

Reckoning with the Past and Imagining the Future

THE SCIENCE- MUSIC BORDERLANDS



edited by Elizabeth H. Margulis, Psyche Loui, and Deirdre Loughridge

The Science-Music Borderlands

The Science-Music Borderlands

Reckoning with the Past and Imagining the Future

Edited by Elizabeth Hellmuth Margulis, Psyche Loui, and Deirdre Loughridge

**The MIT Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England**

© 2023 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This work is subject to a Creative Commons CC-BY-ND-NC license. Subject to such license, all rights are reserved.



The MIT Press would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers who provided comments on drafts of this book. The generous work of academic experts is essential for establishing the authority and quality of our publications. We acknowledge with gratitude the contributions of these otherwise uncredited readers.

This book was set in Stone Serif and Stone Sans by Westchester Publishing Services.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Margulis, Elizabeth Hellmuth, editor. | Loui, Psyche, editor. | Loughridge, Deirdre, editor.

Title: The science-music borderlands : reckoning with the past and imagining the future / edited by Elizabeth H. Margulis, Psyche Loui, and Deirdre Loughridge.

Description: Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, 2023. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022014716 (print) | LCCN 2022014717 (ebook) | ISBN 9780262047647 (paperback) | ISBN 9780262373036 (epub) | ISBN 9780262373043 (pdf)

Subjects: LCSH: Music—Psychological aspects. | Musical ability. | Cognition. | Neuropsychology.

Classification: LCC ML3830 .S293 2023 (print) | LCC ML3830 (ebook) | DDC 781.1/1—dc23/eng/20220328

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022014716>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022014717>

Contents

Acknowledgments ix

Introduction 1

I Beyond Nature vs. Nurture

Volume editors

1 Human Musicality and Gene-Culture Coevolution: Ten Concepts to Guide Productive Exploration 15

Aniruddh D. Patel

2 Musical Meaning in Transspecies Perspective: A Semiotic Model 39

Gary Tomlinson

3 Cross-Species Research in Biomusicality: Methods, Pitfalls, and Prospects 57

Diandra Duengen, Marianne Sarfati, and Andrea Ravignani

4 Humane Treatment, Sound Experiments 97

Rachel Mundy

Interlude

5 Of Sound Minds and Tuning Forks: Neuroscience's Vibratory Histories 115

Carmel Raz

II Beyond Music as a Window into the Mind

Volume editors

6 Music, Mind, Body, and World 135

Jonathan De Souza

- 7 Rhythmic Entrainment and Embodied Cognition** 161
Maria A. G. Witek
- 8 The Musical Mind: Perspectives from Developmental Science** 183
Haley E. Kragness, Erin E. Hannon, and Laura K. Cirelli
- 9 The Science of Music Is about Relations** 203
Jim Sykes

Interlude

- 10 Toward Neurotechnology for Musical Creativity** 221
Eduardo Reck Miranda

III Beyond Reductionism

Volume editors

- 11 Combating Reductionism in Music Neuroscience with Ecologically Valid Paradigms: What Can (and Cannot) Be Gained?** 239
Jamal Williams and Matthew Sachs
- 12 Hidden Repertoires in the Brain Accessed by Music in Aging and Neurodegeneration** 263
Sarah Faber and Randy McIntosh
- 13 Composing at the Border of Experimental Music and Music Experiment** 277
Grace Leslie

Interludes

- 14 Music Theory and Experimental Science** 291
Diana Deutsch
- 15 Conversation with Pamela Z** 303
Pamela Z, Psyche Loui, and Deirdre Loughridge

IV Beyond Musicians and Nonmusicians

Volume editors

- 16 “The Musical Mind Is the Normal Mind”: Remaking Musicianship for Eugenics** 315
Alexander W. Cowan

17 The Musician-Nonmusician Conundrum and Developmental Music Research	329
Beatriz Ilari and Assal Habibi	
18 Building Sustainable Global Collaborative Networks: Recommendations from Music Studies and the Social Sciences	347
Patrick E. Savage, Nori Jacoby, Elizabeth H. Margulis, Hideo Daikoku, Manuel Anglada-Tort, Salwa El-Sawan Castelo-Branco, Florence Ewomazino Nweke, Shinya Fujii, Shantala Hegde, Hu Chuan-Peng, Jason Jabbour, Casey Lew-Williams, Diana Mangalagiu, Rita McNamara, Daniel Müllensiefen, Patricia Opondo, Aniruddh D. Patel, and Huib Schippers	
19 Conversations with Steven Feld	367
Steven Feld, Nori Jacoby, Deirdre Loughridge, Psyche Loui, and Elizabeth H. Margulis	
List of Contributors	385
Index	389

Acknowledgments

This volume sprang from a shared belief that scientific and humanistic approaches to music have much to offer each other and a desire to create spaces and conversations to realize the opportunities for greater mutual understanding and collaboration. We would like to thank the many people and institutions that helped make this endeavor possible. For financial support for the daylong workshop that brought the contributing authors together, thank you to the Princeton University Department of Music, Princeton University Council on Science and Technology, Northeastern University Department of Music, and National Science Foundation (NSF 1734025 to Elizabeth Hellmuth Margulis). Natalie Miller, Maddy Kushan, Cara Turnbull, and Dr. Parker Tichko managed the workshop's Zoom logistics and documented the discussions, and Vijay Iyer contributed challenges to the category of music and encouraged us to think about musicalities as embodied relations among beings and objects. Thank you for lending your time and expertise to the workshop.

For transcribing the interviews included in this volume, thank you to Johanna Linna and Yaen Chen. A Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Dissemination Grant from Northeastern University College of Arts, Media, and Design funded our writing retreat at the cottage in Chester, Connecticut, known locally as "The Recycle House." Additional summer support came from the National Science Foundation (NSF-CAREER 1945436 to Psyche Loui) and the National Institutes of Health for Sound Health: An NIH-Kennedy Center Partnership (NIH R21AG075232 to Psyche Loui). Thanks to George Lewis for posing the question "what is an experiment?" at the Musical Thought and Scientific Imagination Study Day at Harvard University in 2018 and to Emily MacGregor and Emily Dolan for organizing that inspiring event. Thank you to Philip Laughlin and the editorial team at MIT for shepherding this project through publication and to Larisa Martin and the team at Westchester Publishing Services for managing the production process. For indexing, thank you Erika Millen.

Finally, we would like to thank our families, with special gratitude to each of our husbands for moral and practical support, including bringing us lunch (because “real people need a real lunch”).

Introduction

Do you hear *Laurel* or *Yanny*? The realization that one person might be hearing something very different from another person in the same sequence of sounds spurred urgent headlines about the audio clip that “divided America” (Salam & Victor, 2018). A train of questions followed: Which is the “right” way to hear it? What should we make of individuals hearing different things with equal conviction? Why is the disagreement so shocking in the first place?

Morphing the original sound clip revealed that one person’s perception could switch between *Laurel* and *Yanny* and that one’s current percept was dependent on one’s immediate prior percept (Pressnitzer et al., 2018). This persistence of the past, known as perceptual hysteresis, tantalizingly gestures at a system’s dependence on its own history. Perception, a topic typically thought to occupy the realm of psychological science, seems intertwined with history, a topic typically thought to occupy the realm of the humanities.

The Laurel-Yanny phenomenon is more than linguistic, bleeding into the musical. In fact, it is around music that one finds richly developed theories and practices—robust traditions of knowledge—relevant to explaining the Laurel-Yanny phenomenon, among them neural, cognitive, cultural, historical, and technological processes. As both a physical and a perceptual phenomenon, sound entwines the natural and cultural, and with them the sciences and the humanities. In music, the idea that perception in the moment depends on what has come before is hardly surprising, this basic feature of experience being the subject of theories of learning and memory, expectation, groove, and repetition. On a longer time scale, the idea that present perception is predicated on the past is also built into historical and anthropological approaches that assume a cultural production of the senses.

Rifts

Music studies is a rich and multifaceted domain populated by researchers with expertise in history, ethnography, music analysis, technology, psychology, linguistics, physics,

neuroscience, philosophy, performance, computer modeling, and more. One might think that a sustained inquiry from multiple perspectives would help build a precise, multidimensional account of music's identity and functions or well-developed practices for sharing knowledge across specializations. Yet despite the unique opportunities for confluence afforded by the more than century-long existence of humanistic and scientific inquiry into music, and despite the potential offered by the decades-long existence of a society that strives to foster interdisciplinary collaboration (the Society for Music Perception and Cognition [SMPC], whose inaugural president Diana Deutsch reflects on the field's history in this volume), rifts between the approaches persist. Instead of finding papers about music and the brain on the syllabus of musicology classes or papers about musical culture on the syllabus of psychology classes, one is more likely to find scholars from one area eviscerating the work of the other on Twitter or—perhaps worse—entirely ignoring it.

What's the problem with this state of affairs? Can't musicology and psychology maintain the status quo of independent work, leaving interaction to the minority of scholars engaged with the SMPC? A commitment to this future misses the powerful opportunity presented by a model of interdisciplinarity that "springs from a self-conscious dialogue with, criticism of or opposition to the aesthetic, ethical or political limits of established disciplines" (Barry & Born, 2008, p. 29). This practice needn't be overly conflict based; it simply "stems from a commitment or desire to contest or transcend the given epistemological and ontological foundations of historical disciplines" (Born, 2010, p. 211). Given that the "standard reductionist agenda" underpinning conventional work in the psychology of music may never scale up to connect with the questions that animate humanistic work (Hartley & Poeppel, 2020, p. 597), failing to attempt a radical mutual reckoning amounts to a capitulation to the limits of knowledge before those limits have even been explored or tested.

But that is the palest and most distant of possible consequences. Graver and more immediate is the danger of scholarship that is wrongheaded, with impoverished designs and weak, erroneous, or actively harmful conclusions. Consider, for example, a (not atypical) goal that might be articulated for a scientific project on music: identifying the features that enable a piece of music to relax someone, make that person happy, or facilitate some sort of healing, and then using this knowledge to concoct an off-the-shelf musical prescription available to anyone. But if a person's experiences, body, and culture all contribute to that individual's sensibilities regarding music, there is no one universal set of musical features that can be expected to reliably act on the brain in the way this study's design assumes. Instead, relaxing, happiness-inducing, or healing effects must be reconceptualized in terms of a constellation of relevant factors.

As argued by Hasson, Nastase, and Goldstein (2020) and by Siegel et al. (2018), scientific and computational tools exist to facilitate these complex models, but for them to be usefully applied, scientific questions must be asked in new and humanistically informed ways. Understanding cutting-edge accounts of culture and musical interaction in the humanities is foundational to good science.

Concerning, too, are tendencies to forswear vast fields of inquiry because of particular problems or challenges. It is always possible to ask whether there are counterexamples to generalized claims, whether a concept or measure is valid across cultures, how histories of exploitation and dehumanization influence the present, who is left out and whose interests are being served. These questions are important, and historians and anthropologists of music specialize in the analyses that can answer them. In practice, however, such questions are often lobbed against scientific approaches to invalidate them *a priori*—with assumed answers about their limitations and complicities—rather than as a genuine inquiry into a study's aims, methodologies, implications, and possibilities. Such tendencies are especially apparent in cross-cultural comparisons, due to the understandings developed over many decades of ethnomusicological self-critique that comparative methods emerged from and supported a colonial world order wherein hierarchy was presupposed, and to compare was to measure against Western art music. The perpetuation of a colonial world order is a serious risk, but comparative work can take other forms, and there are questions about music as well as modes of collaboration that make cross-cultural comparison something to consider anew.

Humanistic and scientific approaches to music *must* interact for new and potentially transformative insights to occur within their own domains, let alone insights that transcend them. Such interaction moves beyond imagining that humanities expertise exists either to serve science or to critique it. Chapters in this volume by Witek; Tomlinson; De Souza; Kragness, Hannon, and Cirelli; and Sykes, for instance, articulate state-of-the-art accounts of the co-constitutive roles of environment and interactions in shaping musical behavior—accounts that entail the social worlds of music making to which music historians and anthropologists have long devoted attention. In contrast, much research in the psychology and neuroscience of music assumes a unidirectional causal flow from the brain to musical behavior and posits that the structure and organization of the mind and brain can be inferred from musical behavior itself. In such a landscape for music research, humanistic and scientific accounts cannot continue to proceed in parallel as if they have nothing to do with each other; in fact, they are actively contradictory. If humanistic accounts are correct, then many experiments in the psychology of music are built on faulty assumptions. If scientific accounts are correct, then the humanistic assumptions are wrong.

This volume aims to turn attention and energy away from rifts and toward the borderlands—contact zones where the generative potential of interaction can be realized. Although rifts have been the sites of outrage cycles and acrimonious exchanges in recent years, researchers have also been steadily working toward new paradigms informed by developments across disciplinary boundaries and the global conditions of the twenty-first century. The contributors to this volume include both scholars at the forefront of such developments and emerging researchers. Together, they point the way to a future where sustained interaction among disciplines can lead to richer understandings of musical life.

What Is Musicality?

An inescapable question bedevils efforts at humanistic and scientific interaction: what is musicality? There is no shortage of definitions of music or musicality in the literature; in fact, the shift to understanding musicality as a suite of capacities for music making, rather than some bounded set of actions describable as music, was important in enabling confluence among scholars who think about behavior and scholars who think about sound. By considering how a fundamental question like “what is musicality” is refracted through multiple voices from diverse disciplines, this volume charts a path forward for work at the intersection of these approaches. To Patel (chapter 1), musicality refers to the “widespread and spontaneously developing mental and physical abilities that underlie the human capacity for music”—that is, developing without explicit instruction. Feld (chapter 19) takes a somewhat different perspective, referring to musicality as an enculturated system of knowledge that is developed through repeated interactions with the culture. Kragness, Hannon, and Cirelli (chapter 8) posit that “the musical mind does not develop in isolation from other domains”; this is echoed by Ilari and Habibi (chapter 17), who see musical development resulting from “musical participation and affordances, contexts, and culture over time.” These two chapters view musicality as an emergent property of the developing mind and body. Thus, the chapters in this volume represent diverse perspectives along a spectrum ranging from nativist (Patel) to emergentist (Feld) views of musicality, with others falling somewhere in between (Kragness, Hannon, and Cirelli; Ilari and Habibi). Together, they cover a variety of views on the origins of musicality. The goal is not to arrive at one definition of musicality but rather to help readers understand the multiplicity of views, providing a sense of where they are truly incompatible, where they reflect mutually consistent but different approaches, and how they might be integrated to drive research forward within individual fields.

Another aspect of musicality that gives rise to a spectrum of views concerns where musicality is situated. At issue is the relation between body and mind. How large a part does the body play in music processing? Is it a vessel, an instrument, or an active contributor? Does music originate in the mind of its conceptualizer, as suggested by Miranda (chapter 10)? He describes the paramusical ensemble, wherein a brain-computer interface enables musical ideation in the absence of bodily movement, employing a distributed set of agents to enact musical ideas. Or, as De Souza (chapter 6) discusses, does music emerge from “an interaction between sound and mind,” where the mind includes mental representations of grammatical structures but is also “embodied and situated in a world, alongside objects and others”? Witek (chapter 7) reviews different claims related to embodiment, entrainment, and theories of the relationship between brain and body in musicality. Perhaps the most all-encompassing view comes from Tomlinson (chapter 2), who offers an account of the evolution of music making via the plastic responsiveness of the genome in moment-to-moment interaction with its environment, a model he terms radical niche construction.

What Is an Experiment?

Another overarching theme that cuts across the chapters in this volume relates to experimentation as a means of generating knowledge. What constitutes an experiment, and how can experiments, broadly construed, contribute to knowledge in different disciplines? Most would agree that the design and implementation of experiments are classic elements of training in the sciences. Yet experimentation is not exclusive to scientists; many researchers in the humanities and the arts have employed empirical observations or manipulated different variables to observe their effects on certain outcomes as a way to learn about musicality. Deutsch (chapter 14) provides some early examples of musical artists as scientists, and Leslie (chapter 13) describes scientist-composers whose perceptual experimentation guided their music making, and vice versa. Our interviews with Pamela Z (chapter 15) and Steven Feld (chapter 19) also reveal how the spirit of experimentation goes hand in hand with music making: Pamela Z is inspired by found objects and their usefulness for sonic art, whereas Feld describes recording sessions with Ghanaian artist Nii Otoo Annan as a way of learning about musical knowledge and how it is constantly negotiated through interactions (“acoustemology as relational ontology”).

The feedback loop between experimentation and sound making precedes disciplinary boundaries between sciences and the humanities. Raz (chapter 5) chronicles how empirical experimentation led to the rise of new physiological theories of music’s effects on the mind and body in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. By the 1920s, music

psychologist Carl Seashore was pushing for empirical experimentation as a way to learn about musicality. This entailed a shift in thinking about musicality—from an exceptional state (possessed by few) to a combination of continuous variables (possessed by many). This shift, though useful, also sowed the seeds of some deep problems in the science of music, motivated by eugenic selection, as discussed by Cowan (chapter 16).

Though one core of experimentation in contemporary music psychology centers around statistical learning, mental representations, and the grammatical structures of music in humans, the field has recently shifted toward experimentation that takes into account the role of the body in enactive perceptual experiences (Witek, chapter 7) or embodied metaphors (De Souza, chapter 6). Observing embodied behaviors is a central component of experiments with nonhuman animals in the study of musicality across different species (Duengen, Sarfati, and Ravignani, chapter 3) and of experiments involving infants to study the development of the musical mind (Kragness, Han-non, and Cirelli, chapter 8).

Seeking to push the boundaries toward more flexible, inclusive, and forward-thinking experiments, Faber and McIntosh (chapter 12) use music as a metaphor to describe theoretical tools that characterize the mind and brain as an intricate system of networks where hidden states may reveal important information about injury or illness. In an effort to understand musicality through neuroscience using more flexible, experiential approaches, Williams and Sachs (chapter 11) describe naturalistic music listening studies that span the continuum between ecological validity and generalizability. And to attain a richer cross-cultural understanding of musical behaviors, Savage et al. (chapter 18) offer some best-practice suggestions for building sustainable collaborative networks that move beyond the traditional overreliance on WEIRD (Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic) music or musicians.

To escape an impoverished level of interdisciplinary interaction that remains mired in the abstract, this volume moves readers into the specifics and the stakes, balancing the value of deep domain expertise with the value of accessibility and translatability so that each chapter speaks to specialists and nonspecialists alike. Each chapter reflects conversations among the authors and editors that took place before, during, and after a workshop where drafts were circulated and their contents and cross-cutting themes were earnestly and openly discussed. Thus, the chapters strive to reach a common understanding rather than merely juxtapose incompatible viewpoints.

Past, Present, and Future

In some ways, it is harder than ever to keep up to date with the cutting edge of knowledge and approaches outside any one specialty, especially across the humanities-sciences

divide. Yet, as we hope to show in this volume, state-of-the-art work on music from diverse fields has opened up new possibilities for dialogue and collaboration. Where there was previously a focus on clearly differentiating biological and cultural components of music, there is now more concern with how the biological and the cultural work together. As Creanza, Kolodny, and Feldman write in a discussion of gene-culture coevolution, “attempting to answer the question of what are the extensions of human biology through culture leads to a striking conclusion: There are few aspects of human biology that have not been shaped by our culture. Human culture has also affected the biology, even the survival, of nonhuman species” (2017, p. 7785). For humanities scholars, interests have likewise extended into the natural world and non-human species. As Ochoa Gautier argues in a call for “acoustic multinaturalism,” the climate crisis makes the early twenty-first century a time of “radical transformation of the conditions for posing questions regarding what historically in the West have been considered the differential fields of nature and culture” (2016, p. 108).

Reflecting a commitment to the notion that sensitive consideration of the past can help illuminate the present, this book is divided into four sections, each of which engages the history, current status, and future of a myth surrounding the scientific study of music. The first section addresses the apparent clash between music as a product of nature and music as a product of nurture, a false dichotomy that newer models, such as gene-culture coevolution, move beyond. Research based on the assumption of an inherent opposition between biology and culture, such as asking what kind of music the brain likes before experience intervenes, turns out to be poorly conceived when considered in light of contemporary work on the co-constitutive aspect of culture and biology. Patel (chapter 1) evaluates the repercussions for the design of experiments in music cognition, and Tomlinson (chapter 2) lays out a state-of-the-art model of meaning that places neural architectures and environmental niches in continual interaction. Duengen, Sarfati, and Ravignani (chapter 3) and Mundy (chapter 4) consider, from a humanistic and scientific perspective, how animal musicality illuminates the construction of and alternatives to a nature-nurture dichotomy.

The second section addresses the myth that the human experience of music can reflect how the mind works, a notion that becomes increasingly insufficient as one moves away from conceptions of the mind as something unitary and disembodied. Studying musical behaviors may not uncover the workings of some amodal cognitive processor because cognition emerges out of a brain in a body that is constantly interacting with its environment. De Souza (chapter 6) argues that both music and the mind are inherently relational, and Witek (chapter 7) delineates how the musical mind emerges out of embodied interactions. Kragness, Hannon, and Cirelli (chapter 8) trace how these feedback loops between mind, behavior, and environment develop

in the earliest stages of life, irrefutably demonstrating that rather than being passive blank slates, babies are active participants in knowledge building. Sykes (chapter 9) interrogates the conceptions of music and self that have governed music-humanities and music-sciences alike and introduces concepts from anthropology and his own fieldwork—including sound as a gift exchanged between and beyond humans—that open up new framings. This section is bookended by interludes by Raz (chapter 5), who explores how historical links between nerves and vibration have shaped modern neural sciences, and Miranda (chapter 10), whose compositions involve overt interactions between performance and neural signals, thus presenting a test case that vividly illustrates the consequences of the other chapters' ideas.

The third section addresses the notion that specific components of music can be understood and manipulated separately, a common tenet in experimental approaches that reduce music to untenable or distorted musical experiences. Williams and Sachs (chapter 11) evaluate the extent to which using full-fledged, realistic musical stimuli addresses the dangers of reductionism. Faber and McIntosh (chapter 12) consider how tools drawn from complex systems research can help make less reductive research designs tractable. Leslie (chapter 13) argues that music cognition researchers and composers share a suite of experimental techniques, illuminating what science can learn from artistic practice. In a pair of interludes, Deutsch (chapter 14) and Pamela Z (chapter 15) offer insights based on their experimental practice. A pioneering researcher in music cognition, Deutsch reflects on how computer technology enables the empirical study of more complex musical phenomena. A musician and multimedia artist, Pamela Z reflects on the role of tools in her creative work and how she uses perceptual phenomena such as the manipulable boundary between speech and music.

The fourth section addresses the division between musicians and nonmusicians, a dichotomy common in the scientific literature that has the effect of building prior assumptions about the kinds of experiences and abilities that constitute proof of musicality into results. Cowan (chapter 16) traces the relationship between the eugenics movement and early psychological notions of musical ability, providing firm evidence that contemporary research practice can be understood only by closely studying its history. Ilari and Habibi (chapter 17) consider how naïve notions of what constitutes a musician versus a nonmusician can hold research back, and Savage et al. (chapter 18) provide practical steps to move the field forward to a more pervasively cross-cultural approach. In chapter 19, Feld joins the volume editors and Jacoby for a multidisciplinary conversation about the challenges of and opportunities for collaborative research that would integrate cognitive and cultural understandings of musical life.

By bringing scholars from the sciences and the humanities together around these four key issues, this volume encourages sustained attention to core disciplinary questions for music studies. The organizing myths map out the existing problems in music science, while going beyond them brings to light people, musics, and approaches that typically fall through the cracks of this parcellated space. This volume also provides the scientific study of music with its first major reckoning, integrating the field's past with the project of imagining its future. Grappling with the tension between the reductionist, universalizing impulses in scientific approaches to music and the commitment to the particular in humanistic approaches, for example, enables one to envision ways to negotiate between them. *The Science-Music Borderlands* thus charts a path forward for music studies that combines insights from the sciences and the humanities. Connecting these divergent branches requires that we address questions at the core of how knowledge is produced, providing an example for other disciplines facing similar issues. We hope that by immersing readers in a diverse field, this volume lays the groundwork for further conversations and collaborations.

References

- Barry, A., & Born, G. (2008). Logics of interdisciplinarity. *Economy and Society*, 37(1), 20–49.
- Born, G. (2010). For a relational musicology: Music and interdisciplinarity. Beyond the practice turn. *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 135(2), 205–243.
- Creanza, N., Kolodny, O., & Feldman, M. W. (2017). Cultural evolutionary theory: How culture evolves and why it matters. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(30), 7782–7789.
- Hartley, C., & Poeppel, D. (2020). Beyond the stimulus: A neurohumanities approach to language, music, and emotion. *Neuron*, 108, 597–599.
- Hasson, U., Nastase, S., & Goldstein, A. (2020). Robust-fit to nature: An evolutionary perspective on biological (and artificial) neural networks. *Neuron*, 105(3), 416–434.
- Ochoa Gautier, A. M. (2016). Acoustic multinaturalism, the value of nature, and the nature of music in ecomusicology. *Boundary*, 2, 43(1), 107–141.
- Pressnitzer, D., Graves, J., Chambers, C., de Gardelle, V., & Egré, P. (2018). Auditory perception: *Laurel and Yanny* together at last. *Current Biology*, 28(13), R739–R741.
- Salam, M., & Victor, D. (2018, May 15). Yanny or laurel? How a sound clip divided America. *New York Times*.
- Siegel, E. H., Sands, M. K., Van den Noortgate, W., Condon, P., Chang, Y., Dy, J., Quigley, K. S., & Barrett, L. F. (2018). Emotion fingerprints or emotion populations? A meta-analytic investigation of autonomic features of emotion categories. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(4), 343–393.

I Beyond Nature vs. Nurture

Volume Editors

It would seem like we're moving past the nature vs. nurture debate. Gene-culture coevolution captures the idea that human cultural practices and lasting changes in human biology interact over evolutionary time (Richerson, Boyd, & Henrich, 2010, as cited in Patel, 2018). Biocultural hypotheses posit that the either-or dichotomy between culture and biology is limiting and inaccurate (van der Schyff & Schiavio, 2017). Before we declare the end of investigations into whether the musical mind is inherited or acquired, however, it behooves us to pause and reflect on whether anything has really changed. As Evelyn Fox Keller observed, "One of the most striking features of the nature-nurture debate is the frequency with which it leads to two apparently contradictory results: the claim that the debate has finally been resolved (i.e., we now know that the answer is neither nature nor nurture, but both), and the debate's refusal to die" (2010, p. 1). We are yet again at risk of declaring the debate resolved, only to see it persist, if we cannot imagine alternatives that speak across the humanities and sciences, to those doing research and those funding it, to specialists and the general public alike.

Why has the nature-nurture debate proved so stubborn? One way to address this question is to examine the disciplinary and institutional structures where the debate remains entrenched, despite persistent efforts to move beyond it. For music psychologists and cognitive scientists, the kinds of findings and claims that have high value are yoked to a larger hierarchy of knowledge. Although a wide range of research questions and methodologies are represented in specialist music cognition journals, the demands of publishing in general-interest scientific journals can push researchers to strive to link music to the biological, with the assumption that being biological means being scientific, objective, and universal and thus resistant to the winds of social and cultural change. Thus, within the institutional structures of science, incentives persist that encourage a stark approach to the relationship between nature and nurture.

On the flip side, it is a veritable taboo in many humanities fields to consider biology a determinant of cultural life or to take an interest in what might be "universal"

to humanity. As Mundy writes (chapter 4), World War II revealed deeply flawed thinking about the relation between biological and cultural evolution, and as a result, music scholars retreated to a focus on the music itself. In chapter 19 of this volume, Feld discusses a heightened suspicion of “universalism” that took root in anthropology and cultural studies in the 1990s, in the context of increasing disciplinary specialization and competition for resources that further polarized the sciences and the humanities. More recently, humanities scholars have targeted human exceptionalism and anthropocentrism as culprits in the planetary climate crisis; this adds a new set of ethical liabilities to discussions of uniquely human capacities (Nayar, 2014; Ochoa Gautier, 2016).

One step forward would be recognizing the pressures that operate on both scientists and humanists to stay in their respective lanes vis-à-vis nature and nurture, as well as the constraining and distorting effects of those pressures. Additional steps require sustained interaction between thinkers in both fields. Keller, for instance, suggests reformulating the nature-nurture question to preserve what people care about knowing, without creating a false dichotomy: “how malleable is a given trait, at a specified developmental age?” (2010, p. 75).

For music research, such paradigm shifts have implications for what counts as a major or meaningful finding and also for the questions that experiments are designed to address. Attempting to isolate innate from learned, for instance, is less important than identifying a broad range of factors and how they interact. As Patel reminds us in chapter 1 of this volume, the value of music doesn’t depend on its evolutionary status. Likewise, the value of research doesn’t depend on falling on one side or the other of the nature-nurture dichotomy.

Three major areas of research that have been shaped by the nature-nurture debate are evolutionary origins, animal musicality, and cross-cultural comparisons. These areas most clearly demonstrate not only the problems of trying to separate nature and nurture but also the new possibilities opened up by alternative framings. The chapters in this section focus on evolutionary origins (Patel, Tomlinson) and animal musicality (Mundy; Duengen, Sarfati, and Ravnani). The topic of cross-cultural comparison is taken up elsewhere in this volume (in particular, see chapters 9, 18, and 19).

Patel and Tomlinson have published extensively on music and evolution: Patel as a neuroscientist whose research centers on music and language and cross-species musicality, and Tomlinson as a humanist whose engagement with differences across history and culture led to work on the emergence of human cultural capacities through evolutionary processes. In their contributions to this volume, they offer complementary voices on the emergence of culture in interaction with biological substrates. Tomlinson proposes that the burgeoning of culture, including behaviors we might call music and

language, shares the same “indexical commons” across species. Patel uses the phrase “purely cultural” to describe capacities for which no neural specializations evolved specifically, while pointing out that “purely cultural” does not mean independent from biology, given that any cognitive capacity still “draws on specific brain regions or pathways and can be influenced by changes to those substrates.”

The chapters by Duengen, Sarfati, and Ravignani and by Mundy address animal studies, showing how animals can help us think through music researchers’ assumptions and how behaviors exhibited throughout the animal kingdom can provide insight into notions of musicality. As Duengen, Sarfati, and Ravignani demonstrate through their survey of the current literature on animal musicality, although testing animals for human musical capacities—especially pitch perception—has been a dominant research practice, it yields limited insight compared with what could be learned by considering a broader range of cognitive capacities and sounds of ecological relevance to various species. Mundy takes up the ethical dimensions of animal research, considering the history shaping that research in order to question its enabling human-animal binary and propose future research directions founded on different premises.

The chapters in this section illustrate a back-and-forth relationship between empirical studies and theoretical models, the latter endeavoring not only to explain the former but also to enable new testable hypotheses. Music provides a domain within which broader philosophical and scientific issues around the relationship between nature and nurture can be theorized and investigated in tractable ways.

References

- Keller, E. F. (2010). *The mirage of a space between nature and nurture*. Duke University Press.
- Nayar, P. K. (2014). *Posthumanism*. Polity Press.
- Ochoa Gautier, A. M. (2016). Acoustic multinaturalism, the value of nature, and the nature of music in ecomusicology. *Boundary 2*, 43(1), 107–141.
- Patel, A. (2018). Music as a transformative technology of the mind: An update. In H. Honing (Ed.), *The origins of musicality* (pp. 113–126). MIT Press.
- Richerson, P. J., Boyd, R., & Henrich, J. (2010). Gene-culture coevolution in the age of genomics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107, 8985–8992.
- van der Schyff, D., & Schiavio, A. (2017). Evolutionary musicology meets embodied cognition: Biocultural coevolution and the enactive origins of human musicality. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 11(519), 1–18.

1 Human Musicality and Gene-Culture Coevolution: Ten Concepts to Guide Productive Exploration

Aniruddh D. Patel

Introduction

Debates over the evolution of human musicality have a long history and are far from resolved. Impressed by music's psychological power and cultural ubiquity, Charles Darwin (1871) theorized an adaptive origin for music in *The Descent of Man*. He proposed that wordless songs and rhythms arose in our prehuman ancestors as a display to attract mates, laying the foundation for our strong emotional response to music and scaffolding the later evolution of articulate language. In contrast, William James, who generally accepted Darwin's view that our minds are replete with evolved instincts, held a nonadaptationist view of music's origins. James touched lightly on music in *The Principles of Psychology* and saw human musicality as a fortuitous by-product of how our minds work, a "mere incidental peculiarity of the nervous system . . . of no teleological significance" (1890, vol. 2, p. 419). In short, Darwin claimed that we are an inherently musical species, while James claimed we are not.

Darwin and James never debated their positions. Darwin died eight years before James's *Principles* was published, and no correspondence between the two scholars has ever been found. Yet their conceptual alternatives have persisted in evolutionary debates over music. In the modern era, support for Darwin's theory that human music originated in sexual selection has waned, but several other adaptive theories of music's origins (e.g., rooted in social bonding, parent-infant communication, or signaling of coalition strength) have been proposed by biologists and psychologists and continue to attract attention (e.g., Dunbar, 2012; Mehr et al., 2021). Many scholars remain unconvinced, however, and James's by-product view has morphed into a number of detailed theories positing that musical behavior is a purely cultural invention building on brain functions that evolved for other reasons (e.g., Sperber, 1996; Pinker, 1997; Marcus, 2012).

It is certainly true that cultural invention can give rise to psychologically and socially powerful cognitive capacities that are not specifically predisposed by evolution.

Literacy proves this point. Psychologists, neuroscientists, and evolutionary biologists agree that human beings did not evolve to read and write (e.g., Wolf, 2007; Dehaene, 2010; Henrich, 2020). We are no more an “inherently literate” species than we are an “inherently bicycling” species. Literacy is a relatively recent human invention whose historical roots are known and date to around 3000 BCE. Humans invented literacy by drawing on evolved capacities for language, fine motor control, detailed visual pattern perception, imitation, and so forth to forge a purely cultural invention that has transformed human life. Note that “purely cultural” in this context does not mean immune from biological influences. Literacy, like any cognitive capacity, draws on specific brain regions and brain pathways and can be influenced by changes in those substrates. For example, certain genetic variants influence reading ability and the risk of dyslexia (Centanni, 2020; Doust et al., in press). This is not because humans have specific genes for reading but because those variants influence the development of brain areas or pathways that happen to be important for reading. Literacy is a purely cultural invention in the sense that no brain areas, pathways, or mechanisms have evolved specifically to facilitate the acquisition of this ability. This is unlike speech, for which there is strong, converging evidence from multiple disciplines (including cognitive science, neuroscience, and cross-species research) that the human brain has been modified over time to support a child’s ability to acquire spoken language (Patel, 2008, ch. 7; Hagoort, 2017). Of course, speaking also interfaces with neural circuitry that long predates the evolution of speech and is unlikely to be specialized for language, such as brain circuits for motor habit formation. (Thus, individuals with nonfluent aphasia, who cannot generate novel sentences due to cognitive problems after a stroke, can often recite previously memorized prayers or count fluently.) The key point is that there is broad consensus among researchers that *some* human cognitive and neural mechanisms have been specialized over evolutionary time for the processing of spoken language.

Relating back to music, the modern version of the Darwin-James debate offers two conceptual alternatives: either human brains evolved neural specializations for music processing, or music relies entirely on brain circuits that evolved to serve other functions. In the latter view, such circuits are neurally “recycled” during brain development to serve music processing functions (Dehaene & Cohen, 2007). A few years ago I conducted an informal survey using an international mailing list of thousands of researchers who specialize in human auditory cognitive neuroscience. I asked the researchers to indicate which of the two positions they favored. I received about 200 responses, and they were almost perfectly split between the two alternatives. This was striking, given that there has been an explosion of research on music and the brain since 2000. Darwin and James cannot both be right, and it seems that modern neuroscientific findings have not moved the needle strongly toward one position or the other.

One reason that neuroscience has had little impact on this debate (so far) is that during ontogeny the brain can acquire neural specializations for activities we did not specifically evolve to do, via experience-dependent neural plasticity. For example, when a person learns to read and write, a region in the ventral occipitotemporal cortex begins to respond more strongly to orthography in that person's language than to other visual stimuli (Hervais-Adelman et al., 2019). This visual word form area (VWFA) is involved in interpreting visual patterns as written characters and connects to language regions that process these characters phonologically, semantically, and grammatically (Dehaene, 2010). The existence of the VWFA implies that identifying brain regions that respond selectively to music rather than to other sounds (i.e., regions neurally selective for music) would not help resolve the Darwin-James debate. Indeed, there is now robust evidence for the existence of such regions. This is interesting because, to date, the only sounds for which category-selective neural regions have been found are speech and music (Norman-Haignere et al., 2015; Boebinger et al., 2021). Yet, like the VWFA, music-selective brain regions could result from experience-dependent neural plasticity because music is a complex, meaningful sound pattern heard throughout life. Indeed, humans begin hearing and learning about music before birth (Hepper, 1991; Partanen et al., 2013) and are regularly exposed to music throughout infancy and early childhood, when the brain is developing rapidly (Lewis, 2016; Trehub & Cirelli, 2018; de Almeida et al., 2020; Mendoza & Fausey, 2021). Thus, the existence of music-selective brain regions in adults is not conclusive evidence that the brain has evolved neural specializations for music processing.

About a decade ago, based on evidence from cognitive neuroscience and other disciplines, I argued for a purely cultural view of music's origins (Patel, 2008, 2010). Although I emphasized music's ability to have a psychologically transformative effect on individual human lives and to shape the brain through mechanisms of neural plasticity, I believed there was insufficient evidence to argue that humans had evolved neural specializations for music processing. In the ensuing years, however, new empirical findings about music cognition and evolutionary biologists' growing interest in theories of gene-culture coevolution have led me to reconsider my position. In terms of empirical work, surprising discoveries indicate that seemingly basic aspects of human musical rhythmic and melodic cognition (i.e., aspects that develop without explicit training and are culturally widespread) are not widely shared by other species and require surprisingly complex neural processing (for a review, see Patel, 2019; cf. chapter 3 in this volume). This hints that evolved neural specializations may underlie these abilities. Furthermore, recent large-scale genomic studies of musicality (Niarchou et al., 2022) are ushering in a new era of neurogenetic research that can help test evolutionary hypotheses about the origins of musicality in our species.

On the theoretical front, a number of evolutionary biologists are arguing that interactions between cultural invention and biological evolution played a key role in shaping the human mind (e.g., Henrich, 2016; Laland, 2017). This work is rooted in growing evidence that cultural inventions such as agriculture, fire control, and cooking have influenced the course of human biological evolution (Itan et al., 2009; Wrangham, 2009, 2017). Although this theory of gene-culture coevolution has been present in biology for some time (Lumsden & Wilson, 1981; Feldman & Laland, 1996), recent years have seen an uptick in its application to the evolution of human cognition (e.g., Fisher & Ridley, 2013; Dennett, 2017). The idea that gene-culture coevolution played a role in the emergence of human musicality was articulated 20 years ago (Cross, 2003), yet only recently has this idea been explored in detail (e.g., Tomlinson, 2015; Podlipniak, 2017; Patel, 2018, 2021; Savage et al., 2021; Shilton, 2022). Notably, this theory provides an alternative to the adaptation versus cultural invention polarities that have dominated debates over music and evolution for more than a century. For instance, perhaps musical behavior started as a purely cultural invention in our human ancestors and then later triggered processes of gene-culture coevolution due to its impact on survival. The question, of course, is how to test such a view (for suggestions, see Savage et al., 2021; Patel, 2021).

In formulating and testing gene-culture coevolutionary theories of musicality, it is essential to consider the diverse ways music is made, used, and perceived. In other words, research from ethnomusicology, anthropology, and musicology is crucial to this enterprise. However, crossing back and forth between the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities is far from trivial. These territories are very different, with distinct vocabularies, customs, and concerns (Shelemay, 2011; Feld, 2012; Margulis, 2014; Mundy, 2018, chapter 4 in this volume; Albouy et al., 2020). The goal of this chapter is to equip the explorer with some concepts that will make these journeys productive. These concepts are based on my own experience and training in cognitive neuroscience and evolutionary biology and on my limited knowledge of how music varies across cultures, gleaned from my readings, conversations with specialists in anthropology and ethnomusicology, and field trips with ethnomusicologists (Roberts, 2014). I hope this chapter will lead to conversations with colleagues in other fields who can refine and augment these concepts to make them useful to scholars across a range of disciplines.

Music, Musicality, and Choosing Which Musical Abilities to Study

The ten concepts listed in this chapter are premised on a fundamental distinction central to modern evolutionary work on music—namely, the distinction between *music*

and *musicality* (Honing et al., 2015). *Music* is a socially constructed category; this is evident even within the boundaries of western European music, where avant-garde composers have been challenging and expanding what counts as music for more than a century. Ethnomusicologists note that although music occurs in every culture (Nettl, 2015), beyond the boundaries of western Europe or WEIRD (Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic) societies more generally (Henrich, 2020), many languages have no single word for *music* that aligns with the common meaning of this word in English. For example, Trehub, Becker, and Morley (2015) note that the word *nkwa* among the Igbo of Nigeria encompasses music and dance and that the Basonge of Zaire have names for individual genres of music but have no term that encompasses all their genres. Furthermore, any human musical tradition is the product of a rich historical process and is embedded in a complex web of social and political meanings (see chapter 9 in this volume). Thus, it makes no more sense to discuss the biological evolution of music than it does to discuss the biological evolution of French or any of the other approximately 7,000 extant human languages (Eberhard et al., 2021). Just as the capacity for language is the target for scientists interested in explaining the biological evolution of language, the capacity for music is the target for evolutionary biologists interested in explaining music. The human capacity for music, or human *musicality*, can be defined as the spontaneously developing cognitive, sensorimotor, and affective capacities supporting human musical behavior. (Here, “spontaneously developing” means emerging without explicit instruction.)

This cognitive sense of musicality is quite different from the colloquial meaning of the term, which connotes a special interest in or talent for music. For example, one component of musicality in the cognitive sense is the ability to recognize a melody when it is transposed up or down in pitch (e.g., being able to recognize the song “Happy Birthday” whether it is played on a piccolo or a tuba). This is subjectively effortless for human listeners, develops early in life without any special training (Plantinga & Trainor, 2005), and appears to be a universal feature of human music cognition (Nettl, 2015). This ability may seem so simple as to be neurologically trivial, yet numerous studies have shown that songbirds (which rely on complex, learned acoustic sequences for communication and can learn to recognize human melodies) do not have this ability, indicating that it is not an automatic consequence of having a complex auditory system (for a review, see Patel, 2019).¹ Furthermore, neuroimaging reveals that this human ability relies on a network of brain regions extending far outside traditional auditory regions (Foster & Zatorre, 2010a, 2010b). Another component of musicality in the cognitive sense is the ability to perceive a beat in rhythmic music and move in synchrony with that beat in a predictable and tempo-flexible fashion (e.g., via clapping,

bobbing, or dancing). This ability emerges without special training in early childhood and is culturally widespread (Savage et al., 2015). Again, although humans can do this effortlessly, current research suggests that this ability is rare in other species, including nonhuman primates, and is neurally complex, engaging a distributed network of cortical and subcortical regions (for reviews, see Patel, 2014; Cannon & Patel, 2021).

An important question about musicality concerns avant-garde composers' expansion of Western notions of music. Have they also expanded the concept of musicality? For example, Leslie (in chapter 13 of this volume) describes her compositions that integrate physiological signals into music. By passing her own brain waves "through a sonification algorithm that imprints their spectral quality onto a bank of stored flute and voice sounds," she mixes her own live performance sound. Leslie has also created an "algorithmically generated musical composition that breathes softly along with its listener, either according to a predetermined ideal breathing rate or in response to data streamed online from a respiration sensor worn by the listener." This innovative work illustrates how musical avant-gardists can create new and valuable aesthetic experiences. Yet I doubt that avant-garde music has changed human musicality in the cognitive sense, because such musicality is based on musical practices that are *widespread* within a culture. Thus, even icons of the avant-garde like Arnold Schoenberg, who have appreciative and responsive listeners (Auner, 1999; Mencke et al., 2019), have a limited public reach. "Called upon to say something about my public," Schoenberg wrote in a 1930 essay, "I have to confess: I do not believe I have one" (Stein, 1975, pp. 96–99).

In addition to the ability to recognize transposed melodies and synchronize to an auditory beat, human musicality involves many more capacities. Developing a list of such abilities is an important (and thorny) issue that would benefit from multidisciplinary discussions. While some items on this list are likely to be uncontroversial, such as the ability to remember a melodic phrase and sing it back or the capacity to be emotionally moved by music, others would probably be contested among scholars from different disciplines. However, the two abilities cited are sufficient to illustrate a key point for evolutionary research on musicality. One of these abilities (recognition of transposed melodies) can plausibly be regarded as a consequence of neural specializations for spoken language. In speech, salient rises and falls in pitch are used to distinguish linguistically important categories (e.g., word meanings in tone languages and pragmatic categories, such as statement versus question, in many languages). Listeners need to be able to recognize these "speech melodies" independent of absolute pitch because the pitch registers of men, women, and children differ substantially (Ladd, 2008). Thus, neural specializations that allow the recognition of transposed melodies may have evolved to serve speech perception, and they may be employed *by* music

cognition without any additional neural specialization *for* music cognition. In the parlance of evolutionary biology, our ability to recognize transposed musical melodies might be an exaptation of the neural infrastructure for speech, without any subsequent evolutionary specialization for music (Gould & Vrba, 1982). In contrast, our ability to synchronize movements to a rhythmic beat is not so easily explained as a secondary use of speech-related brain processes. Ordinary speech does not have a periodic beat; nor do we bob, tap, or dance to ordinary speech (Patel, 2008). For biologists studying whether humans have evolved neural specializations for music processing, choosing aspects of musicality that are not easily explained as secondary uses of other, more obviously adaptive brain functions (such as speech) is an important consideration.

The broader concept is that music cognition draws on a diverse set of brain mechanisms, many of which are unlikely to be specialized over evolutionary time for music cognition (Trainor, 2015). For example, subcortical sound localization mechanisms are used when we process music, but these mechanisms evolved in animals to serve important ecological functions, such as locating predators, long before humans came on the scene. It is highly unlikely that these mechanisms were modified in humans specifically to facilitate musical processing, even though listening to music (or to any sound, for that matter) engages these mechanisms. Thus, the question at the heart of this chapter is whether music engages *any* brain mechanisms that have been specialized over evolutionary time for music cognition, and if so, whether gene-culture coevolution is responsible for this specialization. With this question in mind, I now turn to ten concepts that can guide researchers through the borderlands between the sciences and the humanities and into the territories that meet at this border.

Concept 1: Music's Value Does Not Depend on Its Evolutionary Status

Many who are drawn to music research respond strongly to music themselves. When studying evolutionary questions, this can create an implicit bias toward adaptationist theories. Implicit biases are dangerous because they can lead a researcher to unwittingly focus on data that support a favored theory and ignore contradictory data or to examine supportive data with a less critical eye than unsupportive data. To minimize such biases, it is important to remember that a particular ability's value to human life is unrelated to whether neural specializations for that ability have evolved in humans. Literacy provides a clear example. Literacy has transformed human cultures and mental experiences in positive ways, yet humans have not evolved any neural specializations for reading and writing (Wolf, 2007). Another example is exercise. Exercise is enormously valuable for physical and mental health (Ratey, 2008), yet recent research in human evolutionary

biology suggests that we have no evolutionary predispositions or specializations for this activity (Lieberman, 2021). Similarly, there is growing evidence that musical activity has beneficial neurological effects in individuals with a variety of disorders (Loui et al., 2018), yet these benefits will not be diminished if it turns out that human beings are not an inherently musical species. More generally, if research on music and gene-culture coevolution ends up supporting the conclusion that humans have not evolved any neural specializations for music, this would not be a failure; it would be a perfectly acceptable outcome. This is because doing this research will lead to valuable discoveries in cognitive and brain science, a point to which I return in the final section of this chapter.

Concept 2: There Are Two Types of Neural Plasticity: Experience-Expectant and Experience-Dependent

As noted in the introduction, during ontogeny human brains can acquire neural specializations for purely cultural inventions (e.g., literacy) via experience-dependent neural plasticity. However, neural plasticity is not the opposite of innateness. Neural plasticity also occurs in circuits that have become specialized over evolutionary time to serve particular functions. This is best documented by research on critical or sensitive periods—that is, times in early development when experience is known to be essential for the correct wiring and tuning of the brain’s specialized systems, including those for vision, language, and social cognition (Reh et al., 2020). Greenough, Black, and Wallace (1987) used the term “experience-expectant plasticity” to refer to the experience-driven molding of specialized circuits that occurs during critical periods and has a significant influence on subsequent abilities. As a rule, such experiences (e.g., seeing with two eyes that focus on the same point in space or receiving regular social input from a caregiver) are common to all members of a species. By allowing experience to sculpt rapidly developing specialized circuits, these circuits can perform complex tasks better than hard-wired circuits with less flexibility. Greenough’s group contrasted experience-expectant plasticity with experience-dependent plasticity, defined as changes in the brain that can happen throughout life and are based on experiences that are not common to all members of a species. (Literacy is an example of experience-dependent plasticity: even though it is more than 5,000 years old, it is still far from universal.²) The key point is that if a human ability is based on evolved neural specializations *and* is strongly influenced by culture, it will engage both types of plasticity. Spoken language is a good example: learning to speak requires the development of phonological and lexical processing mechanisms that are shaped by experience-expectant plasticity (Kuhl, 2010; Reh et al., 2020), but mastering a particular language involves learning specific words and grammatical structures that are not universal, requiring experience-dependent

plasticity. Thus, a key question for gene-culture coevolutionary research on music is whether the development of any musical ability involves experience-expectant plasticity or only experience-dependent plasticity (Penhune, 2020).

In asking this question, it is important to remember that both types of plasticity build circuits that have ongoing gene-environment interactions throughout an individual's life. As entailed in Tomlinson's idea of "radical niche construction" (see chapter 2 in this volume), biological systems have gene-environment interactions even at rapid timescales. For example, when adult zebra finches hear rhythmic versus arrhythmic versions of their conspecific songs, they exhibit greater levels of immediate early gene expression in auditory forebrain areas in response to the latter. In contrast, juvenile zebra finches show exactly the opposite pattern. This developmental reversal in rapid gene-environment interactions may reflect differences in how rhythm is used in learning songs versus evaluating song structure once learning has occurred (Lampen et al., 2019; cf. Rouse et al., 2021). The important point is that biological systems represent a constant interplay of genes and environment, even in brain circuits specialized by evolution to facilitate certain abilities.

Concept 3: Musical Behavior Might Have Originated as a Purely Cultural Invention

The concept of gene-culture coevolution entails the idea that purely cultural inventions can lead to heritable genetic changes (as discussed earlier regarding fire control in human evolution). This idea is stated succinctly by Fisher and Ridely (2013): "The smallest, most trivial new habit adopted by a hominid species could—if advantageous—have led to the selection of genomic variations that sharpened that habit." Gene-culture coevolutionary theories of musicality are thus concordant with the view that early musical behavior was not spurred by some genetic change in human ancestors but arose when nonmusical behaviors in those ancestors (e.g., coordinated group rhythmic vocalizations, as occur among chimpanzees and bonobos) were culturally repurposed in ways that began to resemble musical behavior. The crucial issue is whether this resulted in a consistent advantage in survival or reproduction that ultimately led to selection for genomic variations favoring the proclivity and capacity for these new behaviors. (For a proposal on how this could have taken place, see Patel, 2021.)

Concept 4: Capacity and Proclivity Are Conceptually and Neurally Distinct Targets for Natural Selection

In the first edition of *The Descent of Man*, Darwin wrote, "the perception, if not the enjoyment, of musical cadences and of rhythm is probably common to all animals

and no doubt depends on the common physiological nature of their nervous systems” (1871, vol. 2, p. 333). Darwin’s assertion that the basic human capacity to perceive music is widely shared among animal species has been challenged by modern research. However, his conceptual distinction between musical capacity and the motivation to engage in musical behavior (i.e., “enjoyment”) remains crucial for research on the evolutionary foundations of musicality. It is conceivable, for example, that evolution has enhanced our motivation to engage in musical behavior without any evolved neural specialization for processing specific rhythmic or melodic aspects of music (Trehub, 2003). In this case, the relevant neural changes would occur only in pathways that support intrinsic reward in response to certain activities, including deep brain structures such as the ventral striatum and the connections between these areas and the relevant cortical structures involved in music processing (Belfi & Loui, 2020; Mas-Herrero et al., 2021). Conversely, selection may have acted on both motivational mechanisms (proclivity) and brain regions and pathways supporting the capacity for musical processing (Patel, 2021; Savage et al., 2021). In either case, a gene-culture coevolutionary view of musicality is premised on the existence of some evolutionary neural specialization for brain mechanisms involved in musical behavior.

Concept 5: Abilities Based on Evolved Neural Specializations Can Vary Widely

A common objection to the idea that humans are inherently musical is the observation that musical abilities vary widely among people. Such claims often implicitly focus on musicality in the informal sense—that is, having a special interest in or talent for music. When one focuses on components of musicality in the cognitive sense, such as implicit knowledge of the norms of one’s native musical system or the ability to move in time with a musical beat, variance is likely to be lower (Rohrmeier & Rebuschat, 2012; Tranchant et al., 2016). Yet even these sorts of abilities can show substantial variation (Tranchant et al., 2021). The key point is that such variance provides no evidence *against* such abilities being supported by evolved neural specializations. Facial recognition illustrates this point. There is compelling evidence that facial recognition relies on brain circuits specialized over evolutionary time and shaped by experience-expectant plasticity in early development (Moulson et al., 2009; Todorov, 2017, chs. 12, 13; Cabral et al., 2020; Kosakowski et al., 2022). Yet the capacity for facial recognition varies widely in neurologically intact individuals, ranging from those with very poor abilities to “super-recognizers” (Sacks, 2011). Notably, even though twin studies indicate a substantial genetic contribution to severe facial recognition deficits (developmental prosopagnosia; Wilmer et al., 2010), and despite the important role of facial

recognition in human social interaction, individuals with developmental prosopagnosia have not been “weeded out” by natural selection. This shows that there will always be humans who struggle with certain abilities for which the human brain is specialized.

Concept 6: Ancient, Universal Cognitive Traits Are Not Necessarily Based on Evolved Neural Specializations for Those Traits

Proponents of adaptationist theories of music’s origins often point out that music is far older and more widespread than purely cultural inventions such as literacy. Music occurs in every culture, and the earliest known instruments are around 40,000 years old. This is likely much younger than the origins of musical behavior in humans, as singing leaves no trace in the fossil record (Higham et al., 2012; Morley, 2013; Nettle, 2015; Savage et al., 2015, Mehr et al., 2019). While the age and ubiquity of music are certainly consistent with theories that posit evolved neural specializations for musicality, they provide no evidence of such specializations. This is because humans likely have some ancient, universal, and culturally prominent cognitive traits that are by-products of evolved aspects of cognition, as William James suggested in *Principles of Psychology*. Belief in ghosts or other spirits is one example. Such beliefs are universal in human culture (Norenzayan et al., 2016), but not because our brains evolved to encourage supernatural beliefs due to their survival value.³ Rather, several authors have argued that certain features of our evolved psychology make us *susceptible* to belief in supernatural agents (e.g., Dennett, 2006). For example, Boyd (2018) and Henrich (2020) argue that such features include a reliance on cultural learning (to such an extent that it overrides even direct experience or intuition), tendencies to infer what others are thinking (theory of mind), and a bias for causal explanations based on the actions of agents. Supernatural beliefs may well be as old as articulate language in the human species and thus far older than the oldest known musical instruments. Such beliefs remind us that not every ancient and culturally universal human mental trait is a result of the brain evolving neural specializations for that trait.

Concept 7: Evolutionary Specialization and Adaptive Function Are Conceptually Distinct Issues

Research on musicality and evolution has often focused on music’s adaptive value. Yet as pointed out by Tinbergen (1963), adaptation (what is it for?) is only one question about the evolution of a behavior. A second, equally important question concerns evolutionary history or phylogeny: how did it evolve? With respect to musicality, the

evolutionary history of its components can be studied independently of questions about adaptation. Research on the human ability to synchronize movements to a musical beat provides an example. Patel (2006) hypothesized that this ability has its origins in the neural capacity for complex vocal learning, since both abilities involve sophisticated forebrain auditory-motor processing and engage some of the same neural circuits. This hypothesis yielded testable predictions and led to numerous empirical studies. More recently, Patel (2021) updated this hypothesis to suggest that vocal learning acted as a preadaptation for spontaneous beat perception and synchronization (BPS) and that subsequent evolutionary neural specialization for BPS took place via processes of gene-culture coevolution. This hypothesis assumes that synchronized movement to a beat in social contexts had adaptive value in early human groups, but it does not commit to just one specific adaptive function. Some theorists argue that synchrony to a beat in social contexts enhanced social bonding outside of those contexts (e.g., Savage et al., 2021), while others argue that it signaled coalition strength to other groups (e.g., Mehr et al., 2021): these theories are not mutually exclusive. The relevant point is that scientists can look for evidence of evolved neural specializations for BPS without waiting for these adaptationist debates to be resolved. To take an analogy from physical anthropology, researchers have provided convincing evidence that, compared with other primates, humans' bodies are specialized for bipedal locomotion, even though debates over *why* bipedalism was advantageous to our human ancestors are far from resolved (reviewed in Lieberman, 2013). In the case of bipedalism, evidence for specialization comes from research on comparative anatomy, biomechanics, development, and other disciplines (e.g., Richard et al., 2020). Similarly, determining whether BPS or other aspects of musicality are based on evolved neural specializations will require the integration of research across numerous disciplines, including neuroscience, genetics, cross-species studies, ethnomusicology, and developmental psychology. It is possible that we may one day have strong evidence of evolved neural specializations for musicality, even while debates over the original adaptive value of musical behavior remain unresolved.

Concept 8: A Trait Can Be Genetically Influenced without Being Genetically Determined

Gene-culture coevolution theories posit that certain components of musicality are genetically influenced. Crucially, modern views of how musical (or other cognitive) abilities are genetically influenced differ in important ways from deterministic views of the relation between genes and cognition. One of the early music psychologists who held such deterministic views was Carl Seashore, who developed auditory pattern

perception tests with the aim of identifying children who were worthy of music education. “The gift of music is inborn,” remarked Seashore, “and inborn in specific types which can be detected early in life, before time for beginning serious musical education” (quoted in Cary, 1922). In contrast, modern research posits that genetic influences on specific components of musicality are subtle, with genetic variants acting probabilistically and dynamically to influence but not determine such capacities. This is in line with modern research on the behavioral genetics of cognitive traits, which emphasizes feedback loops created by gene-environment interactions during child development (Harden, 2021).

For example, a recent large-scale genome-wide association study of musical beat synchronization revealed that variation in this ability is associated with particular genetic variants occurring at numerous positions along the genome, with 67 loci reaching genome-wide significance (Niarchou et al., 2022). That is, the ability to synchronize movement to a musical beat is a complex or polygenic trait that can be weakly influenced by many common genetic variants, rather than a Mendelian trait strongly influenced by variation at a single gene. The results of the study were virtually unchanged by controlling for general cognition, consistent with results from the twin literature showing that the genetics of rhythm are not solely attributable to generally cognitive effects. Importantly, in this new study, genetic variance explained only about 13 to 16 percent of phenotypic variance in the ability to clap in time to a musical beat, indicating that variance in this ability is genetically influenced but far from genetically determined. This means that interactions among genes, experience, and culture are essential in understanding how this trait develops in individuals.

Concept 9: Studying Cultural Variation in Music Requires Reading Primary Sources and Talking with Specialists

Recent years have seen a growth in “big data” studies of music that draw on ethnographic databases or collections of audio recordings to study cross-cultural patterns in musical structure or behavior using quantitative analyses. Such studies have provided valuable information and are well worth conducting, and when they are published in high-profile journals (e.g., Savage et al., 2015; Mehr et al., 2019), they are frequently cited by cognitive scientists seeking to understand musical diversity. Yet such studies are far from the final word on musical diversity because they draw on a limited sample of the world’s cultures. For example, Savage et al. (2015) examined 304 diverse recordings of traditional music from around the world (taken from the *Garland Encyclopedia of World Music*), while Mehr et al. (2019) examined ethnographic descriptions from

60 traditional societies chosen to represent 60 cultural clusters from among the 315 cultures in the Human Relations Area Files. Mehr's group also analyzed audio recordings from 86 traditional societies around the world, taken mainly from the Archive for World Music in Harvard's music library. Although these studies examined more cultures than previous comparative work on music and applied modern methods of analysis to generate quantitative comparative data, many cultures were not represented in these samples (recall that there are around 7,000 extant languages on earth today; Eberhard et al., 2021). Theories built on limited samples inevitably reflect the biases of those samples.

For example, building on their previous cross-cultural work, Savage et al. (2021) and Mehr et al. (2021) proposed evolutionary theories of music that emphasize collective music making. Yet there are some traditional societies, not included in their earlier cross-cultural studies, where music making is primarily a solo endeavor (Patel & von Rueden, 2021). Without developing a list of such cultures and understanding why they opt for solo rather than collective musical behavior, theories of music and evolution remain incomplete. The relevant point is that researchers interested in musical diversity should not rely solely on existing cross-cultural "big data" studies. There is no substitute for reading primary research and talking with researchers who have spent years in the field with small-scale traditional societies. For example, such readings and conversations led Patel and von Rueden (2021) to learn about the predominance of solo musical behavior in multiple small-scale cultures (including several hunter-gatherer societies), none of which appeared in Savage's and Mehr's earlier cross-cultural studies. Fortunately for those who want to study musical diversity and develop hypotheses to help explain it, anthropology and ethnomusicology are thriving disciplines with primary sources and scholars available for consultation.

Concept 10: Variance in Musicality Is an Asset for Gene-Culture Coevolution Research

As noted earlier, musicality in the cognitive sense refers to the widespread and spontaneously developing mental and physical abilities that underlie the human capacity for music. Measurement of such abilities typically reveals substantial individual differences. For example, Tranchant et al. (2021, fig. 6) provided data on nonmusicians' ability to synchronize movements to a beat and to perceive beat in the absence of movement, and Jacoby et al. (2019, fig. 2) provided cross-cultural data on musically untrained individuals' ability to accurately sing back a simple pitch interval when the model is presented either within or outside their vocal range. Both studies revealed considerable individual variation. Significant variation in musicality is not limited to perception and production skills but is also apparent in responsiveness to music.

Research has revealed that a small percentage of individuals from western European cultures do not derive pleasure from music, even though they do not suffer from depression or other neuropsychological disorders, are not tone deaf, and can derive pleasure from other arts (Mas-Herrero et al., 2012, 2018). Brain imaging suggests that these “musically anhedonic” individuals have a low degree of neural coupling between auditory processing and reward regions of the brain (Martínez-Molina et al., 2016; Loui et al., 2017).⁴ Importantly, it appears that such individuals are at the low end of a continuum in terms of how rewarding people find music and how strongly connected their auditory and reward regions are (Loui et al., 2017; Martínez-Molina et al., 2019; Belfi & Loui, 2020). In other words, whether measuring perceptual, motor, or affective aspects of musicality, there is considerable variability across individuals. From the standpoint of theories of music and gene-culture coevolution, this variance is good because it can be leveraged to study mechanistic links among genes, experience, brains, culture, and musicality. This will require research using measures of musical ability and responsiveness that can be adapted to different cultures, ages, and degrees of musical training. (For some current measures of musicality, see Mas-Herrero et al., 2012; Sandstrom & Russo, 2013; Harrison & Müllensiefen, 2018; Jacoby et al., 2019; Zentner & Gingras, 2019.) Ultimately, this work will need to connect with emerging methods for studying the relations among human genetics, brain structure, and natural selection (Tilot et al., 2021).

Conclusion: Why This Research Matters

How is research on musicality relevant to the broader study of human evolution? Understanding the evolution of the human mind is a central issue in determining human origins. Among biologists studying the evolution of the mind, there is growing interest in the idea that gene-culture coevolution played a key role in this process. For example, Laland argues that compared to other species, humans experienced an unusually strong interaction between cultural and genetic processes:

Human culture is not just a magnificent end product of the evolutionary process, an entity that, like the peacock's tail or the orchid's bloom, is a spectacular outcome of Darwinian laws. For humans, culture is a big part of the explanatory process too. The evolution of the truly extraordinary characteristic of our species—our intelligence, language, cooperation, and technology—have proven difficult to comprehend, because, unlike most other evolved characters, they are not adaptive responses to extrinsic conditions. Rather, humans are creatures of their own making. The learned and socially transmitted activities of our ancestors, far more than climate, predators, or disease, created the conditions under which our intelligence evolved. Human minds are not just built *for* culture; they are built *by* culture. (2017, pp. 29–30)

Yet despite interest in the idea that gene-culture coevolutionary dynamics shaped the human mind, evidence supporting this view remains scarce. Convincing examples of gene-culture coevolution in human biology come from studies of genetic and physiological nonneural adaptations related to diet, climate, and disease (Laland et al., 2010; Richerson et al., 2010). Musicality may prove to be a more tractable domain for developing and testing theories of cognitive gene-culture coevolution than others mentioned by Laland, such as language and cooperation. This is because there are well-developed disciplines that study cultural variation in music and individual variation in musicality and because several core cognitive components of musicality (e.g., beat processing) are likely to be easier to understand in terms of neural mechanisms than are core cognitive components of language (e.g., lexical processing) or cooperation (e.g., theory of mind) (cf. Cannon & Patel, 2021; Cannon, 2021). Also, core components of musicality are likely to be more amenable to exploration in animal models, aiding in the elucidation of links among genes, brains, and cognition. In other words, there are several reasons why musicality may be a promising model for studying cognitive gene-culture coevolution in human beings. The methods and findings emerging from such research may prove valuable for gene-culture coevolutionary research on other key human mental faculties, such as language.

However, what happens if, decades from now, after many studies motivated by gene-culture coevolutionary theories of music, we conclude that music is a purely cultural invention based on brain functions that evolved for other reasons, like literacy? Even if this should transpire, research on the evolution of musicality will have been fruitful. As shown by a growing body of surprising discoveries, cross-species research on musicality (motivated by evolutionary hypotheses) is a powerful way to illuminate distinctive features of human nonlinguistic cognition. Furthermore, I suspect that evolutionary research on musicality will lead to breakthroughs in our understanding of the mechanistic links among human genes, brains, experience, and culture, regardless of whether we prove to be an inherently musical species.

Acknowledgments

I thank Elizabeth Margulis, Deirdre Loughridge, and Psyche Loui for organizing the workshop for which this chapter was written and for their helpful comments, and I thank Reyna Gordon for her input on concept 8. I also thank Gary Tomlinson, Rachel Mundy, Mathias Guenther, Sam Norman-Haignere, and Daniel Dennett for thoughtful comments on the first draft of this chapter.

Notes

1. At this point, it is unclear whether any nonhuman primates have this ability, as there are only a few studies with contradictory results.
2. For a fascinating discussion of how literacy spread in Europe between 1500 and 1900, see Henrich (2020, pp. 3–17).
3. Belief in ghosts or spirits is distinct from organized religion, and the latter is not present in all human cultures. In today's world there are many people who do not believe in the supernatural, but this is likely a relatively recent historical phenomenon associated with the rise of modern, scientifically based education. However, even in cultures where such education is prominent, there are many who still believe in the supernatural.
4. The extent to which these neurological patterns are a cause or a consequence of the lack of engagement with music remains unclear, and it has yet to be determined whether genetics plays a role in musical anhedonia.

References

- Albouy, P., Benjamin, L., Morillon, B., & Zatorre, R. J. (2020). Distinct sensitivity to spectrotemporal modulation supports brain asymmetry for speech and melody. *Science*, 367(6481), 1043–1047.
- Auner, J. H. (1999). Schoenberg and his public in 1930: The Six Pieces for Male Chorus, Op. 35. In W. Frisch (Ed.), *Schoenberg and his world* (pp. 85–125). Princeton University Press.
- Belfi, A. M., & Loui, P. (2020). Musical anhedonia and rewards of music listening: Current advances and a proposed model. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1464(1), 99–114.
- Boebinger, D., Norman-Haignere, S. V., McDermott, J. H., & Kanwisher, N. (2021). Music-selective neural populations arise without musical training. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 125(6), 2237–2263.
- Boyd, R. (2018). *A different kind of animal: How culture transformed our species*. Princeton University Press.
- Cabral, L., Zubiaurre, L., Wild, C., Linke, A., & Cusack, R. (2020). Category-selective visual regions have distinctive signatures of connectivity in neonates. *BioRxiv*, 675421.
- Cannon, J. (2021). Expectancy-based rhythmic entrainment as continuous Bayesian inference. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 17(6), e1009025.
- Cannon, J. J., & Patel, A. D. (2021). How beat perception coopts motor neurophysiology. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25, 137–150.
- Cary, H. (1922). Are you a musician? Professor Seashore's specific psychological tests for specific musical abilities. *Scientific American*, 127(6), 326–327.
- Centanni, T. M. (2020). Neural and genetic mechanisms of dyslexia. In G. Argyropoulos (Ed.), *Translational neuroscience of speech and language disorders* (pp. 47–68). Springer.

- Cross, I. (2003). Music and biocultural evolution. In M. Clayton, T. Herbert, & R. Middleton (Eds.), *The cultural study of music: A critical introduction* (pp. 19–30). Routledge.
- Darwin, C. (1871). *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex*. John Murray.
- de Almeida, J. S., Lordier, L., Zollinger, B., Kunz, N., Bastiani, M., Gui, L., Adam-Darque, A., Borradori-Tolsa, C., Lazeryas, F., & Hüppi, P. S. (2020). Music enhances structural maturation of emotional processing neural pathways in very preterm infants. *NeuroImage*, 207, 116391.
- Dehaene, S. (2010). *Reading in the brain: The new science of how we read*. Penguin.
- Dehaene, S., & Cohen, L. (2007). Cultural recycling of cortical maps. *Neuron*, 56(2), 384–398.
- Dennett, D. C. (2006). *Breaking the spell: Religion as a natural phenomenon*. Penguin.
- Dennett, D. C. (2017). *From bacteria to Bach and back: The evolution of minds*. W. W. Norton.
- Doust, C., Fontanillas, P., Eising, E., Gordon, S. D., Wang, Z., Gökberk, A., Molz, B., 23andMe Research Team, Quantitative Trait Working Group of the GenLang Consortium, St. Porcain, B., Francks, C., Marioni, R. E., Zhao, J., Paracchini S., Talcott, J. B., Monaco, A. P., Stein, J. F., Gruen, J. R., Olson, R. K., . . . Luciano, M. (in press). Discovery of 42 genome-wide significant loci associated with dyslexia. *Nature Genetics*.
- Dunbar, R. I. M. (2012). On the evolutionary function of song and dance. In N. Bannan (Ed.), *Music, language, and human evolution* (pp. 201–214). Oxford University Press.
- Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (Eds.). (2021). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (24th ed.). SIL International.
- Feld, S. (2012). *Sound and sentiment: Birds, weeping, poetics, and song in Kaluli expression, with a new introduction by the author* (3rd ed.). Duke University Press.
- Feldman, M. W., & Laland, K. N. (1996). Gene-culture coevolutionary theory. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 11(11), 453–457.
- Fisher, S. E., & Ridley, M. (2013). Culture, genes, and the human revolution. *Science*, 340(6135), 929–930.
- Foster, N. E., & Zatorre, R. J. (2010a). Cortical structure predicts success in performing musical transformation judgments. *Neuroimage*, 53(1), 26–36.
- Foster, N. E., & Zatorre, R. J. (2010b). A role for the intraparietal sulcus in transforming musical pitch information. *Cerebral Cortex*, 20(6), 1350–1359.
- Gould, S. J., & Vrba, E. S. (1982). Exaptation—a missing term in the science of form. *Paleobiology*, 8(1), 4–15.
- Greenough, W. T., Black, J. E., & Wallace, C. S. (1987). Experience and brain development. *Child Development*, 58, 539–559.
- Hagoort, P. (2017). The core and beyond in the language-ready brain. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 81, 194–204.

- Harden, K. P. (2021). *The genetic lottery: Why DNA matters for social equality*. Princeton University Press.
- Harrison, P. M., & Müllensiefen, D. (2018). Development and validation of the computerised adaptive beat alignment test (CA-BAT). *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 1–19.
- Henrich, J. (2016). *The secret of our success: How culture is driving human evolution, domesticating our species, and making us smarter*. Princeton University Press.
- Henrich, J. (2020). *The WEIRDest people in the world*. Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- Hepper, P. G. (1991). An examination of fetal learning before and after birth. *Irish Journal of Psychology*, 12(2), 95–107.
- Hervais-Adelman, A., Kumar, U., Mishra, R. K., Tripathi, V. N., Guleria, A., Singh, J. P., & Huettig, F. (2019). Learning to read recycles visual cortical networks without destruction. *Science Advances*, 5(9), 1–10.
- Higham, T., Basell, L., Jacobi, R., Wood, R., Ramsey, C. B., & Conard, N. J. (2012). Testing models for the beginnings of the Aurignacian and the advent of figurative art and music: The radiocarbon chronology of Geißenklösterle. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 62(6), 664–676.
- Honing, H., ten Cate, C., Peretz, I., & Trehub, S. E. (2015). Without it no music: Cognition, biology and evolution of musicality. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 370(1664), 1–8.
- Itan, Y., Powell, A., Beaumont, M. A., Burger, J., & Thomas, M. G. (2009). The origins of lactase persistence in Europe. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 5(8), e1000491.
- Jacoby, N., Undurraga, E. A., McPherson, M. J., Valdés, J., Ossandón, T., & McDermott, J. H. (2019). Universal and non-universal features of musical pitch perception revealed by singing. *Current Biology*, 29(19), 3229–3243.
- James, W. (1890). *The principles of psychology*. Henry Holt.
- Kosakowski, H. L., Cohen, M. A., Takahashi, A., Keil, B., Kanwisher, N., & Saxe, R. (2022). Selective responses to faces, scenes, and bodies in the ventral visual pathway of infants. *Current Biology*, 32(2), 265–274.
- Kuhl, P. K. (2010). Brain mechanisms in early language acquisition. *Neuron*, 67(5), 713–727.
- Ladd, D. R. (2008). *Intonational phonology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Laland, K. N. (2017). *Darwin's unfinished symphony: How culture made the human mind*. Princeton University Press.
- Laland, K. N., Odling-Smee, J., & Myles, S. (2010). How culture shaped the human genome: Bringing genetics and the human sciences together. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 11(2), 137–148.
- Lampen, J., McAuley, J. D., Chang, S. E., & Wade, J. (2019). Neural activity associated with rhythmicity of song in juvenile male and female zebra finches. *Behavioural Processes*, 163, 45–52.

- Lewis, J. (2016). Play, music, and taboo in the reproduction of an egalitarian society. In H. Terashima & B. S. Hewlett (Eds.), *Social learning and innovation in contemporary hunter-gatherers: Evolutionary and ethnographic perspectives* (pp. 147–158). Springer.
- Lieberman, D. (2013). *The story of the human body: Evolution, health, and disease*. Pantheon.
- Lieberman, D. (2021). *Exercised: Why something we never evolved to do is healthy and rewarding*. Pantheon.
- Loui, P., Patel, A., Wong, L. M., Gaab, N., Hanser, S. B., & Schlaug, G. (2018). Music, sound, and health: A meeting of the minds in neurosciences and music. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1423(1), 7–9.
- Loui, P., Patterson, S., Sachs, M. E., Leung, Y., Zeng, T., & Przysinda, E. (2017). White matter correlates of musical anhedonia: Implications for evolution of music. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1664.
- Lumsden, C., & Wilson, E. O. (1981). *Genes, mind, and culture: The coevolutionary process*. Harvard University Press.
- Marcus, G. F. (2012). Musicality: Instinct or acquired skill? *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 4(4), 498–512.
- Margulis, E. H. (2014). *On repeat: How music plays the mind*. Oxford University Press.
- Martínez-Molina, N., Mas-Herrero, E., Rodríguez-Fornells, A., Zatorre, R. J., & Marco-Pallarés, J. (2016). Neural correlates of specific musical anhedonia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(46), E7337–E7345.
- Martínez-Molina, N., Mas-Herrero, E., Rodríguez-Fornells, A., Zatorre, R. J., & Marco-Pallarés, J. (2019). White matter microstructure reflects individual differences in music reward sensitivity. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 39(25), 5018–5027.
- Mas-Herrero, E., Karhulahti, M., Marco-Pallares, J., Zatorre, R. J., & Rodriguez-Fornells, A. (2018). The impact of visual art and emotional sounds in specific musical anhedonia. *Progress in Brain Research*, 237, 399–413.
- Mas-Herrero, E., Maini, L., Sescousse, G., & Zatorre, R. J. (2021). Common and distinct neural correlates of music and food-induced pleasure: A coordinate-based meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 123, 61–71.
- Mas-Herrero, E., Marco-Pallares, J., Lorenzo-Seva, U., Zatorre, R. J., & Rodriguez-Fornells, A. (2012). Individual differences in music reward experiences. *Music Perception*, 31(2), 118–138.
- Mehr, S. A., Krasnow, M. M., Bryant, G. A., & Hagen, E. H. (2021). Origins of music in credible signaling. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 44(e60), 23–39.
- Mehr, S. A., Singh, M., Knox, D., Ketter, D. M., Pickens-Jones, D., Atwood, S., & Glowacki, L. (2019). Universality and diversity in human song. *Science*, 366(6468), 1–17.
- Mencke, I., Omigie, D., Wald-Fuhrmann, M., & Brattico, E. (2019). Atonal music: Can uncertainty lead to pleasure? *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 12, 979.

- Mendoza, J. K., & Fausey C. M. (2021). Everyday music in infancy. *Developmental Science*, e13122.
- Morley, I. (2013). *The prehistory of music: Human evolution, archaeology, and the origins of musicality*. Oxford University Press.
- Moulson, M. C., Westerlund, A., Fox, N. A., Zeanah, C. H., & Nelson, C. A. (2009). The effects of early experience on face recognition: An event-related potential study of institutionalized children in Romania. *Child Development*, 80(4), 1039–1056.
- Mundy, R. (2018). *Animal musicalities: Birds, beasts, and evolutionary listening*. Wesleyan University Press.
- Nettl, B. (2015). *The study of ethnomusicology: Thirty-three discussions*. University of Illinois Press.
- Niarchou, M., Gustavson, D. E., Sathirapongsasuti, J. F., Anglada-Tort, M., Eising, E., Bell, E., McArthur, E., Straub, P., 23andMe Research Team, McAuley, J. D., Capra, J. A., Ullén, F. U., Creanza, N., Mosing, M. A., Hinds, D. A., Davis, L. K., Jacoby, N., & Gordon, R. L. (2022). Genome-wide association study of musical beat synchronization demonstrates high polygenicity. *Nature Human Behaviour*. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-022-01359-x>.
- Norenzayan, A., Shariff, A. F., Gervais, W. M., Willard, A. K., McNamara, R. A., Slingerland, E., & Henrich, J. (2016). The cultural evolution of prosocial religions. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 39, 1–65.
- Norman-Haignere, S., Kanwisher, N. G., & McDermott, J. H. (2015). Distinct cortical pathways for music and speech revealed by hypothesis-free voxel decomposition. *Neuron*, 88(6), 1281–1296.
- Partanen, E., Kujala, T., Tervaniemi, M., & Huotilainen, M. (2013). Prenatal music exposure induces long-term neural effects. *PLOS ONE*, 8(10), e78946.
- Patel, A. D. (2006). Musical rhythm, linguistic rhythm, and human evolution. *Music Perception*, 24, 99–104.
- Patel, A. D. (2008). *Music, language, and the brain*. Oxford University Press.
- Patel, A. D. (2010). Music, biological evolution, and the brain. In M. Bailar (Ed.), *Emerging disciplines* (pp. 91–144). Rice University Press.
- Patel, A. D. (2014). The evolutionary biology of musical rhythm: Was Darwin wrong? *PLOS Biology*, 12(3), e1001821.
- Patel, A. D. (2018). Music as a transformative technology of the mind: An update. In H. Honing (Ed.), *The origins of musicality* (pp. 113–126). MIT Press.
- Patel, A. D. (2019). Evolutionary music cognition: Cross-species studies. In P. J. Rentfrow & D. Levitin (Eds.), *Foundations in music psychology: Theory and research* (pp. 459–501). MIT Press.
- Patel, A. D. (2021). Vocal learning as a preadaptation for the evolution of human beat perception and synchronization. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 376(1835), 20200326.
- Patel, A. D., & von Rueden, C. (2021). Where they sing solo: Accounting for cross-cultural variation in collective music-making in theories of music evolution. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 44(e85), 77–78.

- Penhune, V. B. (2020). A gene-maturation-environment model for understanding sensitive period effects in musical training. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 36, 13–22.
- Pinker, W. (1997). *How the mind works*. W. W. Norton.
- Plantinga, J., & Trainor, L. J. (2005). Memory for melody: Infants use a relative pitch code. *Cognition*, 98(1), 1–11.
- Podlipniak, P. (2017). The role of the Baldwin effect in the evolution of human musicality. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 11, 542.
- Ratey, J. (2008). *Spark: The revolutionary new science of exercise and the brain*. Little Brown.
- Reh, R. K., Dias, B. G., Nelson, C. A., Kaufer, D., Werker, J. F., Kolb, B., & Hensch, T. K. (2020). Critical period regulation across multiple timescales. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(38), 23242–23251.
- Richard, D., Liu, Z., Cao, J., Kiapour, A. M., Willen, J., Yarlagadda, S., Jagoda, E., Kolachalama, V. B., Sieker, J. T., Chang, G. H., Muthurulan, P., Young, M., Masson, A., Konrad, J., Hosseinzadeh, S., Maridas, D. E., Rosen, V., Krawetz, R., Roach, N., & Capellini, T. D. (2020). Evolutionary selection and constraint on human knee chondrocyte regulation impacts osteoarthritis risk. *Cell*, 181(2), 362–381.
- Richerson, P. J., Boyd, R., & Henrich, J. (2010). Gene-culture coevolution in the age of genomics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(Supplement 2), 8985–8992.
- Roberts, C. (2014). *Music of the Star Mountains: A naturalist's guide to the composition of songs in central New Guinea*. Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies.
- Rohrmeier, M., & Rebuschat, P. (2012). Implicit learning and acquisition of music. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 4(4), 525–553.
- Rouse, A. A., Patel, A. D., & Kao, M. H. (2021). Vocal learning and flexible rhythm pattern perception are linked: Evidence from songbirds. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(29), 1–9.
- Sacks, O. (2011). Face blind. In *The mind's eye* (pp. 82–110). Vintage.
- Sandstrom, G. M., & Russo, F. A. (2013). Absorption in music: Development of a scale to identify individuals with strong emotional responses to music. *Psychology of Music*, 41(2), 216–228.
- Savage, P. E., Brown, S., Sakai, E., & Currie, T. E. (2015). Statistical universals reveal the structures and functions of human music. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(29), 8987–8992.
- Savage, P. E., Loui, P., Tarr, B., Schachner, A., Glowacki, L., Mithen, S., & Fitch, W. T. (2021). Music as a coevolved system for social bonding. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 44(e59), 1–22.
- Shelemay, K. K. (2011). Musical communities: Rethinking the collective in music. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 64(2), 349–390.
- Shilton, D. (2022). Sweet participation: The evolution of music as an interactive technology. *Music & Science*, 5, 1–15.

- Sperber, D. (1996). *Explaining culture: A naturalistic approach*. Blackwell.
- Stein, L. (Ed.). (1975). *Style and idea: Selected writings of Arnold Schoenberg*. University of California Press.
- Tilot, A. K., Khramtsova, E. A., Liang, D., Grasby, K. L., Jahanshad, N., Painter, J., Colodro-Conde, L., Bralten, J., Hibar, D. P., Lind, P. A., Liu, S., Brotman, S. M., Thompson, P. J., Medland, S. E., Macciardi, F., Stranger, B. E., Davis, L. K., Fisher, S. E., & Stein, J. L. (2021). The evolutionary history of common genetic variants influencing human cortical surface area. *Cerebral Cortex*, 31(4), 1873–1887.
- Tinbergen, N. (1963). On aims and methods of ethology. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie*, 20(4), 410–433.
- Todorov, A. (2017). *Face value: The irresistible influence of first impressions*. Princeton University Press.
- Tomlinson, G. (2015). *A million years of music: The emergence of human modernity*. MIT Press.
- Trainor, L. J. (2015). The origins of music in auditory scene analysis and the roles of evolution and culture in musical creation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 370(1664), 1–14.
- Tranchant, P., Lagrois, M. É., Bellemare, A., Schultz, B. G., & Peretz, I. (2021). Co-occurrence of deficits in beat perception and synchronization supports implication of motor system in beat perception. *Music & Science*, 4, 1–13.
- Tranchant, P., Vuvan, D. T., & Peretz, I. (2016). Keeping the beat: A large sample study of bouncing and clapping to music. *PLOS ONE*, 11(7), e0160178.
- Trehub, S. E. (2003). The developmental origins of musicality. *Nature Neuroscience*, 6(7), 669–673.
- Trehub, S. E., Becker, J., & Morley, I. (2015). Cross-cultural perspectives on music and musicality. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 370(1664), 20140096.
- Trehub, S. E., & Cirelli, L. K. (2018). Precursors to the performing arts in infancy and early childhood. *Progress in Brain Research*, 237, 225–242.
- Wilmer, J. B., Germine, L., Chabris, C. F., Chatterjee, G., Williams, M., Loken, E., Nakayama, K., & Duchaine, B. (2010). Human face recognition ability is specific and highly heritable. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(11), 5238–5241.
- Wolf, M. (2007). *Proust and the squid: The story and science of the reading brain*. Harper.
- Wrangham, R. (2009). *Catching fire: How cooking made us human*. Basic Books.
- Wrangham, R. (2017). Control of fire in the Paleolithic: Evaluating the cooking hypothesis. *Current Anthropology*, 58(S16), S303–S313.
- Zentner, M., & Gingras, B. (2019). The assessment of musical ability and its determinants. In P. J. Rentfrow & D. Levitin (Eds.), *Foundations in music psychology: Theory and research* (pp. 641–683). MIT Press.