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HEATH AND LUFF

21 Musical Spaces
John B. Haviland

In this comparative look at several kinds of musical performance, I present various threads of an investigation in progress, on musical performances in and for the first instance, on ‘entertainments’ in general, on mastery and expertise, and the interactive structuring of space. I concentrate first on how the spaces in which musicians play set the layout of the playing area, its physical characteristics and those of the instruments, and the bodies of the musicians themselves – structure and are structured by musical and para-musical interaction, including what might be called ‘social structure.’ I then consider multiple techniques musicians in three different traditions use to coordinate their actions. Finally, I examine some of the semiotic resources – involving talk, non-speech sounds, both musical and other, and associated physical objects – these musicians put to work for communicating musically, both in performance and in practice.

In the study of interaction, a central analytic focus has been how participants coordinate with one another to accomplish ‘joint actions’ (Clark, 1992, 1996) that cannot be achieved by individuals alone, requiring instead several participants (if not other entities as well) acting conjointly (Hutchins, 1993). Conversational exchanges have this character, as do basketball games and tag-of-war, riding on a sea-saw, carrying a piano up a flight of stairs, getting an ocean liner out to sea, and performing a string quartet. In joint action, not only are the coordinated actions of multiple participants involved, but so too is the whole (whether considered as result or process) more than (in fact, qualitatively different from) the sum of its parts, unlike in mechanical ways, as any team player knows. The first violin part does not constitute the string quartet; a single kill is not a volleyball game; and a monologue is hardly a conversation. The appropriate coordination of different participants in joint action thus becomes a central condition for accomplishing some things in the first place, and interactive techniques for managing such coordination are integral to the activities, regardless of any individual skills that must be simultaneously employed. A gifted three-point shooter or a virtuosic cellist can do nothing to win the game or play the quartet without knowing as well how to integrate her skills with other players or musicians.

Although I focus on joint actions, and although coordination is a familiar part of everyday experience, there are at least two important consequences of these facts that still seem insufficiently explored in an anthropological approach to acting and communication, weit large, and in the anthropological study of language in particular. First, just as individual skills will never be enough to accomplish joint actions, individual knowledge or cultural competence is never a sufficient basis for social expertise. Specifically, in the case of language, ‘knowledge of language’ taken as an individual’s mastery of grammar is a meager, perhaps even a misfit component of what we might call true linguistic competence, which implies using language to accomplish social ends.

Second, and perhaps most consequential, given the importance accorded to a proposed general-purpose ‘turn taking systems’ (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974) in conversation, is the fact that the character of different joint actions can have determinative effects on the coordination required. Not only do different joint actions require different sorts of coordination, but the mechanisms for achieving it may be differentially constrained by the actions themselves. As is well known, turn taking in criminal court is different from that in a university seminar or a dinner conversation. Although one might still want to posit an unmarked turn-taking mechanism, or more generally what has been called an ‘interpersonal substrate’ (Maynard & Malraire, 1992; Maynard & Schaeffer, 2002; Schegloff, 2007), which takes on specialized forms for specialized activities, it is useful to examine the specific requirements for coordination (of which turn allocation is a single, particular instance) given by different activities. Moreover, coordination may rely on communicative modalities largely unexplored in linguistics or in the study of conversation – uses of the body, or of objects, or of the overall environment of the activity that the long-standing focus on speech might not lead us to consider. Given that music is at once highly communicative, inherently joint,
and by nature multimodal, musical interactions seem a useful counterpoint to talk. My principal material is drawn from two musical "master classes" in a university setting, one involving a string quartet (Haviland, 2007) and the other a jazz combo.1 I take a further comparative look at ritual music in a Mayan Indian community in southeastern Mexico (Haviland, 1967). There is a minor tradition in studies of interaction linking musical performance to spoken conversation (see Sudnow, 1978, 1979). The comparison is also evidently explicit among some musicologists, especially students of jazz. Berliner (1994) writes, "The metaphor likens group improvisation to a conversation that players carry on among themselves in the language of jazz" (p. 348), and his extensive interviews with jazz musicians include many explicit descriptions of improvised conversation as practice. Sawyer (2006) is more explicit still: "The most important aspects of musical creativity occur outside of the head of musicians: they occur in musical conversation and in interaction between musicians." (p. 239). Still, the specifics of musical coordination in group performance—a topic of some interest in music and performance theory, though often studied strictly from the point of view of the music itself—have received little attention from social scientists as an object of empirical study; despite Schütz's classic early remarks on the subject (Schütz, 1951).

"Traditional" music, played in the modern Tzotzil-speaking community of Zacanantán, in Chiapas, Mexico, is descended from sixteenth-century Spanish choral ensembles. The situation in Zacanantán is "a striking though not unique instance of the oral transmission through about three centuries of originally written part-music" (Harrison & Harrison, 1968, p. 2). Zacanantán vob or "string music" is nowadays played exclusively to accompany ritual. Its practitioners are increasingly scarce specialists who, according to local understanding, acquire their musical skills neither by practice nor from instruction, but in a dream as a supernatural gift from ancestral deities. In the most common ensemble, there are three instruments—violin, harp, and guitar—and there is a strict hierarchy between the musicians who play these instruments, from highest to lowest in the order given. The hierarchy has various expressions, but here the most important fact is this: The violinist "leads" the ensemble. Specifying exactly what "leading" means will be one of my first concerns.

For the most common rituals, there is a fixed cycle of five encom "songs" or sets, given that the first tune, baxt'i, "true song," both begins and concludes each cycle, although neither the length of time devoted to playing each tune nor the exact accompanying lyrics seems to be predictable in advance, depending instead on a variety of extra-musical factors. Furthermore, although there are observable stylistic and individual differences in how each song or each instrumental part is played, the Zacanantán theory of the matter is that there is just one right way to play the tunes, and that either a person knows how to play them (in which case he is a xajb'atvob "musician" or vob "music") or not (in which case he is unable to play between musicians are considered by most Zacanantecs to be matters of knowledge or mastery: how well one knows how to tune or play specific instruments, or make them "speak the songs well:" for how many different kinds of rituals one knows the proper music and songs (given that for specialized rituals there are also additional specialized tunes); how authoritative one is in matters both musical and extra-musical (given that a central virtue of a musician is his expertise in ritual detail), and so forth.

From my earliest experience as a fledgling anthropologist in 1966, I have been an apprentice xajb'atvob: Zacanantán trying to acquire fragments of such expertise. My first exhibits are drawn from a performance by a Zacanantán string trio playing at a ceremony to mark the first anniversary of the death of a senior Zacanantán man who himself had had a distinguished career in the ritual hierarchy, and for whose funeral commemoration it was thus appropriate to have vob "music." I have spent many years learning from Zacanantán musicians, and my observations about the musical tradition stem from this research. I explore the further kinds of musical performance, with material drawn from two videotaped "master classes." At the invitation of Prof. Leila Falk, of the Reed College Music Department, on February 6, 2003, I filmed a master class in which a young professional string quartet (see Figure 21.3) led a class with a string quartet composed of undergraduate students. The participants involved agreed to let me videotape the class, which included two fragmentary performances by the students and a series of interactive musical demonstrations and discussions. The professional musicians focused their comments on the historical background of the quartets the students chose to perform and explicitly on aspects of coordination in ensemble play. Before the class, they also had a short rehearsal for a concert the following day.

Subsequently on November 18, 2004, I filmed a quite different master class. Students at Reed College had organized a presentation by a visiting jazz group, led on the day by a cornet player from New York, which gave a combined performance/recital/jam session at the Reed College Student Union. Here the emphasis was on improvisation, on at least an ideology of openness and lack of formal constraints, but also on musical attention and emerging discipline in performance. The group began with a single piece, then broke for discussion with several short demonstrations in answer to student questions, and the afternoon ended with a joint jam session.

**COORDINATION AND SPACE**

Obvious differences among these three kinds of music emerge simply from how the musicians are arranged in space. The structuring of musical performance spaces is linked to acoustic facts about instruments and who can hear whom, to certain performance traditions, and to formal properties of the music itself (for example, its relationship to a score or a conductor). The way the musicians arrange themselves in space in turn affects the kinds of sequencing and coordination problems that arise.
HAVELAND

MUSICAL SPACES

Consider the basic cycle of six Zinacantec sonnets (som 'song' + erit 'PLU'). The songs themselves and the order of their movements show a kind of cyclic organization. At the words 'PLU', the dancer will be sung, at least in principle: Each occasion of performance brings with it a set of expected lyrics, or at least a set of expected movements. This is evident in the two parallel couples of Tzotzil ritual language (Gonsior, 1965; Haviland, 1994 [1992], 2000), although there is no fixed script for which verses should be sung in what order, how often repeated, and so forth. This is in obvious contrast to the problems related to the sonnet sequence itself. How to start off the cycle of tunes, how long to play each tune, how to come to its fixed successor, and how to stop at the end. Slightly more complex is the coordination of dancing: When to sing a falsoeto chorus (which has no words), and in the immediately following song section exactly which words to use from the limited repertoire of possibles.

Cronically there is a simple Zinacantec solution to all of these other problems. The violinst decides. The violinst signals that he is ready to start playing by moving from a stylized tuned interval of his instrument (which in turn signals his companions to tune theirs, or to pause him), which method the violinst is considered to be the most expert at tuning) to a similarly stylized short arpeggio, from which he moves somewhat deliberately into the first, or perhaps last of the four songs. The other two musicians are expected to follow him in tuning with the violinst sometime around the end of that first phrase, although it may take another phrase or two before exact synchrony of notes on the remaining music. The other musicians (in addition to the violinst, who strums simple chords, and of the bass strings or left hand of the harp — and of the dancers' feet, when they have time) are in turn expected to join in maintaining such a rhythm, once it is established. If for some reason the violinst is not satisfied with how the ensemble sounds — if an instrument is badly out of tune, or if one of the other musicians fumbles — he in turn may contrast the playing with another, move from a stylized ending arpeggio. He will restart the music once he is satisfied the problem has been corrected. As far as the singing goes, he will simply start to sing at what he deems an appropriate moment, and the others will follow, relying on their individual knowledge of the lyrics, but also on the highly predictable parallelism of the song to follow the violinst's lead.5

5 There are other more specialized tunes, which also come in fixed sequences. They are played for different ritual offices and festivities, and are in turn given nationalistic with only a violin and a slightly larger, deeper-voiced guitar. What distinguishes an accomplished musician from an ordinary one is partly knowledge of these additional tunes.

6 Thus, for example, at the weekly ritual at the Chapel of the Sektor de Uxmal, perhaps on the theory that an impatient ensemble must move down but not up the hierarchy of tunes, there will always be a reference in song to sahur × tolito 'Saturday' and 'Sunday'.

7 Aaron Ciondol has characteristically pressed me on this point. Who, he asks, monitors whether everything is working in these performances, and what happens when things go wrong?

Because for any given ritual event there is a fixed cycle of tunes, the performance will continue through to the end of the ritual, at which point the exchange of tunes, the violinst simply stops playing one tune and starts playing the next, sometimes emphatically (for example with a slight cre- scendo). Again it is up to his companions to note the change and to note their own playing accordingly. Because ritual events are long, and because the music is repetitive and highly predictable, virtually no other phys- icians exchanged at jamboree (as happened other than the music itself, still — not so obvious or shift in posture, or demonstrative movements of the instruments, although these are sometimes present.29 Indeed, the musicians sometimes seem to doff as they play,诱人oung themselves with apparent effort to break into falsoeto singing, or receiving a swift kick from one of their fellows if their instrument goes off.

Zinacantec viol threats something of a limiting case for joint activity: The activity requires multiple participants, but strict convention — in this case with regard to the violinst — makes "correctness" in some sense predetermine the overall outcome. All that is required for coordination is a single authoritative and responsible leader — the violinst, in this case, who plays his tunes and sings his songs, and whom the rest simply follow, using conventional cues as guides to their own pre-determined and similarly conventional parts. Being a musician in the community, and the importance of this community activity, means that everyone tries automatically on the leader in place.

By this means, the violinst's procession is that it is a deliberate execution of actions designed for reception by an audience, to whom, in Bauman's formulation, the performers exalt an explicit, self-referent "responsibil- ity" (Bauman, 1977). The Zinacantec violinst, in this sense as well, vol is a kind of limiting case, because
MUSICAL SPACES

managing overlaps, repairs, and even apparent "pre-
sequences." Although I will not develop the issue here,
the problem of free form is obviously relevant for dif-
ferent for real performances, rehearsals, and practice
sessions, as well as for demonstrations, the mode of per-
foming and listening to the real performances.

For example, the string quartet master class began with a short rehearsal by the professional group of
the final movement (Allegro molto) of the Bartok String
Quartet No. 4. On the second day, the violinists rehearsed the final section several times. The video reveals a series of coordinating techniques, especially as the musicians try to come to agreements about the delicate fermatas (some of which are notated in the written score) at the very end of the
movement. At measure 360, there is a syncopation in
which the first and second violins begin together, playing against each other, joined two beats later by viola and
cello in a parallel phrase.

The choreography of physical signals, playing, and
gaze is also a common device for distinguishing a per-
sonal - is intricate (see Figure 21.5, where notes on
movements and gaze appear below the corresponding
line of the score for each instrumentalist). The sequence is begun, in a conventionalized way, by a
bowing signal from the first violin, who lifts his bow
with a stylized movement to indicate that play is to
begin. The second violinist, who must start simultaneously, keeps his bow low across the strings, but moves his eyes far to his
right so as to keep the violinist in his peripheral view,
thus being able to coordinate with him precisely. Simi-
larly, he glances back to the first violin at the beginning of
the second violin triplets, starting at the end of the second bar.
At the same time, the cellist (player and
probably the cellist as well, though I cannot see his eyes on the video)
waives the first violinist's stylized starting gesture before
returning her gaze to the baritone music. Both viola and
cello then begin to play following the heat established
by the violins, but the cellist also makes a visual check of
the score (as the other baritone player, with whom she
is playing is synchronized, all the way to the end of
the piece, and to which the cellist begins to play).

The master class often initiates discussions about
how he has in mind that something ought to be jointly
performed, including such issues as rhythms, phrasing,
and the relative predominance and responsibilities of
different instruments. The little dance of physical cues, shif-
ting "gaze, eye contact, facial expression, and other sorts
of mutual attention clearly involves coordination not
simply of the notes or the rhythm, but reflects a series of
further issues, one of which is the organization of the music,
arrived at through listening, rehearsal, and discussion - some-
thing Schütz (1951) calls "tuning-in." One observes these
signaling techniques even in those performances where
there is a great degree of "marginalization," to its audience,
that is, most thoroughly in performance mode. During
practices or rehearsals, other more drastic sorts of cues
are permitted, most notably simply ceasing to play (much
like a Zinacantec violinist who simply stops playing if
he thinks his companions' instruments are out of tune).
In the same Bartok rehearsal sequence, the first violinist
suddenly breaks off, lifts his bow from the strings, and
with his left hand makes a kind of dismissive wave to his
right. The rest of the quartet stops playing, and the cell-
list - apparently discerning some specific intention - says
"little faster, quicker," to which he responds "Little
faster, OK." Without another pause, the group immedi-
ately resumes playing from the previous starting point.

In the Jazz performance during the master class, where
no score provided a note-by-note master plan for the
performance, different problems arose. In particular,
because there seemed to be no preset order of solos, and
because the length of any given improvisation was not
apparently predetermined, the quartet had to adapt to
age turn transitions. In the class I observed, these cues
took many forms. Some were themselves musical: riffs
tone musician played a distinctive improvisational
quence of one sort or another, vamps (when a music-
ian repeated a kind of holding pattern on his instru-
mant, maintaining a harmonic progression, perhaps
a minor improvisation accompanying it, in anticipation

13 Monson (1996) notes that some jazz solos are, in fact, note-
ante repetitions of previous performances, despite a prevailing
trend of innovation over the years.

12 Also see Weidler (1996).

11 Alessandro Durugetti (p.c.) informs me that this is commonly
called a "head" in jazz, and that "there are gestures that embody this
time, its time to go back to it after the solos."
of another's more full-blown solo), and explicit kinds of cueing transitional phrases. Others involved bodily signals: gaze, pointing with hand or instrument, shifts in body or facial orientation, even stepping physically into or out of the performance space. Others were oriented to establish- ing a shared rhythm—a "groove" (Berliner, 1994, p. 340f.)—and, indeed, the jazz performance in this class began even before the other instruments played a single note when the bass guitar player set up a rhythmic and harmonic line that he maintained for the entire performance. A good example of a musical cue complemented by a corporeal cue occurs at the end of the main piano solo when the jazz group played what was later identified as a version of King Oliver's "Cemptown Blues." This turned out to be, in fact, the last improvisation of the perfor- mance, after which followed a final reprise by the whole ensemble of the main theme or tune. The other musicians (except for bassist and drummer, who were accompanying the pianist) were thus waiting for the solo to finish so as to play their partially pre-arranged finale. As the piano solo came to the end of his solo improvisation, he repeated a single phrase in a modulated series of descending scales—a maneuver his fellow clearly interpreted as a signal that he would soon close (Figure 21.6). They began to ready their instruments, in response to his riff, and when finally the piano performer confirmed that he was ready for them to resume with a quick glance to his left (Figure 21.7), the rest of the group began to play the finale reprise. Sometimes musicians physically hand the floor over from one improvisation to the next. The cornet player, ending one short solo with a trill, appeared to nod with head, eyes, and instrument (Figure 21.8) to the alto sax player; who responded by starting his own solo with a corresponding trill. The alto sax player, in turn, walked from the edge of the group where he had played his improvisation back into the center (Figure 21.9), physically passing the music to the next soloist. A slightly more complex and explicit coordination manages a later transition from one sax solo to the other. The alto sax player (to the extreme left in Figure 21.10) has just been playing an improvisation; he appears to be finished. The cornet player (in the center), the de facto leader of the group, checks to be sure he does not in fact intend to continue—glancing at him with a little grin—then points to the tenor sax player with his cornet (Figure 21.11). The tenor promptly launches into his own solo. All of the coordination techniques on display here depend on both the physical and perceptual properties of the spaces in which the music is being performed. How the performers are arranged constrains the kinds of visual and aural access they have to one another. Access to the instruments themselves is also at issue, as is the question of mobility. The piano player can hardly move his piano during performance, nor can the drummer move his drum set, although the cornet player occasion- ally moves to his electric keyboard or otherwise wanders around the space with his horn. The string quartet players have their traditionally assigned seats, but in various practice modes they can spring up and move around the musical space. Access even to the musical sounds is also variable, as some instruments can easily overpower others, especially when some are amplified and others not, so that sometimes it may be hard even to hear one's own instrument. The physical layout of the players can also respond to acoustic properties of the musical sounds emitted. In all of the cases examined here, then, space itself both structures and is structured by the techniques of coordination that make the overall activity possible. INTERACTION AND MODALITY "Dialogues" are common in virtually all musical tradi- tions, and they represent a peculiarly musical form of coordinated interaction: a mutual adjustment, in real time, between different actors. The little counterpoint section in the Bartok quartet described previously (Figure 21.5) represents a stylized (and pre-scripted) form of such dialogue, in which a rhythmic or melodic theme by one instrument is echoed by another. In the jazz performance, more serendipitously, the alto sax and piano engaged in several mini "conversations" with one another, as one instrument repeated or transformed a short melodic phrase previously improvised by another and fed it back for further transformation. Berliner quotes bassist Chuck Israels who likens dialogic mutual adjustment between soloists, rhythm section, and other instrumentalists in jazz to assessments and other back-channel talk. "Playing with musicians is like a conversation... If when I say, you say, "Yes," or you look at me and blink your eyes or interject some comment of your own, that keeps me going" (Berliner, 1994, pp. 354-55). In the remainder of this paper, I will explore a few such musical conversations in the master classes to emphasize their inherently multimodal character. A characteristic sort of musical dialogue in a sense engendered the entire jazz master class performance. In line with the musicians' main argument—that almost anything goes in jazz, that one can explore almost all combinations of sound, harmony, and rhythm—the performance of the King Oliver tune began as follows. The bassist established a base line. The cornet player, de facto spokesman for the group, then challenged the pianist simply to invent something to get the tune started. "C'mon, hubb, enjoy this. You can play the song, alright? Play your first chord and then ..." Here he mimed a long arpeggio across the piano keyboard with a sweep- ing movement of his arm. "OK, really beautiful chord, doesn't matter what it is. And you'll figure out what key it is." The piano player obliged with a short chromatic run (shown in the first bar of Figure 21.12), a D boring chord that starts off with a flatted ninths. The trumpet, satisfied, then returned to the center of the performance area and played his own opening riff, basing his first melodic run on the notes of the pianist's chord (although interpreting the sequence of notes as something closer..."
to an F# 7th or major 7th – see the second part of Figure 21.9), continuing with his own improvised theme, which was then taken up by the other instrumentalists. Here it is musical structure itself that serves as the medium of interaction, the raw material for improvisation, which thus has exactly the multivocal structural character that Bakhtin (1986) ascribes to speech: creative and innovative, but looking both backward to previous talk and forward to future response. Here again is Berliner (1994, p. 349) on jazz: "Jazz musicians] constantly interpret one another's ideas, anticipating them on the basis of the music's predetermined harmonic events."

The diverse purposes of master classes make them particularly interesting as performances. They involve multiple modalities that include the music itself – the playing, and the resulting sound – but also various musical "texts" (written scores, musical traditions, tunes, lore, and so on). They combine performance with practice and demonstration, "real" playing with stylized and even mimed or surrogate playing (for example, using the voice in place of the instrument). And they are riddled with talk, as music making gives way to pedagogical reflection about music making, and the coordinated bodily activity of playing becomes instead the object of interactive theorizing and verbalization.

After the truncated rehearsal by the professional group, the string quartet master class proper began with a performance by the student musicians of two movements that had been prepared for the occasion. After each, the teachers alternated between comments and suggestions on the students’ renditions and focused demonstrations or invitations to re-play selected bits of the music. I describe elsewhere the interactions between score, instrument, playing, and other corporeal activities (mime, song, gesture, talk) that characterized the string quartet class (Havliland, 2007). A characteristic combination involved the score itself; often verbally annotated in the standard metalinguage of classical music ("Imagine that these notes have little accents..."), a verbal characterization of how the music should sound, often accompanied with a demonstration – sometimes hummed, sometimes gestured, sometimes mimed, sometimes played by the teacher alone, and sometimes played in accompaniment to the students as they tried out the professionals’ suggestions.

Because the organization of the jazz class was different, there was no real chance for the students to show their stuff and receive criticism. Instead, after the initial performance, the jazz pros invited questions and discussion, and only at the end did they invite the student musicians to join in a somewhat anarchic jam session. Yet many of the same multimodal interactions appeared in even the "question and answer" segment of the jazz class.

For example, although there was nothing in the jazz performance comparable to the written scores of the Mozart or Borodin quartets, nonetheless there was still a virtual canon, a composer, a "song" in relation to which the given performance was a variant. Transcript 21.1 shows what the cornet player said as he started the "class" part of the session. He made both a claim to legitimacy – a link to a comparatively long chronology – and an intertextual claim on an ancestor, a kind of virtual interlocutor.

just so you have an idea about the timeline of the music that song was based on a song by King Oliver called Creole/blues from.

26 or something like that so.

were 'talkin' about a large large.

I mean you know

when you bring in European classical music

but the idea that within American popular music

that we're 'talkin' about a large spectrum here

Transcript 21.1. A large spectrum

Other sub-traditions, styles, and "feelings" also enter into dialogue with any given performance. Indeed, a "feeling" or tradition may seemingly be embodied directly in a particular instrument. The bass player was playing a bowed electric bass, a model that bore the name of a well-known bassist for Miles Davis. As he commented on the "feeling" of the performance just concluded (Transcript 21.2), he held the instrument up to the audience, as a visible metonym (Figure 21.13). The fact that an electric bass guitar can embody a whole musical "feeling" is, of course, evidence that like hoverying composers or musical traditions, not only the musicians’ bodies but even their instruments are "cogent interactants" in the conjoint activity of making music. Of course musicians use their bodies directly to produce musical sound, and there is therefore an unsurprising corelative expressiveness of the body, its techniques, and its imagery as a semiotic resource for communicating about music. Similarly the instrument, its parts, its techniques, its virtues, and sometimes its potential teachery become expressive devices, either physically or virtually, in major classes like these. Most musicians also have available various surrogate instruments – notably the voice – that can stand in for different aspects of music making.

MUSICAL SPACES

The version we just did then

(Left index finger pointing, sweeps back and forth from musician to musician)

Very much reminded me of like the Miles Davis band in the early 80s

And here I am playing Marcus Miller's signature bass

Very nice bass.

Belongs to one of you here, and

And and and in that moment

(bends move back and forth)

I was kinda feeling that thing

(looks down at bass)

Well, we

(Right thumb points out to the piano)

played the song.

Last night

(i wipe nose with same thumb, shakes head)

And it was more like a punk rock vaudeville

(laughter)

And it comes out different every night

Transcript 21.2. Punk rock vaudeville

In the string quartet master class, the violist was particularly demonstrative in his pedagogy, often springing from his seat, viols in hand, to play along with the students, or to demonstrate for them by playing his own viola, by miming playing with only the bow, or moving his arm without the bow, sometimes even moving the students' bowing arms or placing their bows on the strings. His pedagogical spats were multimodal from start to finish, often beginning with a spoken sentence that ended with a played fragment, or a hummed phrase, or a mimed action. The instrument, or the bodily actions used to play the instrument, became experimental resources – interactive tools – for discovering and testing alternate ways of playing. Transcript 21.3 shows what he says as he demonstrates the initial passage from Mozart's string quartet #23 on his viola with long upbow for the first piano measure, and then a strong downbow for the first forte note of the second measure. (Figure 21.14 shows just the first violin part.)

Figure 21.13. Marcus Miller signature bass.
Figure 21.14. Mozart opening (first violin part only).

11 I would suggest .
12 try down .
13 b . .
14 try starting out on . . .
15 [play from music]

Transcript 21.3. Try upbow (see Figure 21.15).

Appreciably satisfied with the result, he now repeats the
motion of the upbow (Figure 21.16), further qualifying it
in words at line 16 in Transcript 21.4 ("very light") and pro-
ducing a light inbreath through pursed lips (Figure 21.17),
simulating both the "light" sound and perhaps also the
anticipatory tension of the note via the inbreath. Here is a
moment where words, motions, mimed actions, and other
bodily performances conspire to display in multiple simul-
taneous modalities a musical point that could perhaps not
be made with any single expressive device.

He now repeats the performance, first miming the bow-
ing he wants (at 17 a-d of Transcript 21.5), and then play-
ing it while first humming (17 d) and then saying "here"
(16 a) at the transition to the strong downbow in the
second measure (18 b) (Figure 21.18). Finally he plays the
whole phrase with the desired bowing and dynamics.

In the jazz master class, performers interacted with their
instruments in a similar way, although the verbally
expressed emphasis was on freedom and experimenta-
tion rather than on finding the most expressive or most
comfortable way to play a given phrase. The piano player
dissected a long progression of chords he had impro-
vised during the performance, explaining in words as he
replayed the progression exactly what he was doing at
each stage, how he had calculated the key he needed to
arrive at by the end of his solo.

Even more experimental is the cornet player's demon-
stration (Transcripts 21.6 and 21.7), in direct interaction
with his electric keyboard, of his general theme: that you
can start almost anywhere and end up almost anywhere
in the process of improvisation (Figures 21.19 and 21.20).

Because of the complexity of the illustrative materials, I have tran-
scribed the video with the following conventions. Each line of text
is shown in Courier type in numbered lines. Above these lines, syn-
chronized with the accompanying words, are small letters
indicating some phase of bodily action, which is then described
in words, in music score type, in lines keyed to the letters that follow the
transcribed speech.
Was that a uh-
That's a nine, that's a good chord
((simplifies the chord to C major 9))
That's a flat five
((finite it))
And that's a raised five
((finite it))
And that's a five's a dom 7th
((finite it))

Every note
((adds another dissonant note))

It's true
I mean
You CAN play anything you want
And-
Over a chord
As long as you resolve it
Now-
You can also choose to resolve it to a non-resolution
D'yknow what I'm saying?
Like, if you feel like
Hey, if you--say if you know
I'm gonna be real entries.
I'm gonna resolve it to a note that's
Still tense.
Then, man, well
((ahh))
That's the kind of person you are
Y'know?

Transcript 21.7. Every note has a relationship
The electric keyboard is presented as an accomplice, producing sounds as if by its own volition, for the musician then to explain, interpret, and make sense of, elaborating the demonstrated sounds in the musical metalanguage of jazz.

MUSICAL PERSONALITY
Personality in Zinacantec music is the personality of the musician: Because the tunes are conceptually fixed, the only evaluation readily available is of the good humor and stamina of the musicians themselves. Once someone "knows how to play," the performing matters considerably less than one's accompanying social skills. In the string quartet music and personality is linked to individual quartets. The Mozart #23 is traditionally one of the "King of Prussia" quartets commissioned by Friedrich Wilhelm II, who himself was an accomplished cellist. "You are the king of Prussia," the prancing cellist says to her student counterpart. When the students later play a movement of the Borodin String Quartet #2, the teachers characterize its personality as "musical fireworks," which they capture through a variety of images. They try to inspire their students' playing with popping gestures of the fingers like little firecrackers, clenched fists, clapping hands, snapping "exploding" syllables, or conducting with sweeping movements of arms and bows. The jazz musicians use a similar variety of expressive modalities to characterize musical personality. They can do it entirely in words, as the cornet player does in Transcript 21.8, expounding further on his theme of freedom. They can also explain personality with a musical demonstration, as the bass player does in Transcript 21.9, extolling the virtues of "simplicity." They can also illustrate a different (in this case despised) musical personality through a musical pantomime, involving no real instruments, no playing, and only stylized vocalized sound. In Transcript 21.10 the alto sax player, the group's acknowledged electronics technology guru, gives his opinion about electronic gimmickery in jazz.

COORDINATION, SPACE, AND MUSICAL MEANING
I began by considering how different kinds of musical traditions structure, and in turn are structured by, the spaces in which musicians arrange themselves. Recognizing a central problem in social activities to be the mutual, real-time coordination of actions, I showed how different problems of musical coordination arise, with solutions shaped by the spatial arrangements of musicians and their instruments, and as a result of constraints imposed by the musical traditions and the musical forms themselves. Since music making involves interaction between individual musicians, their bodies, and their instruments, musical performance inherently implicates the space occupied by those bodies and those instruments and, ideally, shared with an audience. (This is part of the special power of "live music," much lamented and often only virtually appealed to in this iPod/download age.) So in music we see hearers bodies in (inter)action, and their coordination requires not just the synchrony of turns or parts but, inescapably, of arms, legs, heads, hands, and vocal chords, as well as bits of wood and metal.

I moved on to consider coordination in musical "dialogues": dynamic balances and responsibilities in the pre-scored string quartets, or reinterpretations via the score of the composer's intentions; melodic and rhythmic lines in the jazz master class, and the orchestration of solos and improvisations. As in conversational turn taking, starting and stopping as well as engineering dialogic transitions between parts pose problems for musical performers. The solutions to these problems, the techniques we have examined for producing musical synchrony, are social and multimodal. There is a further issue of musically acceptable "substantive" coordination involving harmony, rhythm, style, and "feeling" for the jazz musicians, and for the string quartet players an emotional interpretation for the score and its associated tradition. The medium of an encompassing embodied rhythm, harmony, and dynamics as well as feeling, style, "groove," and imagery implies coordination that goes beyond adjacency and conditional relevance in conversational moves or "coherence" in discourse. The added logic derives as much from the multiple modalities involved in musical activity as from the non-denotational "content" of its component acts.

I then turned from simple performance to the widened frame of activity in musical master classes. Mixed expressive resources -- including complex textuality -- coupled with aesthetic, didactic, and expressive purposes give these classes added complexity, characteristic of many sorts of social activity whether explicitly pedagogical or not. I considered some of the metacharacterizations of music and making that emerged in those master classes, and in particular how the music itself, and the instruments that
serve as its onymons, insinuate themselves into the pedagogical practice.

My initial aim was to emphasize the typically multi-modal devices by which these musicians manage coordination. Coordinating action is a quintessential social technique, and it is thus no surprise that we use not only our voices but our whole bodies, if not everything else at hand, to achieve it. However, it is not only coordination—precise timing, smooth transition—that is achieved multimodally. The very substance of the classes—the sense of musicality, the nature of musical personality and "feeling," the intentions of composer and performer—all of these are multimodal orchestrations as well, in word and gesture, with body and instrument. One wonders how different our view of word, text, discourse, and conversation might have been had we started out with disembodied wrappings of telephone conversations but with the richness of a procession of Zenicautes musicians, a string quartet rehearsal, or a jazz jam session.
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