

# Introduction to the Special Issue on Ethnography and Analysis

Yonatan Malin

WE are pleased to present this special issue on relations between ethnography and music analysis, with papers on music and movement in Greek Orthodox and Jewish ritual contexts, rhythm and timing in a Bulgarian folk dance, discourse and practice in Brazilian samba and candomblé, and modes of theorizing Jewish *niggunim* (songs in the Hasidic tradition) and Biblical cantillation. Our goal is to explore dynamic relationships between ethnography and analysis in an open way—to acknowledge productive interactions and disjunctions, movement in one direction (e.g., from ethnography to analysis) and the other (from analysis to ethnography), kinds of interaction that are commonplace and rare—all in the context of specific case studies. Exploring these relationships is critical for the simple reason that ethnography and music analysis are foundational methodologies for ethnomusicology and music theory respectively, and the growing field of analytical studies of world music is a meeting point of the two disciplines. By thematizing the methodological relationship between ethnography and analysis, we hope to strengthen the discursive web of AAWM while also bringing its challenges to light.

In this introduction, I will review previous work that has combined ethnography and music analysis and situate our four papers in dialogue with this work. I will not be able to provide a comprehensive survey—instead I will focus on a few key sources and ideas, drawing from both ethnomusicological and music-theoretical literature. Under the banner of “ethnography” I include both fieldwork and writing. And under the banner of “music analysis” I include both empirical methods and the more personal, intuitive engagement of analysts with musical materials. Finally, it will be important to remember that neither theory nor ethnomusicology are unitary, self-enclosed disciplines. Both include a multitude of perspectives and methods, and both draw on and are influenced by other areas of study.

## BRUNO NETTL’S MODEL AND THE DISCURSIVE DIVIDE

Scholarly work combining fieldwork, ethnography, and analysis is not uncommon in ethnomusicology. Indeed, ethnomusicologists who explore aspects of musical structure do so as a matter of course in dialogue with perspectives from enculturated musicians and listeners. Bruno Nettl traces a common pathway from fieldwork to analysis in Chapter 7 from his classic text *The Study of Ethnomusicology; Thirty-Three Discussions* (2015, third edition). As Nettl observes, “We could be content simply to report, to describe music precisely as the culture does, or would; alternatively, we could use the culture’s own approach to go further, establishing a new system of description that is nevertheless derived from and continues to be compatible with what would be done by the native experts” (100). This seems straightforward

enough, and Nettl's examples—from his own research on Iranian *radif* and Blacking's research on Venda children's songs—suggest a relatively harmonious relationship between ethnography and analysis. The fieldwork and ethnography provide a foundation, the researcher then draws on this foundation to develop further observations and methods. The approach is culturally informed and there is leeway for individual analytical engagement.

Scott Marcus's (1992) article on modulation in Arab music is a classic example of this approach. Marcus documents oral concepts of modulation, citing individual musicians and occasions from his fieldwork in Cairo. He discusses a variety of concepts and methods, but then goes on to develop his own theory of modulation. As Marcus (1992, 185) puts it, his "rules" for modulation in modern Arab music "are based on the teachings I received from Jihad Racy in the United States and from numerous teachers in Cairo. *They are also based on extensive analysis of pieces in the modern repertoire*" (italics added). In this case the analysis of repertoire, following extensive study with musicians in Cairo and the United States, led to a more generalized theory, a set of "four rules" for modulation in Arab music.

It is informative to compare Marcus's approach to Arabic maqam, published in *Ethnomusicology*, with a recent article on maqam by Sami Abu Shumays (2013), published in *Music Theory Spectrum* (a journal of the Society for Music Theory). Abu Shumays does not mention fieldwork or ethnography in his article. He presents himself as a knowledgeable practitioner with his own approach to the maqam system. Abu Shumays is his own informant when he states, "By my count I have, as a practitioner, around 12 different distinct notes between my lowest E-flat and my highest E-natural" (236). Similarly, with regard to modulation, Abu Shumays writes, "For my own part I notice when tonicizations occur within a note or two at the most, because those few notes fulfill my unconscious expectations built from similar tonicizations I have previously heard" (244). When Abu Shumays cites "experienced practitioners" (239n17), "other experienced listeners" (244), and "musicians and listeners" (248), he does so with an assumption of consensus and without ethnographic documentation.

The contrast between Marcus's and Abu Shumays's approaches is indicative of the discursive divide between ethnomusicology and music theory. An ethnomusicological approach typically involves ethnography and fieldwork, even as it allows for or may even encourage music analysis. Bruno Nettl (2008, v) observes, "ethnomusicologists think of fieldwork as the defining activity of their endeavor." Timothy Rice (2014, 9) defines ethnomusicology, among other things, as "the comparative study of human musical diversity based on fieldwork and musical ethnography."<sup>1</sup> In contrast, a music-theoretical approach typically relies on experience and training in the tradition(s) at hand, but the nature of that experience and training is not documented as such. The statements of music analysis are

---

1. Rice represents the diversity of the field with a myriad of definitions. Among them, "ethnomusicology is the study of all the world's music" and "ethnomusicology is the study of humanly organized sound" (2014, 9) open more space for music analysis.

commonly framed as insiders' contributions or interventions, as in Abu Shumays's article—not as outsiders' descriptions.

Of course, the insider/outsider (or emic/etic) divide is much more complicated in practice than these simple binary labels would imply. I may be both an insider and an outsider in a given cultural context, and I may move between these positions—intentionally or unintentionally. Jeffrey Summit (2000, 5–7) has written beautifully about occupying both positions in his ethnographic fieldwork with American Jewish communities. (Summit is both an academically trained ethnomusicologist and an ordained rabbi.) But one way to facilitate movement between insider and outsider positions is precisely by engaging in both ethnography and music analysis. As an ethnographer, one may take an outsider position (perhaps temporarily), observing, listening, and querying culture bearers; as a music analyst, one may take an insider position (perhaps temporarily), claiming authority to speak about the music. But even this isn't so simple. The participant-observer mode of fieldwork may involve taking insider roles, and detailed music analysis may take one outside of cultures that do not have traditions of such discourse.

Some may seek cognitive universals, or modes of perception that do not depend on insider knowledge or experience. In the introduction to *Analytical and Cross-Cultural Studies in World Music*, John Roeder (2011, 13) quotes from Drake and Bertrand (2001, 17), who observe, “some temporal processes may be universal, in the sense that they function in a similar manner irrespective of an individual's cultural exposure and experience.” In his review of the same volume, Jay Rahn (2013, 422) praises the chapter by Richard Widdess, observing that it “indicates ways in which a noninitiate's hearing can coincide with an expert's.” Several papers at the Fifth Conference on Analytical Approaches to World Music in Thessaloniki, Greece, focused on “whether (or the degree to which) certain listener responses to a given music's time organization are dependent on the listener's enculturation” (Sawatzky 2018). The study of commonalities of perception across cultures is an important area for ongoing research. But the impulse towards ethnography does not deny the possibility of shared experience. It does express interest in the culturally specific, and it resists claims of universalism that are shown to mask cultural values.

The discursive divide between ethnomusicology and music theory often relates to individual proclivity and interests. These interests affect the direction of fieldwork, which is natural and inevitable, but sometimes individual interests are generalized. For instance, after describing “determining the discourse” of a culture as one of the primary tasks of ethnomusicology since the 1990s, Nettle (2015, 99) observes, “I would maintain that for many cultures—including the Blackfoot with whom I had experience—the system of ideas about music is more interesting, to both insider and outsider, than the details of song structure.” Mark Butler (2006, 29), on the other hand, found a hunger for discussion of musical details in his fieldwork with DJs, producers, and fans of electronic dance music: “Those who were musicians seemed to have a particular hunger to talk about musical details; many interviews lasted significantly longer than I had expected and ended with comments about how rarely

they had the chance to discuss these kinds of features.” Michael Tenzer (2006, 10) provides a balanced perspective, with a range of reactions to his interest in music sound and structure from musicians in Bali and South India: “Their responses ranged from respectful apathy to intense curiosity, to immediate and productive debate about musical details.”

By exploring relationships between ethnography and analysis, I do not mean to imply that the two have to go together. Indeed, music analysis without ethnography (or with more limited forms of ethnography) is a viable option for culture bearers; Sami Abu Shumays’s (2013) rigorous work on Arabic maqam, discussed above, is a case in point. Kofi Agawu makes this point polemically in the acknowledgements section of *African Rhythm*:

My understanding of the material presented in this book owes far more to what I learned growing up in Northern Eweland than to periods of official field research. I say this . . . to point to biases in conventions of scholarly discourse, conventions that encourage us to privilege fieldwork paid for by others and knowledge acquired during relatively short periods of intentional search for knowledge over knowledge and experience gained as part of an informal and extended musical education. (1995, xiii)

And yet, even if we are working with music that belongs to our own culture (in whatever form that takes), the discipline of fieldwork and ethnography may lead us to question assumptions and acknowledge divergent views.

Let us return, for a moment, to the contrast between Marcus’s and Abu Shumays’s approaches. The important difference that I want to highlight here does not have to do with how much the terms and methods come from within the culture. Rather, it has to do with whether fieldwork and ethnography are explicitly part of the study, or not. Both Marcus and Abu Shumays draw on Arabic theories of maqam along with musical experience in the tradition. (For Marcus, the “oral theory” of maqam is as important, if not more so, than written theory.) But whereas Marcus begins with a detailed account of his fieldwork, Abu Shumays presents his own take on the material.<sup>2</sup>

The degree to which a given approach draws on terms and methods from the culture is also important. Nettl (2015, 100) suggests that new methods should be at least “compatible” with what experts in the field would do. And Tenzer (2006, 16) surveys a range of approaches taken by authors in his 2006 edited collection, from Peter Manuel, who “rejects the imposition of too much Western theoretical apparatus” to Jonathan Stock, whose analysis goes beyond what knowledgeable Chinese listeners, and even the performer herself might be aware of. Tenzer observes that his own analysis of the iconic Balinese composition *Oleg Tumulilingan* pushes “beyond the culture’s own analytical observations” while also relying extensively on

---

2. The majority of the chapters in the volumes edited by Tenzer (2006) and Tenzer and Roeder (2011) focus on music analysis, with ethnography in the background—mentioned briefly, sometimes in footnotes. Buchanan and Folse’s (2006) chapter on Bulgarian dance tunes, Stanyek and Oliveira’s (2011) chapter on a Brazilian Pagode Song, and Bunk’s (2011) chapter on timbre and form in music of the BSC in Boston are notable exceptions.

Balinese “terminology, categories, and discourse about composition and style” (16). This in turn affects the kind of ethnography that can take place, as both Tenzer (2006, 16) and Stock (2006, 299) observe. In Stock’s account, “musical analysis generates questions that can guide future fieldwork enquiry; it need not be an after-the-event procedure carried out, as an end in itself, away from the musicians” (299).<sup>3</sup>

### BRIDGING THE DIVIDE

I turn now to consider work by Locke (2010), Hesselink (2013), Polak (2010), and Berliner (1994) that combines ethnography and analysis, bridging the discursive divide between theory and ethnomusicology. We will find movement from ethnography to analysis (Locke), the decentering of analysis through ethnography (Hesselink), empirical analysis that is motivated by musical experience in an ethnographic setting (Polak), and a presentation of the two as complementary, mutually corroborating modes of inquiry (Berliner).

In a 2010 article in *Music Theory Online*, ethnomusicologist David Locke makes a notable and explicit move from fieldwork and specific cultural contexts to music analysis that is very much his own. Locke traces the source of the material he analyzes, an arrangement of religious music of the Ewe people from West Africa, to his fieldwork in Ghana in the 1970s, and in particular to an arrangement that he learned from the late Godwin Agbeli (2010, par. 9). He describes Agbeli’s role and position in Ewe performing arts and his own fieldwork—taking lessons, participating in rehearsals and performances, and arranging recorded sessions. But Locke includes his own version at the end of an “authenticity chain.” The chain goes: “local version Agbeli learned growing up in his village, other local and regional versions Agbeli learned as a member of his community . . . version learned by Locke from Agbeli, and version Locke presents here” (par. 11). Locke maintains that the material “remains quite faithful to the way Yeweyu sounds in its ritual settings,” but also observes, “the musical examples are not transcriptions of field recordings, but spring forth from my memory of the piece” (par. 11). Thus, in making the move from ethnography to analysis, Locke takes ownership of the material. Even the material itself, in the way he presents it, is a form of analytical abstraction. Locke observes, “This paper emphasizes what might be characterized as Yeweyu in its ‘basic,’ ‘fundamental,’ or ‘idealized’ state” (par. 11). This is an unusual move; all of the material analyzed in the volumes edited by Tenzer (2006) and Tenzer and Roeder (2011), for instance, is from field or commercially released recordings. Locke’s use of his own performance and “idealized” conception of the piece is a plausible option because of his extensive experience and status as a performer and teacher of West African drumming.

In some situations, ethnography decenters the solo author/analyst model, bringing the author into more robust dialogue with views in the field. Nathan Hesselink (2013) provides an

---

3. Stock’s (2006, 299) own analysis, in this case, is after the fact; he speculates on creative processes that may have generated features of the work at hand, but notes that he did not have a chance to ask the composer/performer about them.

intriguing instance with his study of online responses to Radiohead's "Pyramid Song." Hesselink begins by telling the story of his own analytical engagement with Radiohead's music and with "Pyramid Song" in particular: "With an opening that features just a series of sustained piano chords with no drum beat or discernable regular pulse, it would take repeated listenings *to begin to come up with my own rhythmic understanding*" (par. 2; italics added). But rather than present his own understanding in the manner of a typical music analysis article, Hesselink documents, organizes, and comments on a treasure trove of online analytical commentary. He quotes passages at length, "preserving the 'grain' of the individual voice" and cites the ethical importance of not speaking for others (par. 8; see also par. 21). He argues explicitly for a "decentralized approach to analysis and interpretation," and thus "does not advocate for any particular viewpoint" (par. 8)—certainly a radical move in the context of the discipline of music theory. But Hesselink also does not silence his own voice; he continues to maintain his own "individual prerogative and agency in music analysis" as Tenzer (2006, 6) describes it. Here is a passage from the section titled "Two Separate Songs":

Most listeners made attempts at exacting a rhythmic structure and/or meter—either right from the beginning or based on the interaction of drums and piano in the second iteration of the verse—and then assumed that this structure was applicable to the song in its entirety. While this was my own strategy (and, generally, the way I listen to this song), the following respondents were happy to think of the two verses as inhabiting different realms . . .

After having spent numerous listenings perfecting my tapping abilities to an underlying but hidden pulse (see below), I now also enjoy hearing the first time through the verse as a kind of rhythmic dream state without a beat, allowing myself to be surprised by the entrance of the drums the second time through. (Hesselink 2013, par. 24)

Thus, Hesselink brings his own natural proclivities into the play of voices, allows himself to learn from others, and experiments with new modes of hearing and understanding.

Hesselink's working method is distinct from the classic methodology presented by Bruno Nettl, whereby the scholar learns from native experts and then applies the methods in new ways or contexts (see above). Hesselink—generally speaking—presents himself as no less and no more an expert than the participants in online discussion boards. (He notes the "music-theoretical sophistication" of audiences, but also indicates that "the tools of music theory" can help to standardize and compare views [par. 9].) Hesselink's dialogue with online commentary is fruitful, and not only for the article's explicitly stated goal of showing "how the confluence of ambiguity and rhythm in a pop/rock song creates a powerful force for audience participation" (2013, abstract). It also may help readers and listeners "understand the piece better," a goal that David Lewin (1969, 63) identified as central to the activity of music analysis. An appendix at the end of the article provides a "listening challenge" with three sound files for the reader to experiment with, in dialogue with earlier examples.

For Rainer Polak, the experience of learning jembe music from West Africa and then performing and teaching it led to questions of theory and representation—which he addresses through empirical analysis (Polak 2010). In other words, sometimes it is not the discourse of the musicians that guides analytical questions (as in Nettl’s model), but the experience of learning and making music with them.<sup>4</sup> Polak describes how his views evolved through fieldwork and teaching:

In my personal experience of jembe music, the cyclic variation of subpulse durations shapes the expectation for the timing of phrases; it distinguishes the rhythmic feels of different pieces and regional styles; and it disambiguates the beat. These opinions are the result of a long learning process. During my first staying Bamako in 1991 . . . I experienced great difficulty in identifying and repeating the phrases my jembe teachers played for me. (Polak 2010, par. 22)

Polak goes on to describe his learning process, as well as pedagogical methods that he has developed for teaching jembe music in Germany. Questions of timing, representation, and pedagogy then motivate his empirical study, including aspects of the fieldwork methodology. Polak notes, for instance, that he used clip-on microphones in open-air facilities; the tracks thus remained relatively isolated and each could be analyzed separately.

Ethnography and music analysis are treated as complementary, mutually corroborating methods in a monograph that has been foundational for the field of jazz studies: Paul Berliner’s (1994) *Thinking in Jazz*. After describing his fieldwork, which included lessons, performance, and interviews with over fifty musicians (Berliner 1994, 5), Berliner notes that he also “devoted time throughout the project to studying and transcribing jazz recordings” (11). And the breakthrough, for Berliner, was when various approaches combined to clarify the nature of jazz improvisation: “remarks in interviews began to tally with my own experiences in the practice room; observing a master’s approach to teaching enlarged my understanding of ideas expressed by musicians in a nightclub audience; *and analyses of transcribed improvisations verified described impressions of performance*” (12; italics added). It is important to note that Berliner’s music-analytical methods are not tethered to specific concepts gleaned from interviews, lessons, or conversations. He observes that his own experience with “experimental improvisation” guided certain aspects of the analysis (12). And he offers his own terminology at certain points, “in the absence of commonly held terminology” (185).<sup>5</sup> In one instance, a

---

4. Hesselink’s (2011) analysis of rhythm and folk drumming in South Korean village society is similarly motivated by his experience making music with others. He observes, “I was struck by how intense my feelings of group cohesion and communal awareness had become . . . This chapter can be seen as a way of analyzing and intellectualizing these experiences and processes through a musicological lens” (267).

5. In his review of *Thinking in Jazz*, Deveaux (1998, 400) observes, “With these transcriptions (or more precisely, with the commentary that accompanies them), ethnography gives way to musical analysis. Berliner does his best to smooth the transition between these different modes of scholarly discourse, but the extent to which his analytical categories and criteria can be directly derived from his ethnographic labors is necessarily limited.” Deveaux also observes, “The authority of Berliner’s analyses derives from his credentials as a participant in the culture he describes” (400).

footnote links the new terminology back to interviews and intensive forms of participant-observation: “The categorizations that follow are based, in part, on such complementary methods as interview data, my own experiences improvising during formal performances, and reflective experiments recalling, altering, and developing musical ideas from a set of known models in the practice room—training myself according to the methods described by interviewees” (Berliner 1994, 193n21).<sup>6</sup> This is very close to the method described by Nettle, which I will quote here again for reference: “We could use the culture’s own approach to go further, establishing a new system of description that is nevertheless derived from and continues to be compatible with what would be done by the native experts” (Nettl 2015, 100). But the idea of “going further” does not fully account for Berliner’s process; it does not account for the individual, active, and creative engagement with musical materials, which then informs analytical choices. Berliner’s method was also distinct in that he engaged in the two activities—ethnography and analysis—side by side, with the idea that the two might combine to clarify issues related to learning and improvisation, as indeed they did (1994, 12).<sup>7</sup>

#### THE PRESENT VOLUME

The four papers in the present volume offer additional approaches, combining music analysis and cultural ethnography. We do not claim that these approaches are radically new; they build on types of discourse that have been established in the broader fields of ethnomusicology and music theory. But they each dig into a particular issue, exploring how far we can go with it. And the combination of the four papers suggests directions for further research in the inter-discipline of analytical approaches to world music.

Chris Stover’s article “Contextual Theory, or Theorizing between the Discursive and the Material” follows through with the ethnomusicological agenda that Nettle (2015, 99) identifies as “determining the discourse—how people talked and maybe debated about their music.” Stover does this with fieldwork on Brazilian samba and *candomblé*, carried out in Rio de Janeiro, Salvador de Bahia, and Belo Horizonte in 2015, 2016, and 2018. But he uses the musicians’ discourse, including conversations with his teachers, not only to develop an analytical approach, but also to argue for an ethical mode of theorizing that joins analytical acts with worlds of music-making. Three central terms, *ritmo*, *balanço*, and *circularidade*, suggest ways of understanding musical temporality that are sometimes at odds with common theories of rhythm and meter. For instance, the use of the term *ritmo* (characteristic rhythm) by one of the author’s teachers in Salvador suggests that there are many ways of understanding a given rhythmic configuration and these are “irreducible to any main element (like a metric framework or timeline).” This article also resonates with the reflexive,

---

6. This footnote is quoted in Deveaux (1998).

7. Both Berliner and Locke did their doctoral work at Wesleyan University in the 1970s; Berliner graduated in 1974 and Locke in 1978. Wesleyan was known in the 1970s as a place where graduate students did technical, performance-based research (Mark Slobin, personal communication, February 8, 2018). Nettle (2015, 101) also mentions an analytical study by T. Viswanathan (1977), a celebrated performer and teacher of Carnatic music who received his PhD from Wesleyan in 1975 and went on to teach there until his death in 2002.

decentering impulse of Hesselink's (2013) article on Radiohead's "Pyramid Song." Stover asks, "How does thinking in terms of certain insider usages allow me to dislodge myself from my own discursive modes, to open up possibilities for plural ways of thinking and understanding?"

Rosa Abrahams's article "Mimicry as Music Analysis" confronts a situation where new and innovative forms of ethnography are required to gather material for the analysis of music and movement. Abrahams explores the interaction between semi-metered ritual chant and body movements in Jewish and Greek Orthodox services; she does so with creative forms of real-time documentation and, crucially, by mimicking the movement of the participants—by learning to move as they moved. Studies of music and movement typically use video, but in this case the videotaping of religious services was either banned (in Jewish settings) or impractical (in Greek Orthodox settings). The ethnographic fieldwork thus involved a temporary kinesthetic identification with others, both lay participants and service leaders, and an embodied understanding of movement patterns. Interviews with study participants helped Abrahams understand their motivations and intentions, as well as the social contexts, and she presents the analysis of musical temporality and movement with animated examples. The idea that particular forms of musical ethnography may be required for a given circumstance—with the music analytical enterprise in mind—resonates with Simha Arom's (1976) work on African polyphony, carried forward more recently by Susanne Fürniss (2006) and, in a Brazilian context, by Jason Stanyek and Fabio Oliveira (2011). Of course, the ethnography of Arom, Fürniss, and Stanyek and Oliveira involved particular recording techniques, and Abrahams's ethnographic method was developed as an alternative to video recording. But the principle remains the same: an author's music-analytical agenda, combined with unique musical and social circumstances, may motivate new forms of fieldwork and documentation.

Daniel Goldberg sets musicians' statements in dialogue with quantitative analysis of field recordings and his own observations in the article "What's the Meter of *Elenino Horo*? Rhythm and Timing for a Bulgarian Folk Dance." Bulgarian musicians disagree about the correct time signature for notating *elenino horo*; the author explains the source of this disagreement in terms of timing patterns, conventions for notating Bulgarian rhythms, and a nationalist agenda of distinguishing Bulgarian folk music from that of surrounding countries. Thus, "how people . . . debated about their music" (Nettl 2015, 99) leads directly to analytical study, which then feeds back into issues of culture and identity. But Goldberg also notes that the discourse around time signatures is of limited value for understanding meter as a cognitive phenomenon. To explore this mental framework, Goldberg works with a set of basic rhythms, which serve to organize performance of *elenino horo* in an ensemble context. These basic rhythms, and the idea of focusing on them, also emerged from the author's ethnographic fieldwork. Goldberg observes, "When I asked about the rhythm of a dance type, musicians often responded not with a verbal description, but by performing such a repeating rhythm." Thus, in ethnographic settings, discourse about the music may flow seamlessly into musical demonstration, which then provides material and grounding for music analysis.

I take music analysis into the field, so to speak, in my article “Ethnography and Analysis in the Study of Jewish Music.” I adapt the structural and expressive analysis of a *niggun* (a song from the Hasidic tradition) for a lay, largely Jewish audience. The analysis itself takes on new meaning and significance in this context; it becomes a pathway to understanding the inner *kavannah* (intentionality) of the song, and a way to connect with one of the leaders of the modern movement of “Jewish Renewal.” In the second part of this paper, my fieldwork on Biblical cantillation reveals a deep form of orality, with associations that link sacred text, musical performance, and the memory of individual voices. I develop an analysis of a field recording that is congruent with the importance placed on individual voices, while still noting that music analysis and discussion with practitioners bring out distinct and complementary aspects of the experience.

\* \* \*

Jeff Todd Titon (2008, 29) has described an emerging paradigm for ethnomusicology that involves “the study of people making music,” or “the study of people experiencing music.” Meanwhile, Kofi Agawu (2004, 274–75) has suggested that one of the primary motivations for music analysis is “the desire to inhabit temporarily a certain sonic world—and to enjoy the sensuous pleasure of doing so.” The relationship between these two activities is not obvious. Knowing people making music may lead to more informed listening and music analysis; music analysis may open the door to particular forms of music making and knowing people; knowing people may decenter the solitary, introspective music analyst; or, the two activities may occur side-by-side. With this introduction and our four papers, we hope to initiate a more explicit and reflexive discussion of music analysis, musical ethnography, and the two together.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Rosa Abrahams, Eric Charry, Daniel Goldberg, Bruno Nettl, Christopher Stover, Benjamin Teitelbaum, and an anonymous reviewer for their detailed and perceptive comments on earlier drafts of this introduction.

#### REFERENCES

- Abu Shumays, Sami. 2013. “Maqam Analysis: A Primer.” *Music Theory Spectrum* 35(2): 235–55. <https://doi.org/10.1525/mts.2013.35.2.235>.
- Agawu, Kofi. 1995. *African Rhythm: A Northern Ewe Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004. “How We Got Out of Analysis, and How to Get Back In Again.” *Music Analysis* 23(2–3): 267–86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0262-5245.2004.00204.x>.
- Arom, Simha. 1976. “The Use of Play-Back Techniques in the Study of Oral Polyphonies.” *Ethnomusicology* 20(3): 483–519. <https://doi.org/10.2307/851046>.

- Berliner, Paul. 1994. *Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Buchanan, Donna A., and Stuart Folsie. 2006. "How to Spin a Good Horo: Melody, Mode, and Musicianship in the Composition of Bulgarian Dance Tunes." In *Analytical Studies in World Music*, edited by Michael Tenzer, 58–91. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bunk, Lou. 2011. "Timbre-and-Form: The BSC and the Boston Improvising Community." In *Analytical and Cross-Cultural Studies in World Music*, edited by Michael Tenzer and John Roeder, 225–62. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Butler, Mark J. 2006. *Unlocking the Groove: Rhythm, Meter, and Musical Design in Electronic Dance Music*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Deveaux, Scott. 1998. Review of *Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation* by Paul Berliner and *Saying Something: Jazz Improvisation and Interaction* by Ingrid Monson. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 51(2): 392–406. <https://doi.org/10.2307/831983>.
- Drake, Carolyn, and Daisy Bertrand. 2001. "The Quest for Universals in Temporal Processing in Music." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 930(1): 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2001.tb05722.x>.
- Fürniss, Susanne. 2006. "Aka Polyphony: Music, Theory, Back and Forth." In *Analytical Studies in World Music*, edited by Michael Tenzer, 163–204. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hesselink, Nathan. 2011. "Rhythm and Folk Drumming (*P'ungmul*) as the Musical Embodiment of Communal Consciousness in South Korean Village Society." In *Analytical and Cross-Cultural Studies in World Music*, 263–287. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2013. "Radiohead's 'Pyramid Song': Ambiguity, Rhythm, and Participation." *Music Theory Online* 19(1). <http://mtosmt.org/issues/mto.13.19.1/mto.13.19.1.hesselink.html>.
- Locke, David. 2010. "Yeweyu in the Metric Matrix." *Music Theory Online* 16(4). <http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.10.16.4/mto.10.16.4.locke.html>.
- Lewin, David. 1969. "Behind the Beyond: A Response to Edward T. Cone." *Perspectives of New Music* 7: 59–69. <https://doi.org/10.2307/832293>.
- Marcus, Scott L. 1992. "Modulations in Arab Music: Documenting Oral Concepts, Performance Rules and Strategies." *Ethnomusicology* 36(2): 171–96. <https://doi.org/10.2307/851913>.
- Nettl, Bruno. 2008. "Foreword." In *Shadows in the Field*, edited by Gregory F. Barz and Timothy J. Cooley, 2nd ed., v–x. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2015. *The Study of Ethnomusicology: Thirty-Three Discussions*. 3rd edition. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Polak, Rainer. 2010. "Rhythmic Feel as Meter: Non-Isochronous Beat Subdivision in Jembe Music from Mali." *Music Theory Online* 16(4). <http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.10.16.4/mto.10.16.4.polak.html>.

- Rahn, Jay. 2013. Review of *Analytical and Cross-Cultural Studies in World Music*, edited by Michael Tenzer and John Roeder. *Journal of Music Theory* 57(2): 419–31. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00222909-2323524>.
- Rice, Timothy. 2014. *Ethnomusicology: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Roeder, John. 2011. "Introduction." In *Analytical and Cross-Cultural Studies in World Music*, edited by Michael Tenzer and John Roeder, 3–16. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sawatzky, Grant. 2018. "Conference Report: Fifth Conference on Analytical Approaches to World Music, and Eighth Folk Music International Workshop." *Music Theory Online* 24(3). <http://mtosmt.org/issues/mto.18.24.3/mto.18.24.3.sawatzky.html>.
- Stanyek, Jason, and Fabio Oliveira. 2011. "Nuances of Continual Variation in the Brazilian Pagode Song 'Sorriso Aberto.'" In *Analytical and Cross-Cultural Studies in World Music*, edited by Michael Tenzer and John Roeder, 98–146. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stock, Jonathan P. J. 2006. "'Yang's Eight Pieces': Composing a Musical Set-Piece in a Chinese Local Opera Tradition." In *Analytical Studies in World Music*, edited by Michael Tenzer, 275–302. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Summit, Jeffrey A. 2000. *The Lord's Song in a Strange Land: Music and Identity in Contemporary Jewish Worship*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tenzer, Michael, ed. 2006. *Analytical Studies in World Music*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tenzer, Michael, and John Roeder, eds. 2011. *Analytical and Cross-Cultural Studies in World Music*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Titon, Jeff Todd. 2008. "Knowing Fieldwork." In *Shadows in the Field*, edited by Gregory F. Barz and Timothy J. Cooley, 2nd ed., 25–41. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Viswanathan, Tanjore. 1977. "The Analysis of Rāga Ālāpana in South Indian Music." *Asian Music* 9(1): 13–71. <https://doi.org/10.2307/833817>.

© 2020 by the author. Users may read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of this article without requesting permission. When distributing, (1) the author of the article and the name, volume, issue, and year of the journal must be identified clearly; (2) no portion of the article, including audio, video, or other accompanying media, may be used for commercial purposes; and (3) no portion of the article or any of its accompanying media may be modified, transformed, built upon, sampled, remixed, or separated from the rest of the article.