Disorienting Race

Humanizing the Musical Savage and the Rise of British Ethnomusicology

Bennett Zon
Durham University

Although definitions of orientalism and racism seldom achieve consensus, the significance of their interplay is universally acknowledged amongst theorists of non-Western cultures. Tony Ballantyne, in his recent *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire*, describes their relationship in terms of mutuality,[1] and Ziauddin Sardar, in *Orientalism*, describes them as 'circles within circles'.[2] Edward Said, of course, deals with their relationship exhaustively in *Orientalism*, and describes them as inextricably linked. Writing of the nineteenth century, he suggests that 'Theses of Oriental backwardness, degeneracy, and inequality with the West most easily associated themselves early in the nineteenth century with ideas about the biological bases of racial inequality.'[3]

Unsurprisingly, this same recognition appears in what Joep Bor calls the 'intellectual history of ethnomusicology'.[4] As he shows in 'The Rise of Ethno-

1 Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism and the British Empire* (Basingstoke, 2002), 14.

2 Ziauddin, Sardar, *Orientalism* (Buckingham, 1999), 49.

3 Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London, 1978), 206.

4 Joep Bor, 'The Rise of Ethnomusicological Sources on Indian Music c. 1780–c.1890', *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 20/1 (1988): 51. The use of the term 'ethnomusicology' as applied to work before 1950 is hotly disputed. The term appears to have originated in Jaap Kunst's *Musicologica: A Study of the Nature of Ethno-musicology, its Problems, Methods and Representative Personalities* (Amsterdam, 1950), but it is used by many musicologists and ethnomusicologists, such as Bor, loosely to describe work from a much earlier date, in some instances as early as the 1550s. Other sources for this type of usage include Frank Harrison, *Time, Place and Music: An Anthology of Ethnomusicological Observation c. 1550 to c. 1800* (Amsterdam, 1973); Stephen Blum, 'European Musical Terminology and the Music of Africa', in *Comparative Musicology and Anthropology of Music: Essays on the History of Ethnomusicology*, ed. Bruno Nettl and Philip Bohlman (Chicago and London, 1991), 3–36; and Helen Myers, 'Introduction', in *Ethnomusicology: Historical and Regional Studies*, ed. Helen Myers, The Norton/Grove Handbooks in Music (New York and London, 1993), 3–15. Helen Myers writes (p. 4) that 'What we now call ethnomusicology began long before that term was invented', citing reference to European folk, North American and Chinese music in Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Dictionnaire de musique* (1768), as well as in travel literature, missionary or civil servant reports including Chinese music by Jean-Baptiste du Halde (1735) and Joseph Amiot (1779); Arab music by Guillaume André Villoteau (1809–22) and Raphael Kiesewetter (1842); Indian music by Jones (1784) and Charles Russell Day (1891); and Japanese music by Francis Taylor Piggott (1893).

Nineteenth-Century Music Review, 3/1(2006): 25–43.

musicology', the 'Oriental Renaissance', from its beginnings in the late eighteenth century, right through to the middle part of the last century, was intimately bound up with countering racial attitudes translated into orientalist critiques of non-Western music. As such, this feature characterized the development of ethnomusicology as much on the Continent as it did in England, and therefore directly informs the periods to be discussed in this essay, namely the 1780s to the 1930s. Thus, in contradistinction to prevailing attitudes in musical research of the time, in 1784 the earliest figure in British ethnomusicology, the vastly talented philologist William Jones, could remark that Indian music is 'a happy and beautiful contrivance'.[5] Like Bor, Anthony Seeger comments on early ethnomusicologists, saying that they recognize, and also epitomize, the need to disaggregate questions of race from the study of non-Western musical cultures. The ethnomusicologist A.H. Fox Strangways, founder of *Music and Letters* and copious writer on Indian music, is especially singled out for praise, as one of the first modern ethnomusicologists to debunk Western orientalist concepts of the linguistic universalism of music.[6] These, of course, deprive non-Western musical cultures of their individual identity. Fox Strangways, author of *The Music of Hindustan* (1914), writes that 'Music has been called a universal language, and no doubt, in the deepest sense, it is. But just as no one language can be really common to all peoples because it will be pronounced differently in different mouths, so the very same notes will be sung by different throats in such a way as to be unrecognizable to us.'[7]

This fundamental consciousness and acceptance of difference, embedded in early ethnomusicological praxis, is something that Philip Bohlman comments upon when delineating the various strata of ethnomusicological investigation today. Accordingly, we begin with scientific observation, and move to experimentation, fieldwork, and lastly to the acknowledgement of ourselves in the Other and the Other in ourselves.[8] This last point, of critical self-reflexivity, is at the historical root of disorienting race. It is by achieving parity of cultural identity that the Western orientalist presumptions of Eastern inferiority could, by the end of the nineteenth century, be subsumed into increasingly equalizing racial discourses. In this sense, Philip Bohlman is the inheritor of a well-established ethnomusicological tradition. Where, within ethnomusicology, Fox Strangways codifies the idea of universalism within the culturally distinct, Bohlman embraces the culturally distinct as a medium for establishing universal ethnomusicological truths. Thus, rather than focusing on *what* the historical ethnomusicologist studies, Bohlman, like many others, looks at '*how* they represented it'.[9]

This approach, of *how* rather than *what*, or what Bohlman calls *re*presentation rather than presentation, is in many ways the modern realization of an early twentieth-century racial concept that the psychological historian Graham Richards calls 'cultural adaptationism', essentially the view that all human sensory acuities

5 Sir William Jones, 'On the Musical Modes of the Hindoos: Written in 1784, and since much enlarged, By the President [of the Asiatic Society of Bengal]', reprinted in Sourindro Mohun Tagore, *Hindu Music* (Delhi, 1882/1994), 131.

6 Anthony Seeger, 'Styles of Musical Ethnography', in *Comparative Musicology and Anthropology of Music*, ed. Nettl and Bohlman, 351.

7 A. H. Fox Strangways, *The Music of Hindustan* (Oxford, 1914), 181.

8 Philip Bohlman, 'Representation and Cultural Critique in the History of Ethnomusicology', in *Comparative Musicology and Anthropology of Music*, ed. Nettl and Bohlman, 139.

9 Ibid., 138.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000331 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(whether primitive or civilized) are culturally adapted rather than innate. In Britain as elsewhere, this represented the last step among psychologists, anthropologists and ethnomusicologists, in disentangling institutionalized orientalism from issues of race, and ultimately in situating non-Western musics within a more modern cultural hermeneutic. As Richards indicates, cultural adaptationism also represented a direct assault on the previously indomitable 'Spencerian hypothesis'. This is the belief that 'primitives' surpassed 'civilized' people in psychophysical performance because they retained more energy for rudimentary functions. The hypothesis continued unabated until the publication of the *Reports* of the 1898 Torres Straits Expedition, for which the psychologist and ethnomusicologist Charles Samuel Myers (1873–1946) was resident music specialist. In the *Reports* Myers and his colleagues discount the Spencerian hypothesis so effectively that genuine race difference could not be promulgated with any confidence, and eventually, Myers, like many of his peers in England and America, assumed the more 'politically correct' position of cultural adaptationism. As Richards says, 'The contrast between experimental performance (showing little "racial" difference) and real-life performance (conforming to the "savage superiority" stereotype) led … Myers to conclude that these latter signified learned adaptation to the demands of "primitive" life'.[10] This conclusion had the immediate effect of undermining orientalist conceptions of non-Western inferiority, by its association with the racialist discourse of the Spencerian hypothesis, a fact borne out in Myers's slightly later paper, 'On the Permanence of Mental Racial Differences' (1911).[11] From a musicological standpoint, it enabled Myers to conceive of the musical 'savage' as more human than racial, and as more universal than ethnic. From a psychological standpoint, these ideas evolved into theories of individual human differences, which, in Myers's terms, banished the question of race entirely.

This article essentially examines the origins of British ethnomusicology from the 1780s to its professional founding at the turn of the twentieth century. I will suggest that some writers strove to contradict culturally dismissive norms of musicological orientalism from the start, leading to the point when notions of cultural adaptationism and individual differences made their appearance. Far from entrenching orientalism, as Said might have us believe, early ethnomusicologists dismantle orientalism altogether. They remove orientalism from the orient, or 'disorient'. Later ethnomusicologists, from the late nineteenth century, do much the same with racism. Through the rise of cultural adaptationism and individual differences, they effectively remove racism from ethnological studies of race. By the beginning of the twentieth century, one might argue, ethnomusicology had effectively disentangled musicologically institutionalized orientalism and racism, and had removed any last remnant of orientalist racism from its own prevailing theoretical praxis. Indeed, by disorientalizing early in its history, and deracializing in its later history, ethnomusicology was finally able to 'disorient race', and ultimately fulfil its self-imposed obligation to humanize the musical savage.

10 Graham Richards, 'Getting a result: the Expedition's psychological research 1898–1913', in *Cambridge and the Torres Strait: Centenary Essays on the 1898 Anthropological Expedition*, ed. Anita Herle and Sandra Rouse (Cambridge, 1998), 148.

11 Charles Samuel Myers, 'On the Permanence of Racial Mental Differences', in *Papers on Inter-Racial Problems Communicated to the First Universal Races Congress Held at The University of London July 26–29, 1911*, ed. G. Spiller (London and Boston, 1911), 73–9.

Disorienting the Orient

As Frank Harrison shows in *Time, Place and Music*, prejudice towards non-Western music is recorded as early as the seventeenth century. Writing about this in 1973, just before Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), Harrison, like so many theorists of the period, admonishes ethnomusicologists to define their own objectivity, for this

> may not always be complemented by the degree of positive intellectual engagement and penetration that is necessary for unbiased understanding and non-assumptive exposition … Bias may be involved not only through social, intellectual and technical pre-suppositions, for example, irrelevant concepts of 'purity' or 'progress', but also in project-stereotypes …[12]

This bias – or the lack of functional objectivity – finds its cultural-theoretical analogue in the orientialism of Edward Said, amongst others. Said, in 'Shattered Myths', an important pre-*Orientalism* article, defines orientalism in terms of a Barthian trap, in which the idea of the Oriental and the Orientalist – or the written about, and the writer – coalesce into a self-perpetuating mythology. As he says, 'The Oriental is given as fixed, stable, in need of investigation, and in need even of knowledge about himself … There is a source of information (the Oriental) and a source of knowledge (the Orientalist): in short, a writer and subject matter otherwise inert.'[13] Although highly debated in more recent writings on orientalism, this level of fixity is something that one recognizes throughout Harris's book, and it is certainly an easily identifiable component in early British writings on non-Western music. Burney and Hawkins are prime examples. Burney talks of non-Western music as 'noise and jargon'[14] or as 'hideous and astonishing sounds'.[15] Even William Stafford, author of *A History of Music* (1830), and one of the first historians purported to redress the racism of Burney and Hawkins, remains 'fixed', to use Said's term, in an orientalist inertia. He writes, for example, that 'What we learn of the natives of the islands of the Pacific, when they were discovered by Captain Cook, equally proves the rudeness and simplicity of the music of savage tribes';[16] and later still: 'The music of the Friendly Islanders is as uncouth and barbarous now as when they were visited by Captain Cook.'[17]

Strangely, this fixity begins to loosen at roughly the same time as it was being further entrenched by Burney and Hawkins in the late eighteenth century. In this case, however, it is not through conventional encyclopaedic musicology, but through the aegis of philology and the work of Sir William Jones, founder and president of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Jones's treatise, 'On the Musical Modes of the Hindoos' (1784), is generally recognized amongst historical ethnomusicologists as the first treatise to emblemize a shift in conventional orientalist prejudice towards non-Western music evidenced in Burney, Hawkins and later Stafford. Gerry Farrell, in

12 Harrison, *Time, Place and Music*, 1–2.

13 Edward Said, 'Shattered Myths', in *Orientalism: A Reader*, ed. A.L. Macfie (Edinburgh, 2000), 92–3.

14 Charles Burney, *A General History of Music from the Earliest Ages to the Present Period. To which is Prefixed, a Dissertation on the Music of the Ancients*, 4 vols (London, 1789), 703.

15 John Hawkins, 'Preface', *A General History of the Science and Practice of Music* (London, 1776).

16 William C. Stafford, *A History of Music* (Edinburgh and London, 1830), 6.

17 Ibid., 7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000331 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Indian Music and the West (1997) cites Jones's ability to translate key musical texts, and to use them in conjunction with the transcription of music, however Westernized.[18] In some ways, despite this, Farrell is rather critical of Jones, claiming that he focused on textual history to the exclusion of current practice, and thereby denied unrecorded Indian musical history almost 160 years of influence up to his time.[19] As a result, Jones's findings skew unwittingly towards much the same orientalist preconceptions he will have tried to eschew in his peers. In Saidian terms, he is in the Orient/Orientalist trap – that intrinsic conceptual mantle in which all cultural theoreticians are clothed.

Nevertheless, Jones is significant, precisely because he is recognized as the first scholar of non-Western music, and as such the earliest to have set Western and non-Western music on a level playing field. Writing of the relationship of poetry and music, for example, he claims that 'the *Hindoo* poets never fail to change the *metre*, which is their *mode*, according to the change of subject or sentiment in the same piece; and I could produce instances of *poetical modulation* (if such a phrase may be used) at least equal to the most affecting modulations of our greatest composers: now the musician must naturally have emulated the poet, as every translator endeavours to resemble his original'.[20] Here, as elsewhere, however, Jones utilizes East/West comparison to evoke a sense of aesthetic parity, and in so doing manifestly fails to conform to conventional Saidian terms of orientalism. He resists hierarchical and cultural predispositions, and seeks to relate and differentiate, to *re*present and present, to compare and contrast. In post-Saidian terms, he escapes the Orient/Orientalist trap. He disorients orientalism.

The Cultural and Interdisciplinary Lynchpin

One of the ways in which Jones escapes the Orient/Orientalist trap is to use music as a means of undermining conventions of cultural discourse that render civilization a Western accomplishment and, by definition, a non-Western failure. This maledictive commonplace, which Jones and others after him sought to destabilize, has as much to do with the troublesome and early relationship of musicology to anthropology as it does the frequently oppositional relationship of anthropology to other intellectual disciplines of the period. In other words, it is fully emblematic of the problematizing discourse of anthropological and musicological interdisciplinarity.

Acknowledgement of the historically embedded nature of an interdisciplinary problematic occurs across numerous disciplines today, and certainly registers within the mainframe of musicological and ethnomusicological debate centring around the relationship of culture and music. Richard Middleton, writing in *The Cultural Study of Music*, argues as follows: 'To look across the full range of disciplinary perspectives is important. Indeed, the parallelism of the different histories of engagement with "musics and cultures" research, together with their varied dialogues, seems to be integral to its problematic.'[21] Middleton, like many

18 Gerry Farrell, *Indian Music and the West* (Oxford, 1997/1999), 10.

19 Ibid., 25.

20 Jones, in Tagore, *Hindu Music*, 157.

21 Richard Middleton, 'Music Studies and the Idea of Culture', in *The Cultural Study of Music: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Martin Clayton, Trevor Herbert and Richard Middleton (New York and London, 2003), 2.

before him, argues that the study of music is the study of music within culture: 'the new approaches all stand for the proposition that *culture matters*, and that therefore any attempts to study music without situating it culturally are illegitimate (and probably self-interested).'[22] The fact that culture matters is, of course, nothing new, as he points out, citing references as far back as Merriam's ground-breaking *The Anthropology of Music* (1964), and it is of some relevance that Middleton refers to the relation of culture to music as a 'problematic'. Indeed, the relationship of music to culture – whether we study music *within* culture, music *in* culture, music *as* culture, music *of* culture, and so on – is, and has been, a source of endless semantic fascination amongst ethnomusicological and musicological theorists for some time – even as far back as Jones (though this is rarely admitted). Partly, Bruno Nettl finds the origins of the problematic in the follower-mentality of ethnomusicology in relation to anthropology. 'Anthropology oriented ethnomusicologists',[23] he writes. Musicologists faired no better historically, because 'to them music is primary and culture a less specific concept'.[24]

This criticism of musicology, as anthropologically uncontextualizing, is repeated frequently in recent literature. Nicholas Cook, for example, takes a swipe at musicology, claiming that it is culturally pessimistic: 'If both music and musicology are ways of creating meaning rather than just representing it, then we can see music as a means of gaining precisely the kind of insight into the cultural or historical other than a pessimistic musicology'. Thus, he argues, 'if we use music as a means of insight into other cultures, then equally we can see it as a means of negotiating cultural identity'.[25] As Middleton says, however, the problematic is also integral to the study of it, and the same criticisms that Cook levies against pessimistic musicology can be, and are, also levied against optimistic musicology of the type in which Cook seeks to engage. Dibben and Windsor's critique of Cook's critique is a prime example of this: 'In Cook's eyes, musicology fails to grasp something fundamental about the way in which musical meaning both constructs and is constructed by our socio-cultural milieu.'[26] Inevitably, however, for Dibben and Windsor, Cook, like many musicologists, remains locked in a pessimistic musicology, too hopelessly immersed within the culture of musicology to objectify his own relation to it. Julian Johnson echoes this criticism, suggesting that the pessimism of musicology correlates directly to the loss of self inherent in the study of music and culture: 'Culture is not about what the work means to me; it is about the meaning the work has beyond my immediate response and how I position my response in relation to that larger meaning.'[27]

Whatever the criticisms and self-criticisms of musicology and ethnomusicology, the fact remains that the study of music and culture *represents* and *is* a problematic, both currently and historically, as we have seen in the case of Jones. As Philip Bohlman says, we ought to be concerned not only with what scholars study, but

22 Ibid., 3.

23 Bruno Nettl, *The Study of Ethnomusicology: Twenty-nine Issues and Concepts* (Urbana and Chicago, 1983), 133.

24 Ibid.

25 Nicholas Cook, *A Very Short Introduction to Music* (New York, 1998/2000), 127.

26 Nicola Dibben and Luke Windsor, 'Constructivism in Nicholas Cook's introduction to music: tips for a "new" psychology of music', *Musicae Scientiae*, Discussion Forum 2, 2001, 43–4.

27 Julian Johnson, *Who Needs Classical Music?* (New York, 2002), 80.

also how they represent it.[28] But whereas the historically bifurcated ethnomusicological and musicological disciplines have only more recently grappled with this problematic, cultural anthropology and anthropology, as a general discipline, have contended with analogous theoretical problems from the very beginning of their disciplines, and certainly from the time of Jones. Indeed, the centrality of culture to the study of anthropology has been debated from very outset of the discipline, and to some extent it is the concept 'culture' – the problematic – that forms anthropology into a recognized academic and professional discipline. According to Ida Magli, 'Either anthropology is cultural, or it does not exist.'[29] Similarly, one might talk of anthropology as 'cultural critique' – as 'not the mindless collection of the exotic, but the use of cultural richness for self-reflection and self-growth'.[30] Michael Herzfeld, for example, talks of anthropology as 'intervention as cultural practice'.[31] Needless to say, variations of these definitions occur frequently within the theoretical framework of cultural anthropology. Indeed, from the very beginning of the discipline of cultural anthropology, theories 'have been constructed about features of social life universally present in society and culture, present in only certain types of society and culture (or at certain levels of development), and present in particular societies that have been ethnographically studied'.[32]

Considering the diversity of these and many other definitions, Clifford Geertz, in his landmark *The Interpretation of Cultures* (1973/1975), suggests that an understanding of cultural anthropology requires methodologically 'thick description' of culture and, to some extent, I would argue that this is what Jones does in relation to Indian music, some two hundred years earlier. 'Thick description' is a term borrowed from Gilbert Ryle, and one designed to allow for the 'piled-up structures of inference and implication'[33] inherent within anthropological praxis. For Geertz, however, the concept 'culture' and the discipline 'anthropology' are too inherently multiplicitous to be described with any real clarity in the phrase 'cultural anthropology', and the very act of distinguishing them diminishes their import as individual terms of reference:

> The interminable, because unterminable, debate within anthropology as to whether culture is 'subjective' or 'objective,' together with the mutual exchange of intellectual insults ('idealist!' – 'materialist!'; 'mentalist!' – 'behaviorist!'; 'impressionist!' – 'positivist!') which accompanies it, is wholly misconceived. Once human behavior is seen as … symbolic action – action which, like phonation in speech, pigment in painting, line in writing, or resonance in music, signifies – the question as to whether culture is patterned conduct or a frame of mind, or even the two somehow mixed together, loses sense.[34]

---

28 Bohlman, in *Comparative Musicology and Anthropology of Music*, ed. Nettl and Bohlman, 138.

29 Ida Magli, *Cultural Anthropology*, trans. Janet Sethre (Jefferson, NC and London, 1980/2001), 1.

30 George E. Marcus and Michael M.J. Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences* (Chicago and London, 1986), ix–x.

31 Michael Herzfeld, *Anthropology: Theoretical Practice in Culture and Society* (Malden, MA, 2001), 152.

32 John J. Honigmann, *The Development of Anthropological Ideas* (Homewood, IL, 1976).

33 Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz* (London, 1973/1975), 6–7.

34 Ibid., 10.

One could argue, similarly, that in Jones's work ethnography and musicology are bound in the same dialectical relationship as culture and anthropology are in cultural anthropology. Indeed, in the same way that Geertz problematizes the internal, and inherently interdisciplinary, dialogue of cultural anthropology, considering its individual components to be too interrelated to be easily divisible or distinguishable, Jones problematizes early ethnomusicology by suggesting that the ethnic and the musical cannot be separated. In other words, Indian music cannot be understood outside its historical, literary and, most importantly, cultural context. The study of it is inherently interdisciplinary, and it is its interdisciplinarity that problematizes and thickens its discourse. It is an optimistic (that is, ethnomusicological) discipline, rather than a pessimistic (that is, musicological) one, as Cook and others might have us think.

Deracializing Race

For Jones it is effectively the interdisciplinary relationship of the ethnic and the musical which ought to realign Western misperceptions of the value of Indian music. Underlying this is his conviction that Indian music is not the expression of a racially enfeebled people, but the result of a glorious, but misunderstood, historical and cultural evolutionary process. Unlike many of his time – for whom the Enlightenment paradigm of developmental progress, from savage to barbaric, and barbaric to civilized, seemed to exclude whole swathes of non-Western peoples – Jones appears to have resisted these categorizations, especially in relation to India. As a result, Jones's work on Indian music is largely bereft of the racial fallout that conventional developmentalist thinking inevitably engenders. This manifests itself not only in his general attitudes towards Indians and their history, but also in some of the characteristics he suggests are inherent within Indian music.

One facet of the developmentalist racism with which Jones would have contended is the view that savages are inherently more imitative of, or steeped in, nature than more developed peoples. Musicologically this finds codification in the 1860s and 1870s, in the writings of the music critic Henry Chorley, who talks of the 'imitative powers of the negro', and conforms to racist anthropological tropes of savageness, including childhood, animality, naturalness, ignorance, innocence, helplessness and imitativeness.[35] Imitativeness, here, and certainly in the late eighteenth century, conjures up images of purposeful fakery or deceit, a characteristic commonly associated with blacks. As Douglas Lorimer shows, although the Victorian perceived the negro as multifarious, certain characteristics remained more or less constant, such as physical attributes. Psychological characteristics and social qualities, however, changed subject to context: 'The Negro' was depicted as both 'the obedient, humble servant, and the lazy, profligate, worthless worker',[36] amongst other things. Imitativeness in music, according to Chorley, was no doubt considered a function of any one of these qualities, and his comment was probably greeted with

35 Gustav Jahoda, *Images of Savages: Ancient Roots of Modern Prejudice in Western Culture* (London and New York, 1999), 9–10.

36 Douglas A. Lorimer, 'Race, science and culture: historical continuities and discontinuities, 1850–1914', in *The Victorians and Race*, ed. Shearer West (Aldershot, 1996), 19. See also Douglas A. Lorimer, *Colour, Class and the Victorians: English Attitudes to the Negro in the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Leicester, 1978).

some approval. Similar attitudes appeared in the eighteenth century. William Godwin, for example, author of *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on Morals and Happiness* (1793), filters this idea by suggesting that early developmental stages are more sensuous and 'natural' than later, more evolved, periods in a people's history. Indeed, early peoples are more imitative of their natural origins in the sensuous. He summarizes these high-Enlightenment presentiments with this characteristic late eighteenth-century formulation:

> Savage races may become civilized, for this has already occurred – the most cultivated nations of modern times are the descendents of savages … They must no doubt at first pass through the same dangers and corruptions of a merely sensual civilization, by which the civilized nations are still oppressed, but they will thereby be brought into union with the great whole of humanity, and be made capable of taking part in its further progress … It is the vocation of our race to unite itself into one single body, all parts of which shall be thoroughly known to each other, and all possessed of a similar culture…[37]

Here, the emphasis on cultural similarity as the summation of progress has very clear implications for notions of race and imitativeness, and what would later become – after Darwin – a core 'problematic' of anthropology. As George Stocking says, at this time, 'various widespread ideas about human difference also gave it [anthropology] a quasi-racial aspect: traditional humoral and environmental notions of the formation of human character and physical type; the idea of the Chain of Being, in which the Huron and the Hottentot were links between the European and the orangutan … Such ideas have stimulated scholarship on the "racism" of the Enlightenment'.[38] According to Roxann Wheeler, 'Europeans believed that all groups of people shared equally in a set of defining physical and cultural features – some of which were perceived to be distinctly more favourable than others.'[39] Thus, in some forms of racism, the extent to which a people was not imitative of, and removed from, nature (in other words, the orangutan) expressed the degree to which civilization had been reached.

From the standpoint of music, Jones, I would argue, turns this anthropological presumption on its head. In his second essay from *Poems, Consisting Chiefly of Translation from the Asiatik Languages, with two Essays on the Poetry of the Eastern Nations and on the Arts called Imitative* (1772), Jones writes that if a Sapphic ode

> with all its natural accents, were expressed in a musical voice (that is, in sounds accompanied with their harmonics), if it were sung in due time and measure in a simple and pleasing tune that added force to the words without stifling them, it would then be pure and original music … not an imitation of nature but the voice of nature herself.[40]

---

37 William Godwin, cited in Nisbet Robert, *History of the Idea of Progress* (London, 1980), 275.

38 George Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology* (New York, 1987), 18.

39 Roxann Wheeler, *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture* (Philadelphia, 2000), 10.

40 Sir William Jones, 'On the arts, commonly called imitative', from *Poems, Consisting Chiefly of Translations from the Asiatik Languages, with two Essays on the Poetry of the Eastern National and on the Arts called Imitative* (Oxford, 1772), reprinted in *Music Aesthetics in the Eighteenth and Early-Nineteenth Centuries*, ed. Peter Le Huray and James Day, Cambridge Readings in the Literature of Music (Cambridge, 1981), 143.

What is interesting in this quotation is not the fact that music can aspire to being 'the voice of nature herself', but the fact that under certain conditions it can be pure and original and *not an imitation* of nature. There are, in other words, two types of music: an inferior one in which music *is* an imitation of nature (hence lacking in purity and originality); and a superior one in which music is *not* an imitation of nature (hence pure and original). The word 'original' here is more than an epithet to connote quality, because it is when music loses its imitativeness that it can be original. By calling music the voice of nature itself Jones creates implicitly the impression that Indian music is not an imitation, but a preternatural reality of it. In other words, on some level, Indian music cannot be reduced to levels of imitativeness, and in anthropological terms, neither can the non-Western savage. They both exist in their own terms, and in terms of a more universal kind. They are the voice of nature herself.

Musicological Racism

For Jones, I believe, the purpose of deconstructing developmentalism from its roots in natural imitativeness is bound up with overturning the worst excesses of the racist orientalist critique, as outlined by Said. One might even call Jones 'disorienting', in the sense in which Linda Colley uses the term 'dis-orientations' in *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World 1600–1850*.[41] Where, according to Colley, Said presents a largely bifurcated world view of East and West, in fact British imperialism presents a much more variegated cultural response to the East. 'Dis-orientations' is therefore not as much about the denigratory racist discourse of Saidian orientalism as it is about its opposite, what Colley calls 'a more measured and multi-faceted British discourse on Islam, in which its believers were *not* viewed unambivalently as the 'Other' or wholly different'.[42] This more nuanced argument also informs one of the principal criticisms of Said, outlined, for example, in Michael Richardson's famous article 'Enough Said' (1990), in which he portrays Said as denying the observing Western subject empathy with its observed Eastern object.[43] Yet this same empathy, if only nascently, forms the basis of Jones's 'disorienting' methodology – if it can be put that way – and indeed appears increasingly in nineteenth-century British scholarship of non-Western music. Thus where Jones could be said to be too wholly immersed in Western scholarly traditions to be sufficiently self-reflective, Augustus N. Willard, for example, in *A Treatise on the Music of Hindustan* (1834), attempts to offer a more satisfactory alternative. For Willard 'The only way by which perfection in this can be attained is by studying the original works, and consulting the best living performers, both vocal and instrumental'.[44]

As soon, however, as orientalism began to be dismantled methodologically by ethnomusicologists, larger questions of race surfaced in musicology, as if to compensate for a general loss of prejudice. Indeed, as early ethnomusicology actively set out to dismantle orientalism, musicology, deprived by ethnomusicologists

41 Linda Colley, *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World, 1600–1850* (London, 2003), 99.

42 Ibid., 107.

43 Michael Richardson, 'Enough Said', in *Orientalism: A Reader*, Alexander Lyon Macfie (Edinburgh, 2000), 208–16 and *passim*.

44 Augustus N. Willard, *A Treatise on the Music of Hindustan: Comprising a Detail of the Ancient Theory and Modern Practice* (1834), in Tagore, *Hindu Music*, 21.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000331 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of an openly orientalist bias, struggled in a precipitate of racial incomprehension. As John Hullah writes in *The History of Modern Music* (1862), 'Not that Orientals have, or have had, no music of their own; but that, as at present practiced, their music has no charm, nor indeed meaning, for us. How is this? How can there be music acceptable to one comparatively civilized people and altogether unacceptable – unintelligible even – to another?'[45]

Hullah's musicological comments, though written in the 1860s, could apply equally well to any period from the 1780s to the 1920s. Indeed, when surveying the musicological literature of this period, one finds invariably that non-Western music is denigrated, racially abused or, as a symbol of this, simply ignored. In George Hogarth's *Musical History, Biography, and Criticism* (1835) oriental music is dispatched in the Preface and first few pages of chapter 1. In later works it is seldom covered even to this extent, as music histories usually begin with the Greco-Roman or Judeo-Christian roots of Western music, brief contemplations on the origins of music, or both. W.S. Rockstro's *A General History of Music from the Infancy of the Greek Drama to the Present Period* (1886) is characteristic in disregarding music out of a Western context, as is H.G. Bonavia Hunt's *A Concise History of Music from the Commencement of the Christian Era to the Present Time* (1878), produced under the aegis of the Cambridge School and College Text Books series. Later writers continue this trend. Charles Villiers Stanford and Cecil Forsyth's *A History of Music* (1916) opens with a first chapter that covers oriental music under the title 'The Origins of Music', but this is separated out from what is the opening part of the book ('Part 1, The Ancient Period To 900 A.D.'), actually beginning with chapter 2. Interestingly, despite their interest in oriental music, Stanford and Forsyth still resist locating oriental music within the development of a Western chronological framework, and prefer, as in most cases, to situate it as part of ancient or early history, rather than part of living and evolved musical traditions.

One early exception to this institutionalized disregard is William Stafford's *A History of Music* (1830), one of the earliest British nineteenth-century histories of music to include reference to a musical orient – and intriguingly, written around the time Willard had written his treatise. As Joep Bor points out, Stafford's book is remarkable in devoting almost a third 'to the music of the ancients and non-Western nations: Egypt, India, China, Persia and Turkey, the Arab world, the Hebrews, the Burmese, Siamese and Singalese, Africa, America and Greece.'[46] The remainder explores Continental and English music, and English music covers about as much space as his work on oriental music. This rather equal coverage of oriental and English music is unusual in relation to the rest of British musicological literature of the nineteenth century. However, where one might expect Stafford to exhibit a sympathy for non-Western music, instead readers are introduced to Western racist abuse and deeply entrenched developmentalist anthropology. As so often happens in anthropological literature of the time, the source of Stafford's ethnological inclusiveness is also the source of his racist discourse, and, inevitably, this impacts on his history of music. So where Jones, as proto-ethnomusicologist, sought to elevate non-Western music to civilization by depriving it of its natural imitativeness, Stafford, as musicologist, reduces it to its expected position of savagery within a developmentalist anthropological projection. This is abundantly

45 John Hullah, *The History of Modern Music. A Course of Lectures Delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain* (London, 1862), 6–7.

46 Bor, 'The Rise of Ethnomusicology', 60.

clear even from the title of his first chapter, 'The Origin of Music Traced to Natural Causes – The Music of Savage Nations'.

Somewhat later in the century, in the 1890s, Stafford's type of musical savagery appears enshrined in the writing of C. Hubert H. Parry. Despite the influence of evolutionism – or perhaps because of it – Parry couches his considerations of non-Western music in unrepentant and pointedly racial developmentalist terms. Attempting to replace the discourse of orientalism for that of evolution, he nonetheless writes that the study of folk music is not so much a study of savage music, but a study of its evolutionary fulfilment in Western music:

> The basis of all music and the very first steps in the long story of musical development are to be found in the musical utterances of the most undeveloped and unconscious types of humanity, such as unadulterated savages and inhabitants of lonely isolated districts well removed from any of the influences of education and culture. Such savages are in the same position in relation to music as the remote ancestors of the race before the story of the artistic development of music began; and through study of the ways in which they contrive their primitive fragments of tune and rhythm, and of the way they string these together, the first steps of musical development may be traced.[47]

Here, Parry's insistence that savage music finds relevance only in relation to Western music is part and parcel of his appropriation of evolution for a Western agenda. For in permitting evolution to dominate his historiographical discourse he also champions a style of developmentalist racism that deems the savage incapable of progressing, yet contradictorily influencing the course of Western musical evolution. It is scientific racism translated into a musicological environment. It is what Waltraud Ernst describes as a typically fossilized post-Enlightenment attitude towards scientific discourse. According to Ernst, 'the Eurocentrism inherent in the Western scientific enterprise has aided both the development of racial hierarchies and the creation of the long-enduring myth of science as an impartial, pure and value-free endeavour'.[48]

Deracializing Musicology: Carl Engel and the influence of E.B. Tylor

Parry dissimulates racism under the guise of evolution, and as such presents non-Western music – and more importantly non-Western musicians – in what are unreconstructed hereditary terms. Indeed, as we have seen, the animality of musical savages has a long and deeply rooted position in the history of musicological racism, and as Parry's work indicates, the metaphor survived in common parlance well into the 1880s and 1890s. Take, for example, the words of O.H.H. in his article 'Music in Embryo', for the *Musical Times* of 1 September 1887:

> The expansion of music into its civilised form from first germs … differs, however, from many analogous processes of growth, by one very marked peculiarity. It is not uniformly progressive, advancing imperceptibly like the growth of a plant … If we

47 C. Hubert H. Parry, *The Art of Music* (London, 1893), 52.

48 Waltraud Ernst, in *Race, Science and Medicine, 1700–1960*, ed. Waltraud Ernst and Bernard Harris (London, 1999), 3.

> may take a parallel from natural growth, it might be found in the crab, the frog, and other animals whose embryonic type is distinguished by essential features from that of maturity. In regarding music as a science, this requires clear recognition; and an acquaintance with almost any of the crudescent music of uncivilised races brings out the point with striking distinctness.[49]

Even as early as the 1860s and 1870s, however, institutionalized musicological racism was ebbing, through an advancing engagement with cultural anthropology and the foundational thinking of E.B. Tylor. This is obvious in the writing of Carl Engel, author of *An Introduction to the Study of National Music; Comprising Researches into Popular Songs, Traditions, and Customs* (1866) and contributor to the formative anthropological pamphlet *Notes and Queries on Anthropology*, first published in 1874. Engel's connection to Tylorian thought has significance for the anthropological study of music, especially in relation to the 1874 *Notes and Queries* (which Tylor spearheaded), because in it he sets out one of the earliest methodological templates for the study of non-Western music:

> The music of every nation has certain characteristics of its own. The progression of intervals, the modulations, embellishments, rhythmical effects, &c. occurring in the music of extra-European nations are not unfrequently too peculiar to be accurately indicated by means of our musical notation. Some additional explanation is therefore required with the notation. In writing down the popular tunes of foreign countries on hearing them sung or played by the natives, no attempt should be made to rectify any thing which may appear incorrect to the European ear. The more faithfully the apparent defects are preserved, the more valuable is the notation. Collections of popular tunes (with the words of the airs) are very desirable. Likewise drawings of musical instruments, with explanations respecting the constructions, dimensions, capabilities, and employment of the instruments represented.[50]

Engel's instructions could not be simpler. Firstly, transcribe the music, retaining in notation as much of the original as possible; secondly try to procure music with words; and thirdly provide information on instruments and their performance. Taken on its own, this condensed methodology does *not*, in fact, reveal the sheer diversity and breadth of Engel's 111 questions. Concerning vocal music, for instance, Engel ranges over 14 questions, from 'Are the people fond of music?'[51] to 'Describe the different kinds of songs which they have (such as sacred songs, war songs, love songs, nursery songs, &c.)?'[52] He asks questions concerning musical ability, ability to discern small intervals, intonation, vocal flexibility, vocal quality and characteristics, vocal range, accompaniment, male/female performance, unison and harmonic singing, solo/chorus music and the categories of repertoire. Questions about instruments are divided by physical type: (1) drums and sticks; (2) winds, including trumpets, flutes, nose-flutes, Pandean pipe, vibrating reeds (single/double), bagpipe and signal instruments; (3) strings (fingered/plucked/bowed); and (4) miscellaneous or peculiar. Tunings on all instruments are requested, as is physical construction and its

49 O.H.H., 'Music in Embryo', *Musical Times* (1 Sep. 1887): 533.

50 Carl Engel, in *Notes and Queries on Anthropology, For the Use of Travellers and Residents in Uncivilized Lands. [Drawn up by a Committee appointed by the British Association for the Advancement of Science.]* (London, 1874), 110.

51 Ibid.

52 Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000331 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ornamentation. Performance context, strangely, does not appear in this description of musical instruments. Under 'Compositions' Engel asks for information on intervallic content; major/minor/pentatonic scales; the sharp/flat seventh; scalar intervals larger than a whole tone or smaller than a semitone; melodic formulae and progressions; repetition as a result of text; the age of compositions; their emotional content (happy or sad); and form. Performances cover a multitude of things, including the constitution and instrumentation of bands or orchestras; commonly used instruments; unison or harmonic music; vocal/instrumental combinations; tempi; loudness; ceremonial or other social functions; extemporization; sacred music; and war dances.

Whereas these sections are, in most respects, rather technical, the remaining two, 'cultivation' and 'tradition', ask broader social questions, perhaps of more immediate anthropological pertinence. These are questions concerning innate ability and musicality – issues which beg questions of relative sensory acuity: 'Do the people easily learn a melody by ear? … Have they a good musical memory? … Any performers who evince much talent?',[53] and so on. Other issues include whether children are taught music, and by whom; the presence/status of professional musicians; composers; the interconnection between religion and music; notation; musical treatises; musical institutions; and music appreciation. Lastly, 'Traditions' asks about musical origins; musical deities, myths, legends and fairy tales; favourite instruments; historical records; music and medicine; its taming qualities in animals; and popular tunes imitative of birds.

Needless to say, these items, and indeed Engel's entire anthropological survey, share similarities with the methodological framework of Tylor's groundbreaking *Primitive Culture* (1871), which Urry suggests, arguably, dominated British anthropology for the next 30 years.[54] On a very basic methodological level Tylor is deeply concerned to ensure that the classification of material precedes conceptualization, writing, for example, that 'A first step in the study of civilization is to dissect it into details, and to classify these in their proper groups.'[55] Engel does this by setting out a rigorous series of questions of musical particulars in advance of his broader cultural and sociological questions. Tylor also provides a general methodological framework that cuts across geographical location – which is mirrored in Engel's completely de-localized methodological prescription – and where Tylor divides his book into chapters on 'The Science of Culture', 'The Development of Culture', 'Survival in Culture' (two chapters), 'Emotional and Imitative Language' (two chapters), 'The Art of Counting', 'Mythology' (three chapters) and 'Animism', Engel catalogues responses into 'cultivation' and 'tradition'. These two sections, in particular, evince a very Tylorian methodological template dependent for its conceptual foundation upon verifiable material taken in a field locality. Speaking of 'survival in culture', Tylor highlights the importance of permanence, indicating that 'When a custom, an art, or an opinion is fairly started in the world, disturbing influences may long affect it so slightly that it may keep its course from generation to generation, as a stream once settled in its bed will flow on for ages.'[56] This conviction is

53 Ibid., 113.

54 James Urry, *Before Social Anthropology: Essays on the History of British Anthropology* (Reading, 1993), 21.

55 Edward B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom* (London, 1871/1913), 7.

56 Ibid., 70.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000331 Published online by Cambridge University Press

embedded in Engel's first questions under 'Traditions': 'Are there popular traditions respecting the origin of music?'[57] A function of this is also understood in the context of local mythologies, which Tylor suggests 'is perhaps no better subject-matter through which to study the processes of the imagination … ranging as they do through every known period of civilization, and through all the physically varied tribes of mankind'.[58] Engel follows this line of thinking, asking if there are 'Any myths about a musical deity or some superhuman musician? … Any legends or fairy tales in which allusion to music is made? if so, what are they?'[59] Similarly Engel is concerned, as Tylor, for the presence of any historical data, asking if there is 'Any tradition or historical record respecting the antiquity of stringed instruments played with a bow?'[60]

These points of contact between Engel and Tylor may, of course, be circumstantial or incidental, because it can only be presumed that Engel would have read Tylor's work. The influence could also have been reversed, as no doubt Tylor was aware of Engel's extensive work on national music and the organology of non-Western instruments. Even if in *Primitive Culture* Tylor eschewed the type of comparative historical ethnological methodology with which Engel was partially engaged in works such as *The Music of the Most Ancient Nations* (1864), there is no doubt that Engel's views would have resonated with him nonetheless. Certainly, his basic analogy with language would have appealed:

> For years I have taken every opportunity of ascertaining the distinctive characteristics of the music not only of civilized but also of uncivilized nations. I soon saw that the latter is capable of yielding important suggestions for the science and history of music, just as the languages of savage nations are useful in philological and ethnological inquiries.[61]

In his slightly later *An Introduction to the Study of National Music; comprising Researches into Popular Songs, Traditions, and Customs* (1866) Engel lays out a methodology that could be said to have found anthropological codification in *Primitive Culture*. The emphasis on establishing cultural connections, by delving into questions of common sources, similarities of art, psychology, material culture, poetry, dances – these are fully extended in Tylor's *Primitive Culture*:

> The similarities [between music of separate nations] are often of such a nature that they cannot possibly be explained as accidental coincidences, but must either have originated in a former connexion between the nations, or must have been derived from a common source which perhaps no longer exists. However this may be, there is reason to surmise that the ethnologist acquainted with national music would meet with some similarity or other – be it in the construction of the music, in its psychological character, in the peculiar modes of its performance, in the musical instruments, in the combination of the music with poetry and dancing, or in the occasions on which it is especially employed – which might be of assistance to him,

57 Engel, *Notes and Queries on Anthropology*, 114.
58 Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, 274.
59 Engel, *Notes and Queries on Anthropology*, 114.
60 Ibid.
61 Carl Engel, *The Music of the Most Ancient Nations, particularly of the Assyrians, Egyptians, and Hebrews; with Special Reference to Recent Discoveries in Western Asia and in Egypt* (London, 1864), v.

> either by providing him with additional proof in confirmation of some particular theory, or perhaps even by suggesting some new investigation.[62]

These relationships come into stronger focus when looking more closely at *Primitive Culture*, where Tylor engages with musical concepts. Writing of vowels, for example, he takes a Helmholtzian view that 'They are compound musical tones, such as, in the vox humana stop of the organ, are sounded by reeds (vibrating tongues) fitted to organ-pipes of particular construction.'[63] Tylor extends this into a concept of music evolution, with decidedly Spencerian overtones (also found in Engel), writing that 'As to musical theory, emotional tone and vowel-tone are connected. In fact, an emotional tone may be defined as a vowel, whose particular musical quality is that produced by the human vocal organs, when adjusted to a particular state of feeling.'[64] Intriguingly, Engel defines national music as that 'which, appertaining to a nation or tribe, whose individual emotions and passions it expresses, exhibits certain peculiarities more or less characteristic, which distinguish it from the music of any other nation or tribe'.[65] Tylor continues his line of thinking by suggesting that whereas the modulation of musical pitch gives emphasis in European languages, in Southeast Asian languages, for instance, the modulation actually gives different meaning, thus affecting the setting of poetry to music. As he says, 'the system of setting poetry to music becomes radically different from ours'.[66]

Universalizing Music

Tylor refers to language as 'linguistic music', and says that it is 'theoretically interesting, as showing that man does not servilely follow an intuitive or inherited scheme of language, but works out in various ways the resources of sounds as a means of expression'.[67] And it is to musical analogy that he resorts when trying to describe linguistic accent or emphasis, which represents an early development in linguistic evolution. In fact he suggests that music be studied philologically precisely to identify this stage in its advance from vocal communication to music itself. Musically, of course, this is more or less what Engel seeks to do, and it is possibly this which separates him out from slightly later figures like John Frederick Rowbotham, or Richard Wallaschek who, despite their own musical interpretation of Darwinian evolution, prefer fundamentally developmentalist conceptions of anthropological progress.[68] Where racism lingers, arguably, in Rowbotham and

62 Carl Engel, *An Introduction to the Study of National Music; comprising Researches into Popular Songs, Traditions, and Customs* (London, 1866), 317.

63 Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, 167–8.

64 Ibid., 168.

65 Engel, *An Introduction to the Study of National Music*, 1.

66 Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, 169.

67 Ibid.

68 John Frederick Rowbotham is known generally for *A History of Music* (3 vols, 1885), and Richard Wallaschek for *Primitive Music: An Inquiry into the Origin and Development of Music, Songs, Instruments, Dances, and Pantomimes of Savage Races* (London and New York, 1893). Despite adopting a broadly evolutionary template, Rowbotham situates this within a larely Comtean pattern of developmentalism, as he says: 'The Embryology of the Arts ends with the evolution or introduction of the 3 forms of instrument … [corresponding to] the order of the 3 Stages in the development of Prehistoric Music, the Drum Stage, the Pipe

Wallaschek, Engel effectively deracializes music through methodologies steeped in Tylorian cultural anthropology.

In fact it was not until the end of the century, with the work of the eminent ethnomusicologist and psychologist Charles Samuel Myers – himself a contributor to the 1912 edition of *Notes and Queries* – that Tylorian notions of progress would themselves be superseded. Myers's writings on music span the period 1902 to 1933 and are characteristically broad in coverage, including ethnomusicological fieldwork, experimental music psychology and work on synaesthesia. Unifying these seemingly disparate strands of research is a conception of individual differences (known as differential psychology), and it is through this that ethnomusicology, as a modern discipline, was founded in Britain. Colin Cooper defines differential psychology as 'the branch of psychology that considers how (and equally importantly *why*) people are psychologically very different from one another. It also considers how such individual differences may be measured by use of psychological tests and other techniques.'[69] Myers's conception of individual differences emerges early in his career, in a 1901 review of James Ward's *Naturalism and Agnosticism*. Here he denies the dichotomy between subject and object (in much the same way Richardson criticizes Said) in our individual experience of life and suggests that though the universe may be seen from either perspective, both perspectives ultimately give rise to the self, or what he calls the 'I':

> The universe may be ever viewed from two distinct standpoints. I may start from myself – my subjective individual feeling of the Inside, with its attributes of activity, will, purpose, and so forth, – and I shall arrive ultimately at the teleological aspect of this, the 'why,' only because subjectively I have no knowledge of the 'how.' Or I may start from my not-self, – my objective universal feeling of the Outside, with its attributes of passivity, order, uniformity, and the like, – and I shall, with equal certainty, deduce the mechanical aspects of things, – the 'how' only, because objectively I have no knowledge of the 'why'. From either standpoint the world is viewed in language by an 'I'. This 'I' is the unity of experience, whereof subject and object are the duality.[70]

Stage, and the Lyre Stage, which, it seems to me, are to the Musician what the Theological, Metaphysical, and Positive Stages are to the Comtist, or the Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages to the archaeologist.' (John Frederick Rowbotham, *A History of Music*, 3 vols (London, 1885), vol. 1, xix–xx). Wallaschek's developmentalist underlay was influenced by the more overtly racializing heredity conceptions of Darwin's younger cousin, Francis Galton, who in 1883 coined the term 'eugenics' (Francis Galton, *Inquiries into Human Faculty and its Development* (London, 1883/1973), 17) and later defined it as 'the study of agencies under social control that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations either physically or mentally' (Francis Galton, 'Eugenics: Its Definition, Scope and Aims' *Nature* 70 (1904), 82). Writing on the development of harmony, for example, Wallaschek echoes Galton in suggesting that race, rather than historical circumstance, lies at the root of musical evolution: 'Now we have seen that even uncivilised races know how to accompany a simple song by ear, while some of the more civilised ones, as the Chinese and other Oriental people, do not understand our harmony, although they have every opportunity of hearing our music. Thus the difference between people with and without harmonic music is not a historical but a racial one' (Wallaschek, *Primitive Music*, 144).

69 Colin Cooper, *Individual Differences* (London, 2002), ix.

70 Charles Samuel Myers, 'Naturalism and Idealism', *The Philosophical Review* 10/5 (Sep. 1901): 476.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000331 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Myers soon turned this into an ethnomusicological concept, beginning with his music-psychological contributions to the *Reports* of the 1898 Torres Straits Expedition, eventually published in 1912. The *Reports*, as Graham Richards says, led Myers and his team to evolve a theory of 'cultural adaptationism', because of insufficient experimental grounds upon which to conclude the sensory (musical) superiority of savages – in other words the veracity of the Spencerian hypothesis. This went further than undermining the hereditary component in perceptions of race. Cultural adaptationism effectively removed race as a conceptual underlay in the anthropological methodology of its day, and introduced into ethnomusicology – and ultimately musicology – a scientific template untarnished by questions of race. Bolstered by musical findings that confirmed his belief in differential psychology, Myers was able to banish racism and humanize the musical savage. As he says in 'The Psychology of Musical Appreciation' (1932):

> The effects of melody are different from those of rhythm, for melody and rhythm, as we have seen, serve different purposes, and the appreciation and enjoyment of each differ in different individuals. But the complex developments which they have undergone are essentially similar. Just as the enjoyment of melody has been enhanced by the simultaneous combination of different melodies or other accompaniments, or by variations in the melody, especially as practised in advanced European music, so too the enjoyment of rhythm has been enhanced by the simultaneous opposition of different rhythms or by complex changes in rhythm, especially as developed (to an amazing degree) among certain primitive peoples. Alike in the higher development of harmony and of rhythm, and for the full comprehension of musical thought, the intellectual acts of synthesis and analysis are required.[71]

Thus, with Myers we complete our progression towards the early stages of British ethnomusicology – to the point when the musical savage became humanized. Here, at least theoretically, racism ceases to have a part, orientalism is banished, and the effect of their inextricable aggregation evanesces into methodological oblivion. As we have seen, this process begins with early ethnomusicologists, such as Jones and Willard, who actually dismantle orientalism. Later figures such as Engel adopt Tylorian cultural theories redolent with musicological import, and later ethnomusicologists, such as Myers, debunk racism once and for all through the universalizing templates of cultural adaptationism. And so, despite racist and orientalist undercurrents within musicology, from Burney and Hawkins to C. Hubert H. Parry, ethnomusicology rose in opposition to undo these two principal impediments to modern musicological praxis. In so doing, by disorientalizing early in its history, and deracializing in its later history, ethnomusicology was able to emerge actively into a modern twentieth-century methodological framework that did indeed disentangle orientalism and racism from the intellectual history of music. It might even be said that over the long nineteenth century, the rise of British ethnomusicology had 'disoriented race' from its position within musicology, and had consequently humanized the musical savage. How this came about is, of course, very much a question, but undoubtedly it has something to do with the intervening rise of cultural anthropology and the pervasive influence of Tylorian thinking. Therefore, when Richard Middleton

71 Charles Samuel Myers, 'The Psychology of Musical Appreciation' (1932), in Charles S. Myers, *In the Realm of Mind: Nine Chapters on the Applications and Implications of Psychology* (Cambridge, 1937), 60–61.

claims that 'the new approaches all stand for the proposition that *culture matters*', he speaks perhaps unwittingly as much for the ethnomusicology of the 1870s as for that of the early part of the twenty-first century. Indeed, as we have seen, even from the late eighteenth century – from the time of Jones – where it matters that 'culture matters' orientalism and racism, in a sense, do not.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479409800000331 Published online by Cambridge University Press