field sites for ethnomusicologists and the more traditional notions of culture and ethnicity are brought into question by post-colonial realities, the more difficult it becomes to conceive of the approaches, methods, and concepts of ethnomusicology as distinguishing marks of a cohesive field. At the same time, the sub-disciplines of musicology (music history, ethnomusicology, systematic musicology, popular music research) have been making great strides toward one another for quite a while now. Ethnomusicology has always been more of a melting pot than a halfway clearly definable subject, but today it is hardly possible to justify differentiating between such sub-disciplines as music sociology and popular music research. Fieldwork and participant observation are (with appropriate research questions) just as useful in relation to the German techno scene as to Jewish wedding music in Brooklyn or to Kurdish songwriters in Istanbul. The same applies, conversely (again depending on the appropriate research question), for the empirical quantitative methods that traditional ethnomusicologists have hitherto rejected. Musically, in most parts of the world, the boundaries between popular music, art music, and traditional music are fictive anyway. In Brazil, for example, practically every form of popular music is influenced by traditional music, contemporary Western music by popular music, and finally—popularized anyway—traditional music by Western elements. Ethnomusicology and music psychology stood for decades, especially methodologically, side-by-side uncomprehendingly; yet they originated together around 1900 in Germany (the initiator in both cases was Carl Stumpf) and the key issues of both disciplines remain interconnected until today. In general psychology the rise of cross-cultural psychology began in the 1970s; in the future a further opening up of cross-cultural psychology of music is to be expected. Here, as in many other ethnomusicological fields of work, computer-based analysis plays an ever more important role. And finally historical studies have been a natural outgrowth of ethnomusicological research since the 1960s. Here too the division between music history and ethnomusicology is hard to justify.

Therefore, the debate about a more current term for what has been called ethnomusicology as a whole has been too short. The insistence on a disciplinary sub-domain devoted to non-Western, non-European music—an idea which has little institutional support in German-speaking countries anyway—bypasses the realities of a globalized, post-colonial world. To regard ethnomusicology as a sub-discipline of musicology is to assume that European music deserves special treatment in the musical landscape of this planet. This assumption is however no longer tenable. The Indian historian Dipesh Chakrabarty called the project of post-colonial historical research “Provincializing Europe,” and especially in musicology, with its decidedly lofty image of Europe, such a deconstruction is urgently needed.⁴⁵ The global present and history in its totality, not just the imaginary Europe, will in future be the starting point for all kinds of historical, sociological, psychological, anthropological, and music analytical investigations of music and music traditions. The traditional research areas of ethnomusicology are about to disappear—and with them the subject called ethnomusicology. No renaming will be able to halt this decline. What is needed instead is a remodeling of musicology, with all of its sub-disciplines, towards interculturality. Of course, this does not mean that any music historian ought to thereby feel coerced to justify his still-relevant research topic against supposedly more

exotic ones. What is necessary is simply acceptance of the fact that the study of African rhythm and new North American compositions for percussion, as well as research on Chinese or European music manuscripts from the tenth century, and popular French or Cuban music in the early twentieth century have equal rights. The subject matter of musicology is music—without geographical, historical, and stylistic circumscription.

Notes

¹ “Die Musikethnologie (oder “Ethnomusikologie”) hat einerseits Untersuchungen zur europäischen Volksmusik, andererseits Forschungen zur Musik außereuropäischer Völker, soweit diese nicht einer Hochkultur zuzurechnen sind (“Naturvölker”), zum Gegenstand.” Study program description of the Musicology Department, University of Mainz, <http://www.musikwissenschaft.uni-mainz.de/musikwissenschaft/studium/studieninhalte.htm> (accessed 17 December 2015). The University of Mainz does not have a chair in ethnomusicology; this definition, according to the website, is however based on one of the main textbooks in German musicology: Nicole Schwindt-Gross, *Musikwissenschaftliches Arbeiten: Hilfsmittel, Techniken, Aufgaben* (Kassel, 2014).—Ed.

² Philip V. Bohlman, “Ethnomusicology, III Post-1945 Developments,” in *NGroveD2*, vol. 8 (London, 2001), 378-86 (385-86). The term was first coined after the Second World War, cf. Carole Pegg, “Ethnomusicology, I Introduction,” *ibid.*, 367-68.

³ Cf. German edition, Simon Broughton, ed., *Weltmusik* (Stuttgart, 2000).

⁴ See example in Artur Simon, “Musikethnologie, IV Musikethnologie heute,” in *MGG2*, Sachteil, vol. 6 (Kassel, 1997), col. 1280-88 (1281).

⁵ Veit Erlmann, *Music, Modernity and Global Imagination: South Africa and the West* (New York, 1999).

⁶ Examples of exceptions are mentioned by Harrison Ryker, ed., *New Music in the Orient: Essays on Compositions in Asia since World War II*, Source Materials in Ethnomusicology, vol. 2 (Buren, 1991); the special issue “Zentrum? Peripherie?,” *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 158 (1997); or the special issue “Views of Music in China Today,” *Asian Music* 22, no. 2 (1991).

⁷ Cf. Bruno Nettl, *The Western Impact on World Music* (New York, 1985), 5.

⁸ Ronald Riddle, *Chinatown’s Music: A History and Ethnography of Music and Music-Drama in San Francisco’s Chinese Community* (Ann Arbor, 1976).

⁹ Saskia Sassen, *Metropolen des Weltmarktes: Die Neue Rolle der Global Cities* (Frankfurt am Main, 1997 [1994]), 163.

¹⁰ Remco van Capelleveen, “E pluribus unum? Einwanderung, Ethnizität und Minderheiten in den USA,” in *USA: Wirtschaft, Gesellschaft, Politik*, ed. Hartmut Wasser (Opladen, 2000), 337-81 (365).

¹¹ Michael Saffle, “Vereinigte Staaten von Amerika: Historischer Abriß,” in *MGG2*, Sachteil, vol. 9 (Kassel, 1998), col. 1355-56.

¹² Philip Bohlman, “Volksmusik,” *ibid.*, col. 1382-89.

¹³ Philip Bohlman et al., “USA, II Traditional Music,” in *NGroveD2*, vol. 26 (London, 2001), 87-113.

¹⁴ James Clifford, “Über ethnographische Autorität,” in *Kultur, soziale Praxis, Text: Die Krise der ethnographischen Repräsentation*, ed. Eberhard Berg and Martin Fuchs (Frankfurt am Main, 1995), 109-157 (122).

¹⁵ Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller, *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World* (New York, 1993).

¹⁶ George M. Marcus, “Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24 (1995): 95-117, quoted in Gisela Welz, “Moving Targets,” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 94, no. 2 (1998): 177-94 (183); James Clifford, “Travelling Cultures,” in *Cultural Studies*, ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler (New York, 1992), 96-112.

¹⁷ Bruno Nettl, *Eight Urban Musical Cultures* (Urbana, 1978).

¹⁸ Stuart Hall, “Cultural Identity and Diaspora,” in *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, ed. Jonathan Rutherford (London, 1990), 222-37 (235); James Clifford, “Diasporas,” *Cultural Anthropology* 9, no. 3 (1994): 302-338.

¹⁹ Gisela Welz, “Moving Targets,” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 94, no. 2 (1998): 177-94; Carol Breckenridge and Arjun Appadurai, “On Moving Targets,” *Public Culture* 1, no. 2 (1989): i-iv.

²⁰ Ayse Çağlar, *German Turks in Berlin: Migration and their Quest for Social Mobility* (PhD diss., McGill University, 1994), 20.

- ²¹ Musicology took over the anthropological concept of acculturation to describe such processes only in the 1960s, almost thirty years late. "Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups" (R. Redfield, R. Linton, and M. J. Herskovits, "Memorandum on the Study of Acculturation," *American Anthropologist* 38 (1936): 149-52 (149)). See also Klaus Wachsmann, "Criteria for Acculturation," in *Report of the Eighth Congress of the International Musicological Society*, vol. 1, ed. Jan LaRue (Kassel and London, 1961), 139-49; George List, "Acculturation and Musical Tradition," *Journal of the International Folk Music Council* 16 (1964): 18-21.
- ²² Fredrik Barth, "Introduction," in *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Bergen, 1969), cited in Werner Sollors, ed., *Theories of Ethnicity: A Classical Reader* (Houndsmills, 1996), 294-324.
- ²³ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1983); German translation: *Die Erfindung der Nation: Zur Karriere eines erfolgreichen Konzeptes* (Frankfurt am Main, 1988).
- ²⁴ Werner Sollors, *The Invention of Ethnicity* (Oxford, 1989).
- ²⁵ Stuart Hall, "The Local and the Global: Globalisation and Ethnicity," in *Culture, Globalisation and the World System*, ed. Anthony King (London, 1991), 21.
- ²⁶ Eric Hobsbawm, "Inventing Traditions," in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge, 1983), 1-14.
- ²⁷ Olle Edström, "From Schotties to Bonnjazz: Some Remarks on the Construction of Swedishness," *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 31 (1999): 27-41; Sophie Chevalier, "'Tradition Musicale' et Construction Identitaire: L'Exemple Portugais en Région Parisienne," in *Das Fremde in der Gesellschaft: Migration, Ethnizität und Staat*, ed. Hans-Rudolf Winkler et al. (Zurich, 1996), 61-74; Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, "Theorizing Heritage," *Ethnomusicology* 39 (1995): 367-380; Martin Stokes, *Ethnicity, Identity and Music: The Musical Construction of Place* (Oxford and Providence, 1994); Owe Ronström, "'I'm Old and I'm Proud!' Dance and the Formation of a Cultural Identity Among Pensioners in Sweden," *The World of Music* 36, no. 3 (1994): 5-30; Christopher Alan Waterman, "'Our Tradition is a Very Modern Tradition': Popular Music and the Construction of Pan-Yoruba Identity," *Ethnomusicology* 34 (1990): 367-79; James D. Chopyak, "The Role of Music in Mass Media, Public Education and the Formation of a Malaysian National Culture," *Ethnomusicology* 31 (1987): 413-52; Ricardo Trimillos, "Music and Ethnic Identity: Strategies among Overseas Filipino Youth," *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 18 (1986): 9-20.
- ²⁸ Line Grenier, "From 'Diversity' to 'Difference': The Case of Socio-Cultural Studies in Music," *New Formations* 3 (1989): 125-42 (126).
- ²⁹ Martin Fuchs, *Kampf um Differenz: Repräsentation, Subjektivität und soziale Bewegungen, Das Beispiel Indien* (Frankfurt am Main, 1999), 16.
- ³⁰ Jérôme Rousseau, *Central Borneo: Ethnic Identity and Social Life in a Stratified Society* (Oxford, 1990), 48, cited in Çağlar, *German Turks in Berlin*, 32.
- ³¹ Heiner Keupp et al., *Identitäts-Konstruktionen: Das Patchwork der Identitäten in der Spätmodern* (Reinbek, 1999).
- ³² Sanjay Sharma, John Hutnyk, and Ashwani Sharma, eds., *Dis-Orienting Rhythms: The Politics of the New Asian Chinese America* (Mahwah, NJ, 1996); Martin Greve, "Alevitische und musikalische Identitäten in Deutschland," *Zeitschrift für Türkeistudien* 13, no. 2 (2000): 213-38; George Lipsitz, *Dangerous Crossroads: Popmusik, Postmoderne und die Poesie des Lokalen* (St. Andrä-Wördern, 1999 [1994]).
- ³³ "People draw on available resources, reshape them for current needs (bricolage), reevaluate, and start over, building a culture day by day" (Mark Slobin, "Micromusics of the West: A Comparative Approach," *Ethnomusicology* 36 (1992): 1-87 (61)).
- ³⁴ Ulf Hannerz, "The World in Creolization," *Africa* 57, no. 4 (1987): 546-59 (552).
- ³⁵ Jan Nederveen Pieterse, "Globalization as Hybridization," in *Global Modernities*, ed. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson (London, 1995), 45-68; Homi K. Bhabha, "The Third Space," in *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, ed. Jonathan Rutherford (London, 1990), 207-21; Margaret J. Kartomi, "The Process and Results of Musical Culture Contact: A Discussion of Terminology and Concepts," *Ethnomusicology* 31 (1987): 227-49.
- ³⁶ Ayşe Çağlar, "Hyphenated Identities and the Limits of 'Culture,'" in *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism, Identity and Community*, ed. Tariq Modood and Prina Werbner (London, 1997), 169-85.
- ³⁷ Arjun Appadurai, "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Economy," *Public Culture* 2, no. 2 (1990): 1-24.
- ³⁸ Line Grenier and Jocelyne Guilbault, "Authority Revisited: The 'Other' in Anthropology and Popular Music Studies," *Ethnomusicology* 34 (1990): 381-97 (383).

- ³⁹ James Clifford and George Marcus, eds., *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley, 1986); Sabine Schupp, *Die Ethnologie und ihr koloniales Erbe: Ältere und neuere Debatten um die Entkolonialisierung einer Wissenschaft* (Munster, 1997), 63 ff.
- ⁴⁰ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York, 1978); James Clifford, "Introduction: Partial Truths," in *Writing Culture*, Clifford and Marcus, 1-16; Fuchs, *Kampf um Differenz*.
- ⁴¹ Lila Abu-Lughod, "Writing against Culture," in *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, ed. Richard G. Fox (Santa Fe, 1991), 137-62 (143).
- ⁴² Werner Schiffauer, "Die Angst vor der Differenz: Zu neuen Strömungen in der Kulturanthropologie," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 92, no. 1 (1996): 20-31.
- ⁴³ Ibid.; Martin Fuchs and Eberhard Berg, "Phänomenologie der Differenz: Reflexionsstufen ethnographischer Repräsentation," in *Kultur, soziale Praxis, Text*, Berg and Fuchs, 11-108.
- ⁴⁴ In ethnomusicology this approach is used, for example, in the special issue "Ethnomusicology and the Individual" of *The World of Music* 43, no. 1 (2001).
- ⁴⁵ Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, 2000).