

Cross-cultural hybridity in music composition: Southeast Asia in three works from America

written 1998, unpublished

Christopher Adler

The act of composing is an engagement with hybridity. Every composer must mediate between the diverse influences, intentions, theories, and emotions impinging upon the compositional moment. For some composers these mediations may be relegated to the subconscious, for some they may be considerations of fine distinctions that come into play only at the level of detail. The compositions discussed in this article, *Spiral*, by Chinary Ung, *Banyuari*, by Michael Tenzer, and *Aneh Tapi Nyata*, by Evan Ziporyn, inhabit different hybrid realms between multiple categories of music, including: Euro-American contemporary concert music, popular musics, Balinese *gamelan*, Khmer classical music, and beyond, and as a result illustrate very different approaches to musical hybridization.

The hybridity of these works is foregrounded by the composers' decisions to compose between prior musical categories. The intentional, self-conscious cross-cultural hybrid has a long history within the Euro-American classical tradition, with such composers as Olivier Messiaen, John Cage, Colin McPhee and Lou Harrison, to name a few from this century. The intentional cross-cultural hybrid takes on an increasing significance in Euro-American contemporary music in this postmodern era of rapidly globalizing artistic, culture and commodity flows, where many composers are exposed to musicians, artists, recordings and ethnomusicological documentation of musics from the most distant corners of the world. While hybridity may be fundamental to musics everywhere, this exposure to global diversity is often dependent upon conditions of power and privilege which favor musicians of the urban centers of

the West and around the world. At the same time, the privilege of exposure does not imply a privileged access or understanding. This motivates my concern in this paper with the question of representation: how, through interconnections of music, discourse, and prior knowledge, a cross-culturally hybrid artistic form can communicate knowledge about a musical Other.

I am taking it as axiomatic that music means in multiple, political, cultural ways, a notion which is in opposition to the popular modernist aesthetic of art as autonomous and apolitical. (For a discussion of this notion and its critique, see Taylor (1995).) Music is a product of people and is received by people and is thus dialogic in nature, that is, its meanings are always produced and reproduced in its creation, anticipation, reception and interpretation. The meanings can not be confined a priori by a particular ideology (such as of the separability of music and politics), an inevitability which is merely foregrounded in the cross-culturally hybrid work. This ongoing emergence of meaning implies that the discourses, both individual and cultural, that contribute to an individual's musical experience are relevant to any musical analysis, for analysis is an assertion of music's meaningfulness. The relevance of this body of discourse problematizes any closed or complete analysis, for no analysis can take everything into account, and that analysis itself is a potentially transformative addition to that same body of discourse.

One possible path of musical meaning which can be especially controversial is interpreting a particular piece as representative of a larger musical category. Although such an interpretation may be open to critique, it is nonetheless frequently made by musicians, musicologists and everyday listeners alike, and is therefore an important component of musical analysis. It is all the more crucial to consider the representation of musical categories in works such as those under consideration here, the composers of which have consciously

decided to compose between prior musical categories. The composers here all have extensive experience in the musics to which they make reference and in fact may be considered participants in those traditions. But it is ultimately impossible and I would argue undesirable to qualify or disqualify an individual to act as representative based on lived experience, ethnicity, gender or any other aspect. My concern is not with the quality of representations in these pieces but in the multiple and myriad ways in which they may come to have representative meaning in a cross-cultural context.

It is difficult to say when a representation is taking place, and it may not necessarily correspond to the intention of the composer. Any number of features, especially in confluence, may signal a representation, including knowledge of a composer's background, the composer's stated intentions, program or liner notes, the use of instruments from other cultures, or the use of musical elements from a musical category. A Balinese *kotekan* in isolation is merely a kind of hocket, indistinguishable from countless other varieties of hocket. Pentatonic modes are fundamental in the pitch organization of many Southeast Asian musics, but are also fundamental throughout East Asia and many other parts of the world. Musical elements such as these may be intended to signify or to comprise a representation, and I argue that through a confluence of such musical signifiers as well as prior knowledge a potentially representative image may emerge to the listener who imagines their common reference to a musical Other.

As all three composers were trained and work primarily within the Euro-American concert music tradition, I have chosen the formalist perspective of traditional Euro-American musical analysis as the primary lens through which to examine the ways in which musical hybridity and the musical categories which are being hybridized are represented at the constructive, compositional level. To facilitate these analyses, I provide background in the relevant Southeast Asian

musics, though it will necessarily remain cursory and archetypal. Analyzing these works as hybrid depends upon an analytical construction of the categories which are being hybridized as prior categories, in this case musical/cultural categories named by geographic locality. While musics from all over the world may be theorized as hybrid, many have been reindigenized in popular consciousness as new musical categories, rather than as hybrids between musical categories. The three compositions here, however, still exist at the margin between Euro-American concert musics and Southeast Asian musics, and are indeed positioned as such in the composers' discourses, in the liner notes/program notes associated with their recordings, and presumably by the recipients for most of whom the categories hybridized are still quite real. Where possible, I have included remarks by the composers, especially concerning their stance towards hybridity as an intentional compositional approach, but I have excluded any reception studies. The reception of cross-culturally works in the multiple cultures from which the composers take influence may constitute the richest and most unpredictable, although also the most difficult, avenue for subsequent analyses of such music.

Southeast Asian music: basics

structure: idiomatic heterophony

Most Southeast Asian instrumental ensemble musics are typically structured as multiple simultaneous variations of a central melody. The melodic instruments render the same melody simultaneously, but in ways characteristic to each particular instrumental part or player, such that each part makes a relatively distinct contribution to an overall texture. This principle of organization has been referred to as “heterophony” and “polyphonic stratification” but I will refer to it as “idiomatic heterophony,” because the distinct contributions of melodic parts are conceived as idiomatic according to conventions of genre and style. The manifestations of this structural principle vary greatly, but the present examples will refer to the musics that are most relevant to the music of the composers under discussion, Balinese *gamelan* and Thai/Khmer/Lao classical music.¹

In the Balinese gamelan ensemble, a central melody (called *pokok*) is rendered in a one-octave range on instruments called *calung* (or *jublag*). The structure of the *pokok* is determined by a cyclical, binary meter which is articulated by the gong. Lower pitched instruments play only the main structural pitches of the *pokok*, and thus sound less frequently, while higher pitched instruments play faster subdivisions filling in between notes of the *pokok*. The example in Figure 1 shows selected parts from a short section of a gamelan piece. The central melody is rendered simultaneously in all the parts, and the resulting alignments are indicated in the figure. This alignment is most important on the

¹ The classical musics of Cambodia, Thailand, and Laos are historically interrelated. All the basic features that will be discussed in this paper are common to all of these musics and thus no distinction will be made between them. As identical instruments have different names in Khmer, Thai, and Lao, the instruments will be referred to by standard English designations.

stronger structural beats (one and three in Euro-American counting style, that is with 'one' corresponding to the striking of the large gong); notice the lack of correspondence between the parts on the second beat of each measure. The organization of Balinese gamelan music will be discussed further preceding the discussions of the compositions by Tenzer and Ziporyn.

In Thai/Khmer/Lao classical music² the melodic instruments simultaneously render a central melody in ways idiomatic to the respective instruments. The melody is adjusted, usually by octave transposition, to suit the range of each instrument, and is embellished in ways which suit the particular instruments and fall within stylistic conventions. For example, on the large gong circle, a melody that is made up of a combination of quarter, eighth and sixteenth notes falling within a two octave range will be played on the principal xylophone with continuous sixteenth notes or thirty-second notes within a three-octave range, while the oboe or flute will play it in a rhythm less constrained to even metrical subdivisions and with ornaments such as trills and glissandi. Figure 2 is a fragment of the melodic parts of a Thai composition for *piiphaat* ensemble. All the instruments play elaborated versions of a simpler melody which is heard only within the minds of the musicians; a possible version of this melody is shown in the figure. Although this particular example was composed, improvisation is a common feature in Thai/Khmer/Lao classical music, constrained by the main melody and the conventional idioms of each instrument.

pentatony

² For more extensive discussions of this music, refer to Myers-Moro (1993) and Miller and Sam (1995).

The musics of Southeast Asia are predominantly based upon pentatonic scales. In the case of Balinese musics, two different scales are used: *pelog*, used in Gamelan Gong Kebyar, and *slendro*, which is roughly a 5-tone equally tempered scale. These scales are shown in Figure 3 in their approximate Western equivalents. In most Southeast Asian musics, the pitch level is not fixed, and the frequency ratios within the scales may vary considerably. Thus many ensembles have unique tunings, but which are still identified by these general categories.

In the case of Thai/Khmer/Lao classical music, the scale used is 7-tone approximately-equal temperament, from which pentatonic modes of the *slendro*³ type are derived, as shown in Figure 4.⁴ Certain pieces may use a pentatonic mode exclusively (in cipher notation, the pitches 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6), while others may use all seven pitches. Within the pentatonic mode, one pitch is central although it need not be pitch 1. In pieces which use six or seven note-modes, pitches 4 and 7 are often used only ornamentally, or are secondary in structural importance.⁵ Notice in Figure 2, for example, that degrees 4 and 7 appear only as passing tones. Modulation between the seven different transpositions of the pentatonic mode is common in Thai/Khmer/Lao classical music, but typically, one mode is primary within a piece. Modulations often occur between sections or phrases, and are often thus related to the form of a composition.

In both Balinese and Thai/Khmer/Lao musics, a pitch may be doubled by the pitch which lies a “fifth” above in the Euro-American sense. In the case of Balinese *slendro* and *pelog*, that is the third pitch, or metallophone bar, above,

³ For convenience, I will use the terms *slendro* and *pelog* throughout this paper to refer to archetypal modes expressed in Western notation, but not necessarily to imply a reference to Indonesian musics.

⁴ A similar derivation of pentatonic modes from 7-tone scales is found in Javanese *pelog* and older Balinese ensembles.

⁵ In Thai cipher notation, the numbers have a fixed correspondence to actual pitches. My use of pitch ciphers in this case refers to a movable modal root 1.

and in the case of Thai/Khmer/Lao musics, the fifth pitch, or xylophone blade, above.

***Spiral I*, by Chinary Ung**

In 1980, with the composition of *Khse Buon* (“Four Strings” in Khmer) for solo cello, Chinary Ung⁶ began an intentional hybridization of structural and aesthetic ideas from both Euro-American contemporary concert music and Asian musics.

Rather than succumbing to descriptions of my music as “East-West,” I prefer to say the following: if the East can be characterized as the color blue and the West as the color yellow, then perhaps my music is green. ... Certainly, my music grew out of formal Western training, yet it evokes an Asian ambiance and color.⁷

He has said that he is not interested in making specific reference to Cambodian music, but instead takes a pan-Asian influence.⁸ In *Spiral I* (1987), for cello, piano and percussion, Ung does not make explicit reference to any specific Southeast Asian musics or cultures, except possibly with the ‘spiral’ concept. These influences could be attributed as much to Ung’s study with Chou Wen-Chung, who took influence from Chinese music, as they can to Ung’s study of Cambodian music. There are, however, a few quotations of Cambodian music in *Spiral*, but they are not indicated in the score.⁹ The two-phrase melody in the

⁶ Chinary Ung is a Professor of Composition at the University of California, San Diego. Chinary Ung was born and studied Western music in Cambodia, but did not begin his formal study of Khmer music until 1980, at which point he began to teach himself to play the principal xylophone (Tsang (1992: 935)).

⁷ Chinary Ung, quoted in Tsang (1992: 935).

⁸ Ung (1996).

⁹ McCurdy (1988: 23). In a later composition, *Child Song (Version I)* (1995), Ung makes specific references to Cambodian court, folk, and tribal musics (his terms) and labels them as such in the score.

cello at mm. 13:3:2–3 stands out as unusually conjunct and rhythmically regular and may be one of the quotations.¹⁰

instruments

Ung's genre of composition for *Spiral*, and all his other works, is fundamentally a Euro-American one, in that the pieces are through-composed, traditionally notated and scored for exclusively Euro-American instruments (the percussion instruments are all common today, if not uniquely Euro-American). This eliminates the most overt, tangible reference to a specific musical Other as is found in the other two works discussed in this paper.

Fundamental to Ung's style are a number of instrumental effects with precedents in both contemporary extended instrumental techniques and in Asian instrumental techniques. There are, for the cellist: extended passages in harmonics, harmonic *glissandi*, snap *pizzicati*, *jeté* bowing, *sul ponticello* bowing, and *glissandi* by turning the pegs; for the pianist: damping strings with the hand, tapping strings with the fingers, and plucking strings with the fingers; and for the percussionist: vibraphone harmonics, scraping the tam-tams and cymbals and playing the vibes at the nodal points. There are also numerous slides indicated between cello notes, both bowed and *pizzicato*, which are common playing techniques for bowed and plucked instruments throughout Asia, quarter-tone inflections common to East Asian plucked stringed instruments, such as the Chinese *pipa* and *qin* (see m. 4:2:1-2) and extended sections of *tremoli* for all the instruments, reminiscent of Thai/Khmer/Lao xylophone and gong circle technique.

¹⁰ The Peters edition of the score to *Spiral* is handwritten and does not include measure numbers. I refer to measures by the rubric *x:y:z*, where *x* is the page number, *y* is the system, and *z* is the measure number within that system.

structure I: idiomatic heterophony

Ung makes extensive use of heterophony in *Spiral*, though much more freely than is common in traditional Southeast Asian musics. In his most direct application of this principle, multiple instruments render the same melody simultaneously, each in its own style, as in mm. 1:2:6–7 (Figure 5), or in measures 2:1:4 through 2:2:3 (2:1:4–6 are shown in Figure 6), where in both cases the cello and piano elaborate a simpler melody stated in the vibraphone. More often, however, Ung superimposes melodic fragments, non-functional chords or isolated pitches or effects, retaining the character of heterophonic organization, but without a central melody common to all the instruments. See for example, mm. 13:3:2–3 (within Figure 10).

Measures 6:2:1–3 (Figure 7) are an example of the combination of these approaches. A central melody, in the top voice of the vibraphone chords¹¹ is harmonized by the vibes, elaborated by the cello, and accompanied by disjunct fragments in the piano, all interrelated heterophonically. Here, Ung has hybridized traditional Euro-American orchestration—that is, the coloring of a melody through instrumentation—with Southeast Asian idiomatic heterophony, such that individual melodies are realized through instrumental choice as well as elaborations and ornamentations that are heterophonically structured and unique to each instrument.

structure II: spiral concept

¹¹ That this melody is central is suggested by its simplicity and by its relation to one of the melodic themes of this section, which will be discussed later.

The upwards spiral is an aesthetic concept which is manifest in Thai music in a kind of song called *thao*, in which a central melody is rendered at successively faster speeds while all the instruments play at the same rate of subdivision (A brief example is shown in Figure 8). Although the *thao* form is hardly used in Khmer music, there are in Khmer music multiple tempo levels as in the *thao* form. Furthermore, although this may not be the spiral notion to which Ung refers in the title, it nonetheless will prove analytically revealing. Ung applies this spiral concept in three ways. The first is the successive subtraction from short, repeated motives, as in the piano part in mm. 2:1:1–3 or in the piano and percussion in mm. 7:1:1–4. The second is to have different instruments play the same material at different speeds, as in a mensural canon. This is shown in mm. 2:1:4–6 (Figure 6), between the piano and vibes, and can be found throughout the piece (e.g. between the dyads in the tubular bells in mm. 3:1:2–3 and the cello in m. 3:1:3; between the cello and piano in m. 10:1:2; or between the cello and piano in m. 11:1:4).

The third application of the spiral concept is the successive expansion and elaboration or variation of themes through sections of the piece in a manner reminiscent of the levels of the Thai *thao* form (the disposition of themes and sectionalization of the piece will be discussed below). The most straightforward example is the phrase played by the cello in m. 5:3:2 which is lengthened and elaborated in mm. 5:3:3–6:1:1 and lengthened and elaborated again in mm. 6:1:4–6:2:2. This passage is rewritten in Figure 9 to show the successive elaboration.

mode and modulation

Ung's pitch language is based not upon a tonal system in the classical sense, but upon the use of pentatonic modes which are subsets of the equal-

tempered chromatic scale. In most cases, Ung implies a hierarchy within these modes, in that there is a tonal center and a typical doubling for each pitch of a fifth above (this can be seen in Figure 6), and in that a few additional pitches foreign to the mode are used as ornamental pitches.¹² In these ways his usage of pentatonic modality is reminiscent of the Thai/Khmer/Lao usage discussed earlier. For example, the opening page of the piece is in the mode A–Db–Eb–E–G,¹³ with Bb as an ornamental neighbor tone in m. 1:2:2 and as a passing tone in m. 1:2:7.

Ung modulates between modes by simply replacing a modal tone or tones while retaining the others, or by reinterpreting non-modal ornamental tones as modal tones, and vice-versa. The melody in mm. 2:1:4–6 is repeated in mm. 2:1:7–2:2:2 with the D# replaced by D-natural, constituting a brief modal modulation with no change in modal center (A-natural). An example of a modal modulation with a change in modal center occurs in mm. 13:2:2–13:3:2 (Figure 10) where the mode A–Db–Eb–E–Ab, with Db as the modal center, modulates to the mode Db–Eb–Gb–Ab–Bb, with Gb as the center, by the change of two modal tones and the retention of A-natural as an ornamental tone in the latter mode.

Ung sometimes superimposes material in different modes. In mm. 6:1:1–6:2:2 (partially shown in Figure 7), the cello and vibraphone are in the mode D–E–F#–A–B, with C-natural and Bb as ornamental tones and A-natural as the modal center. Some of the piano figures are in this mode, while others are in the mode of the opening page: A–Db–Eb–E–G, with Bb as an ornamental tone. As discussed earlier, this multi-modal passage is still interrelated heterophonically.

¹² Ung does not structure the ornamental tones or the use of ornamentation as is found in some Chinese and Vietnamese modal practices, in which certain ornaments are used only on certain modal degrees.

¹³ Ung's enharmonic spelling is inconsistent. I do not believe he intends any difference between D# and Eb on the opening page, for example.

Ung's use of harmony is limited to non-functional textural effects, in a manner very much akin to that of Debussy or Messiaen, whose use of non-functional harmony is partly attributable to their encounters with Asian musics. There are only two types of harmonies used. The first type, used throughout the piece, are clusters or arpeggios of modal pitches. The other type are lush harmonies of modal and non-modal tones which are always rooted in modal pitches, and are played by the piano or vibes. These chords appear only the second section of the piece, according to the form outlined below.

form

Spiral divides into four sections which are reminiscent of a sonata form. Each of the first two sections (mm. 1:1:1–4:1:1 and mm. 4:1:2–7:3:3) expose a group of themes in a distinct modal type. The second section is texturally more stable and more relaxed in tone than the first, due to the longer phrases, harmonic accompaniment and more sparse texture. The third section, which is the least stable texturally (mm. 8:1:1–11:3:3), includes juxtapositions of material from both of the first two sections as well as new material, and the final section (mm. 11:3:4–15:2:1) synthesizes the two theme groups by ending with a theme related to a theme of the first group but in the modal type of the second.

In each of the first two sections, the themes are presented independently, but at key moments are shown to have a heterophonic structural relation. The five themes of the first section are shown in Figure 11, and in mm. 1:2:6–7, three of themes are shown to be structurally related (also Figure 11). All of the first section is in the pelog-type mode A–Db–Eb–E–G or other pelog-type modes closely related through modulation, with A as the modal center. The four themes of the second section, all in the slendro-type mode D–E–F#–A–B with A-natural

as the modal center, are shown in Figure 12. Notice that theme B_2 is the middle component of the spiral of mm. 5:3:2–6:2:2, as shown in Figure 9. Ung illustrates the structural relation of themes B_1 and B_2 by aligning them in m. 7:3:1, as well as by aligning B_1 (in the cello) with the spiraled-out elaboration of B_2 (in the vibes) in m. 6:2:1–2 (see Figure 7).

The theme of the final section which serves to synthesize the first two theme groups appears in mm. 13:2:4–13:3:1 (shown in Figure 10), containing the motive Bb-Eb-Db-Bb which (minus an ornamental E-natural) comes from theme A_3 . This reference to the opening becomes the closing theme, in the slendro-type mode Gb–Ab–Bb–Db–Eb, with Gb as the modal center and A-natural as an ornamental tone.

Although I have shown a number of features which could make reference to Thai/Khmer/Lao music, they may just as easily refer to many other musics in Asia. Ung's uses of heterophony, hierarchical pentatonic scales, and instrumental effects are too ambiguous to refer to a particular musical tradition. In fact, Ung's ametrical, richly ornamented style, colored by instrumental special effects could be interpreted as an Orientalist stereotype of Asia as gentle, exotic and elusive. Ung's claim to write with a "pan-Asian" influence creates a tension between a representation of Asian music as a distinct, cohesive musical category, and an Orientalist projection onto Asia of stereotypes of Asian music that may have little to do with any particular musics from Asia. That tension is complicated by the reference to the spiral concept and the quotations of Cambodian music which allude to a representation but nonetheless remain elusive and ambiguous.

Balinese gamelan gong kebyar: basics

The Balinese *gamelan gong kebyar* is the most well-known contemporary gamelan of Bali, consisting of metallophones, gongs, tuned gong chimes, drums, and bamboo flutes. Gamelan gong kebyar was created in the first decades of the twentieth century and has since become the most popular form of gamelan and medium for contemporary gamelan composition. The instruments are tuned in pelog, approximated in Western notation by B–C–D–F#–G or B–C#–D–F#–G, or a transposition thereof. Almost all of the metallophones in Balinese gamelan ensembles are in matched pairs, with corresponding keys tuned slightly apart to produce between five and seven beats per second when played simultaneously. As a result, the entire ensemble has a ‘shimmering’ quality, which amplifies and gives vibrancy to the overall sound. I present here an extremely simplified description of gong kebyar for the purposes of discussion of Tenzer’s and Ziporyn’s works.¹⁴ There are two basic types of rhythmic structure used in gong kebyar, metrical and ametrical, in both cases employing heterophony, as discussed earlier.

Metrical sections are based upon the central *pokok* melody, played by the *calungs*. The melody is repeated cyclically and the structure of the melody is delineated by the *gong*, a set of two large knobbed gongs and a small knobbed kettle gong, the largest of which is sounded on the structural downbeat of the rhythmic cycle. There are a great variety of gong cycles, but they are almost always binary, that is, of length a power of two (2, 4, 8, 16, 32, etc.) and subdivided evenly; one example of a binary gong cycle is shown in Figure 13. The melodic instruments elaborate the *pokok* heterophonically. The lowest instruments, the *jegogans*, play only some notes of the *pokok*, usually the

¹⁴ For more extensive discussion, the reader should refer to Tenzer (1991).

structurally stronger beats according to the binary structure. The *gangsas*¹⁵ (*pemades* and *kantilans*) and gong chime (*reong*) play faster than the *pokok*, playing two, four, or eight subdivisions per *pokok* note. The elaboration technique, called *kotekan*, is a kind of hocket whereby pairs of instruments (or players in the case of the *reong*) play patterns of one, two or three notes, separated by rests, and the other player plays a related pattern that overlaps with and fills in the gaps of the first. An example is shown in Figure 14.

The ametrical style of gong *kebyar* is called *kebyar*, referring to the striking of lightning, and consists of disjunct unison fragments and *kotekan* fragments, played with extreme speed, precision and virtuosity. When played idiomatically, the rhythm is not easily represented by Western musical notation. There is typically no metrical structure or even regular pulse in these sections. An approximate transcription of a *kebyar* passage is shown in Figure 15.

Most gamelans in Bali are owned and operated communally by villages and most decisions regarding the group are made collectively. “There is little if any room for the individual to express him or herself in gamelan performance; instead the ideal is the cultivation of absolute coordination and channeling of each member’s artistic personality into a unified musical expression”.¹⁶ Although new pieces are created by individuals, most composers are not remembered, and gamelan music has not traditionally been regarded as a kind of intellectual property. Furthermore, in their aural transmission, alterations of pieces, within stylistic conventions, are common and may be made by the composer or teacher, who serves as a *de facto* arranger.

¹⁵ The higher pitched metallophones which play the faster parts are called *gangsas*, and divide into two groups, *pemades* and *kantilans*. The *kantilans* are an octave higher and usually double the *pemades*, but sometime have independent parts in contemporary music.

¹⁶ Tenzer (1991: 14).

***Banyuari*, by Michael Tenzer**

Whereas Chinary Ung works within a Euro-American idiom, borrowing ideas from Asian musics, Michael Tenzer¹⁷ wrote *Banyuari* (1992) (meaning “Little brother of the river”, in other words “tributary”, in Balinese) in the Balinese idiom, and introduced ideas from Euro-American contemporary concert music and South Indian (Karnatak) classical music. The work is idiomatically Balinese in that he writes not only for a standard Balinese gamelan gong kebyar, but takes as fundamental many concepts of Balinese gamelan, namely: cyclic metrical sections and ametrical kebyar sections delineated by gongs and *kempli* (a single dampened kettle gong which keeps the beat), sectional forms with sections typical of gamelan gong kebyar (such as drums solos over unembellished pokok (pp. 24–25)¹⁸), sudden changes of tempo between sections, the centrality of the pokok which is played by the calungs (and *penyacah* and *ugal*, additional metallophones), the heterophonic elaboration of the pokok by the other melodic instruments, with use of kotekan by gangsas and reong in idiomatic styles, leadership of ensemble by *kendang* (drums) and *ugal*, standard instrumental groupings, the teaching of the work without the use of notation in the traditional aural manner, and in the very idea of creating a new work which introduces new ideas into the repertoire. This work is nonetheless hybridized with Euro-American music, and as a result very difficult to play as seen within the Balinese tradition.

¹⁷ Michael Tenzer is an Associate Professor at the University of British Columbia, and was a co-founder of the American Gamelan Sekar Jaya.

¹⁸ The score to *Banyuari* does not contain measure numbers, and will thus be referenced by pages numbers.

instrumental effects

Taking inspiration from the concept of ‘extended technique’ in avant-garde music, Tenzer has introduced some non-standard instrumental techniques to the gamelan. The piece begins with the most dramatic of these, a chord played in tremolo by the full ensemble. There is no notion of harmony in gamelan, except for a system of standard doublings three notes above, and in the chord called *byong* played by the reong as a rhythmic punctuation. The standard doublings, *byong*, and Tenzer’s opening chord are shown in Figure 16. Tenzer also creates a chordal sonority on p. 31 by playing notes successively but not dampening them as is idiomatic.¹⁹

Beginning on p. 25, Tenzer expands the concept of standard doublings by doubling the pokok and doubling the doubling pitch, resulting in a three-note homophony. This cycle, played by the pokok instruments (calung, penyacah, and ugal) is shown in Figure 17.

melodic character

The melodies of *Banyuari* are unusually disjunct for Balinese music, especially in the gangsas, ugal and penyacah. This effect is most pronounced in the recurring theme which first appears on p. 7 (see Figure 18). The rich harmonic spectra of gamelan instruments mask these disjunctures, some of which could be interpreted as octave displacements of a more conjunct melody. The result is more a timbral coloring than a jagged melody, but is nonetheless far

¹⁹ All the metallophones are played with a mallet held by the right hand, and each note is dampened with the left hand when the right hand plays the subsequent note, so that notes do not ring indefinitely, or to create a rest between notes. For the most part the left hand follows the right hand exactly, but one rhythmic subdivision behind. Each player of the reong has mallets in both hands and must dampen notes with same mallet used to strike the note. The large gongs are not dampened.

more difficult to play because of the leaps required by both hands. The disjunct nature of these instrumental parts does not affect the calung or jegogan parts, as both have only a five-note range, nor the reong part which has a large range but is played by four persons in octave unison and is therefore typically very conjunct.

rhythm and meter

Tenzer takes great liberties with the usual binary rhythmic structure of Balinese music. On p. 39, Tenzer writes a kotekan that subdivides each quarter note of the pokok into five rather than four subdivisions, connected to surrounding material by means of a metric modulation such that the gangsas (kotekan instruments) continue to play at the same rate while the beat (played by kempli) slows down by a ratio of 4:5 (Figure 19). The number five is used frequently in the rhythms in *Banyuari*, often to disrupt the usual binary structure of gamelan music.

Throughout *Banyuari*, the pokok and elaborations of the pokok are not built from regular phrases but additively constructed of rhythmic cells and irregular durations. Tenzer frequently uses cells five eighth notes in length or repeated dotted eighth notes, under a quarter note pulse. The gong cycles are similarly built from additive durations rather than with the usual binary regularity. The fifteen-beat pokok which begins on p. 19 (with G in calung) is typically Balinese in that it is melodically conjunct and rhythmically end-oriented (to the culminating stroke of the large gong), however, it cannot have a binary structure and so is divided as 4+4+4+3 beats by the gong and jegogan. On p. 21 the fifteen beat cycle is replaced by another divided as 5+5+5. The thirteen-beat pokok beginning on p. 25 is similarly constructed from a gong cycle of 4+3+3+3 (Figure 17). The non-cyclic pokok on pp. 7–9 is constructed on top of a regularly spaced stroke of the large gong every twelve beats which is subdivided differently (see the jegogan part) each time (p. 9 is shown in Figure 20).

Some sections of *Banyuari* highlight rhythmic experimentation rather than melodic experimentation. On pp. 23–24, the kendang (drums) solo over the 15-beat cycles discussed above. The solo consists of five quarter notes followed by

five dotted eighths, followed by five eighths, then fifteen sixteenths, then the retrograde of the whole rhythmic series. This series together with its retrograde add up to precisely two cycles of fifteen quarter notes. On pp. 29–30 the kempli and kendang simultaneously play two such rhythmic series of groups of fives, one retrograde-invariant and the other not, resulting in irregular polyrhythms.

In writing this kind of self-contained rhythmic section, Tenzer was inspired by the rhythmic practice of South Indian classical music. This influence is most developed in his use of “korvai,” an extended, additively constructed rhythmic composition which Tenzer uses for one of the main themes of the piece. The rhythms of the korvai, again based on groupings of five, are shown in Figure 21, taken from a chart provided by the composer. An abbreviated rhythmic version is played by the kendang on pp. 27–28, but the full melodic version begins on p. 33. It is first played by the gangsas, reong and ugal, but is later distributed through the other parts. An elaborated version of parts 1) and 2) of the korvai returns on pp. 50–51.

structural innovations

As discussed earlier, Tenzer uses the heterophonic relationship between pokok and kotekan typical of Balinese gamelan. On p. 1 and pp. 3–4, he expands the heterophony into four parts: pokok played by calung and penyacah, kotekan played by reong, and two different elaborations of the pokok played by the pemades and kantilans, respectively (the pemade part often relates to the other parts by the standard doubling rather than unison pitch).

The most notable structural innovation, however, is the use of polyphony,²⁰ or the simultaneous presentation of two pokok melodies, which occurs in two places. The melody played by the gangsas which begins on p. 7, m. 2 is presented twice. The first time (p. 7–9) with a slow-moving pokok which is related sometimes heterophonically (such as the first half of p. 9) and sometimes polyphonically. The repetition of the melody, beginning after a short kebyar phrase on p. 10, is accompanied polyphonically by a more elaborate melody played by the calung and penyacah that has no heterophonic relation to the slow-moving pokok.

Near the end of the piece, an elaborated version of the first two parts of the korvai that begins on p. 33 is played by the gangsas, reong, kendang and *ceng ceng* (cymbals) accompanied polyphonically by the 13-beat pokok from p. 25, in ostinato. In this culminating gesture, Tenzer combines a number of the hybridized elements of *Banyuari*: a pokok and gong cycle of non-binary length (fifteen beats), a pokok played in three-part homophony (by doubling the doubling of the pokok), the South Indian inspired korvai rhythmic composition, and the polyphonic superimposition of these two melodic parts.

The hybrid nature of this work at a technical level does not disrupt its being positionable in the traditions of both contemporary Euro-American music and Balinese *kreasi baru*, both of which are open to experimentation and the search for new ideas in foreign cultures.²¹ Implicit in the act of composing this

²⁰ I use the term “polyphony” for the simultaneous presentation of melodies which are not related heterophonically. In the absence of a harmonic system, no distinction can be made between polyphony and the simultaneous sounding of independent melodies as is possible in Western tonal analysis.

²¹ “Kreasi baru” is the Balinese word for “contemporary composition” and literally comes from the Dutch word for “create.” Although the kreasi baru practice may have emerged under Indonesian nationalist influence in the mid-twentieth century, what is relevant to a consideration of Tenzer’s work is the contemporary Balinese understanding of kreasi baru as Balinese (Ramstedt (1992: 67)).

piece is Tenzer's presumption of authority over Balinese gamelan music, based on his study and interaction with Balinese musicians. The title *Banyuari* ("tributary") refers to this composition as "a small stream branching off from the great river of Balinese musical tradition", which expresses not only Tenzer's presumed ability to work within that tradition, but also his humility towards it.²² Tenzer complicates his own authorial power, however, by working aurally, in the traditional Balinese manner, and performing the work in a Balinese context. In that context, free from constraints of intellectual property rights, musicians may re-teach his work, alter it as they see fit, and borrow ideas from it liberally as they would with any other Balinese piece (although it is unlikely that this piece will be played again by a Balinese ensemble, as is the case for more experimental *kreasi baru*²³).

If we accept Tenzer's authority over Balinese music, we might turn the question of representation around and ask how *Banyuari* acts as a representation of Euro-American music within the Balinese tradition. The features of Euro-American music which have discussed above, while potentially sounding from outside the Balinese tradition, are not unequivocally identifiable as Western. In effect, the Other music is prevented from being localized. Similarly, the South Indian rhythmic features are not contextualized by any other references, and might not be apparent as South Indian except for their being named as such in the score and liner notes of the recording.

²² Perlman, in the liner notes to *American Works for Balinese Gamelan* recording (1993: 6).

²³ Ziporyn (1997).

Aneh Tapi Nyata, by Evan Ziporyn

Since 1990, Evan Ziporyn²⁴ has been writing pieces for hybrid ensembles of Balinese and Western instruments, and *Aneh Tapi Nyata* (“Strange But True” in Bahasa Indonesia, the national language), composed in 1992, is the second of these. Taking the dialogic nature of musical meaning as a starting point, Ziporyn approaches cultural hybridization from an personal point of view rather than as a self-appointed cultural representative, that is, he concerns himself not with “cultural meanings” or “cross-cultural understanding” but with his own personal meanings for the musics in which he is involved.

Oddly, this type of individual meaning can often be easier to access by stepping outside one’s own culture, where boundaries and meanings have become so familiar as to be invisible, taken for granted. The value of cross-cultural work is that these personal boundaries are revealed and made more conscious—not discarded, but made malleable and user-friendly.

By working cross-culturally we can make new musics, musics previously unimaginable, which ideally can speak to people in both traditions, saying different but comprehensible things in all languages.²⁵

The text of *Aneh Tapi Nyata*, written by Ziporyn and sung in Bahasa Indonesia, poses this turn to individual subjectivity as an answer to a crisis of modernity and commodification.

What is the meaning of it all?

Wander around, look for a tonic fit for a foreigner to cure anxiety...

Our era has lost all tradition—where can it be bought?

²⁴ Evan Ziporyn is a Professor of Composition at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and is the founder and director of the Balinese Gamelan Galak Tika.

²⁵ Ziporyn, “One Man’s Traffic Noise,” (n.d.: 12).

If I may, I ask for the leftovers from still-authentic offerings
 Newly arrived, I open my suitcase—inside all of my problems have come along
 Strange but true
 A western song accompanied by this mixture...
 Gather together until forced apart—a momentary fusion
 Sweet or sour, it's up to the listener

To a listener unfamiliar with the specific musical cultures involved, the hybridity of the pieces by Ung and Tenzer discussed above is not necessarily localizable. With ensembles of strictly Western instruments or unmodified Balinese gamelan, and the composers' adherence to certain traditions associated with those ensembles, *Spiral* and *Banyuari* can sound like Euro-American or Balinese pieces with the influence of unknown Others. I have attempted to show that the hybridity of those pieces is much more pervasive than an initial listening might suggest. In Ziporyn's case, the hybridity of almost all the aspects of his works is foregrounded, and it's fundamentally cross-cultural nature immediately apparent. It does not follow, however, that the pieces are doubly localizable, as Ziporyn draws upon multiple genres and styles simultaneously instead of clearly reproducing singular musical categories.

Aneh Tapi Nyata was written for Gamelan Sekar Jaya, the first professional Balinese Gamelan in the United States. Ziporyn asked the members (at the time including himself), many of whom were skilled performers on Western instruments, what instruments they would like to play. The result is a mixture of Western, Balinese gamelan and other Balinese instruments: flute, clarinet, bass clarinet, reong (tuned gong row from the gamelan but here played by only one person), one *gender wayang pemade* (Balinese metallophone, tuned in slendro and played with two mallets), *joged bumbung tingklit* (Balinese bamboo xylophone), triangle, ceng ceng, kempli, kendang (only one), Balinese gongs, electric guitar,

two electric mandolins, violin, viola, cello, and female voice. These instruments present three different tuning systems: equal temperament, pelog (reong), and slendro (gender and tingklit, which are not from the same ensemble and thus potentially at different pitch levels or in different variants of slendro). Ziporyn's approach to this piece is to hybridize almost every aspect of the work, so that each particular element of analysis, such as ensemble, tuning, instrumental technique, structure, etc., resists a positioning within a single musical tradition. Even the choice of Bahasa Indonesia for setting the text suggests the cross-cultural hybridity of the piece, as the Indonesian national language derives from Malay and is the *lingua franca* for communication between the multiple ethnicities within Indonesia, which speak over 200 hundred different local languages.²⁶

gandrung Banyuangi

For such a thoroughly hybrid composition, Ziporyn took as a starting point a kind of music whose hybrid origins were already readily apparent, *gandrung Banyuangi*.²⁷ While all music may be theorized as inherently hybrid and hybridizing, the hybridity of *gandrung Banyuangi* stood out to Ziporyn as it is strongly influenced by multiple neighboring musical traditions, includes tangible signifiers of a multi-cultural history such as Euro-American instruments, and falls between the canonical categories of traditional ethnomusicology. The legitimacy of such categories is suspect, especially in light of the present subject matter, but what is relevant here is the persistence of this ethnomusicological knowledge that makes *gandrung Banyuangi* seem so strikingly in-between.

²⁶ Herbert and Milner (1989: 125).

²⁷ For further discussion of *gandrung Banyuangi*, see the liner notes to *Songs Before Dawn: Gandrung Banyuangi* (1991), written by Philip Yampolsky.

Gandrung is a popular entertainment genre known by various names all over Indonesia, and Banyuangi is a small town on the eastern coast of Java that used to be the waypoint to Bali by sea before Bali had its own airport. Gandrung Banyuangi is an all-night event with a female solo singer and music ensemble, and includes participation of the guests as dancers. The music and singing display the influence of Balinese music, Sundanese (West Java) drumming, other local genres, and is played with an ensemble of Indonesian and Western instruments: two violins held upright and played in the manner of the Javanese rebab, a triangle played by the bandleader/emcee, two kendang, two small kettle gongs (Javanese kempli) and one hanging gong. Ziporyn makes a number of references to gandrung Banyuangi, such as the inclusion of a solo triangle part, frequent open fifths and open fifth drones in the violin, viola and other parts, a reong played by one person (recalling the Javanese kempli), and a section with female vocal soloist.

tuning and detuning

Ziporyn considers the combination of instruments in different tuning systems not as a problem to be solved or reconciled, but a source of possibilities found in neither tuning system alone. Balinese pelog and slendro vary among instruments, both in frequency ratios and pitch level. For a performance of *Aneh Tapi Nyata*, Ziporyn requests only that “ballpark relationships” are maintained, and allows the Western instruments to adjust their pitch level to the reong if necessary. The coexistence of these tuning systems results in various frequency beatings and dissonances that are reminiscent of the detuning of pairs of Balinese gamelan instruments that results in a ‘shimmering’ effect.

Ziporyn creates this detuned effect in the equal-tempered Western instruments as well, as a means of further undermining the dominance of any single tuning system. For example, in section **N** (mm. 126–137), the melody is played by the flute and clarinet in parallel seconds, which in addition to creating a timbral tension, blurs the diatonic sound of the melody. There is a similar effect at **W** (mm. 227–232) with the flute, clarinet, bass clarinet and cello playing in parallel augmented chords. The second mandolin is used in a similar fashion to complicate the harmonies of **K**, **L** and **M** (mm. 103–125), contributing to both harmonic tension and tuning ambiguity. Ziporyn also uses glissandi effects in the strings and plucked strings (for example, mm. 13–16, mm. 43–45), blurring the equal-temperament of these instruments.

mode

Having the approximately common note A-natural between all the instruments, Ziporyn uses this pitch as a modal center for the piece, which is for the most part diatonic in A-major, A-minor and other closely related keys. However, this piece is modal, not tonal, consisting primarily of single melodies realized with a great deal of open-fifth doublings and accompanied by similarly constructed chords. Ziporyn also makes use of slendro and pelog type pentatonic modes, often embedded within other modes. For example, in **F** and **G** (mm. 57–69), the plucked strings play kotekan (see below, Figure 22) in the slendro scale G–A–B–D–E but are accompanied by the bowed strings by chords built of open fifths using the diatonic scale which includes this slendro scale and the pitches C-natural and F#. The pattern at **Q** (mm. 145–152) is in pelog D#–E–F#–A–B which is created through the combination of selected pitches from the reong's pelog and the gender's slendro (Figure 23).

kotekan and rhythmic cycles

Ziporyn uses the idea of *kotekan* from Balinese gamelan to create multi-instrument hockets that are a frequent texture in this piece, resulting in a continuous stream of sixteenth notes reminiscent of Balinese gamelan in pace and intensity. Furthermore, Ziporyn uses *kotekan* rhythms, that is rhythmic cells of one, two or three sixteenth notes, throughout the piece. In sections **E** through **G** and **K** through **O** there are true *kotekan* patterns, that is hockets between instruments made of these rhythmic cells resulting in a composite melody. In this case the *kotekans* often span much larger melodic intervals than is possible with gamelan (e.g. a ninth at **E**), and are often interspersed with non-hocketed melodies, as in mm. 61–63 (Figure 22). Ziporyn also applies standard doublings at the fifth as in gamelan. At **M**, Ziporyn departs from the standard doubling of the *kotekan* of the previous sections by doubling the A-natural (gender, *tingklit*) with first C-natural, then C# (reong, guitar, cello) and then the B-natural with D#, creating an ascending line in the inner ‘voice’ of the *kotekan* (Figure 24). This effect, as well as the distribution of *kotekan* across many instruments (up to six) amounts to an orchestration of *kotekan* unlike anything found in Balinese gamelan, where *kotekan* is always played by pairs of identical instruments, or by the reong alone.

Ziporyn’s *kotekan* are not elaborations of a main melody. They are instead textural in nature, maintaining a rhythmic intensity but usually without a conjunct melodic shape, except in the non-*kotekan* passages which are interspersed, as in Figure 22. In fact, when there is a foreground melody as in **N**, it is not heterophonically related to the accompanying *kotekan*.

Although Ziporyn does not employ any typical structure of Balinese gamelan, he does use various rhythmic cycles throughout the piece, and these are often articulated by the gong. Letters **K** through **M** are a large cycle which is repeated three times, and is itself made up of a two short cycles (mm. 103–107 and mm. 113–116) each repeated twice, plus an additional 5-measure phrase. The non-binary meters in this section result in irregular kempli patterns, but the gong is always used to articulate the structural downbeats.

At **Q**, a one-measure cycle, in $9/8$, is repeated, with the downbeat and midpoint articulated by the gong (Figure 23). In **S** through **V**, a two-measure cycle, in $5/4$, is repeated, again articulated by a stroke of the gong. However, the gong that is used corresponds to the bass line, played by the cello. These two-measure cycles are combined into a large 16-measure cycle which is repeated four times (once per letter **S** through **V**). The use of nested cycles disrupts the expectation of the large gong sounding only on the structural downbeat, because there are multiple downbeats at different temporal scales, and the gong choice corresponds to harmonic motion rather than an abstract structure.

I have argued that it is possible to view *Spiral* and *Banyuani* as positionable within single musical categories, Euro-American concert music and Balinese gamelan respectively, and that each of these works are hybridized with somewhat amorphous Others. With *Aneh Tapi Nyata*, Ziporyn has created a thoroughly hybrid composition that resists such a positioning. Ziporyn's stance toward the tuning exemplifies this resistance. In bringing together multiple tuning systems without intentional reconciliation, and in further blurring the boundaries between them by creating new modes from their combination and complicating the perception of any one system through detuning and microtonality (glissandi), Ziporyn has created a new category of pitch

organization which cannot be adequately categorized or contextualized by either Euro-American or Balinese precedents alone. Questions of representation become balanced: the piece is no fairer a representation of Euro-American music within the Balinese tradition as it is a representation of Balinese music within the Euro-American tradition. Coming as it does from a modernist appetite for novelty and incorporation or representation of an exotic Other, this piece could be interpreted as fundamentally Euro-American. As with Tenzer's work, however, this is counterbalanced by the active and equally voracious Indonesian new music scene that promotes works such as this.

Hybridity and representation

The choice to work in the margin between musical categories is an acknowledgment of the inevitable hybridity of culture and its expressive forms and is emblematic of the increasingly disjunct influences on the everyday of postmodern culture. It is a critique of and potential liberation from the ideological categories and boundaries of dominant discourses about music. It is the possibility of engaging the divergent loves of the artist, and it is a strategy for producing the newness and novelty mandated by the still influential modernist aesthetic and by the economics of the music industry. But the hybrid is neither innocent nor utopian, it is a space inevitably infiltrated with the power relationships of its participants.

Hybridity is a contested and contingent theoretical and strategic domain. For bell hooks, the space of the hybrid, the margin, is "a site of creativity and power ... of resistance".²⁸ It is a grounding from which to critique those categories of culture and the unequal distributions of power between them.

²⁸ hooks (1990: 125).

Rosemary Coombe points out, however, that hybridity as a strategy is available not only to the subaltern but to those in power as well.²⁹ In fact it is quite controversial when persons of privilege are accused of adopting hybridity not as a celebratory condition but as an appropriative strategy (see Ziff and Rao (1997), Taylor (1995)). While the domains of control of the author may be transformed, as in the case of Tenzer's piece entering the Balinese aural repertory, authorship of, and thus copyright of and profit from the pieces here are still retained by individual composers. In an international context however, claims to intellectual property may be difficult, impossible or undesirable from the point of view of the composer.

To intentionally work between prior musical categories is to delight in their defiance and to critique their validity but at the same time is to engage with their mutual representation. Likewise, hybridity is not a monologic strategy adopted by the artist but is contingent in its very formulation upon the categories being hybridized. An approach taken by a composer regarding the hybridization of Euro-American and Southeast Asian musics may not then be generalizable to Euro-American and African musics, for example. I do not expect that the composers here operate with the same strategy in two different compositions which call upon different musical categories, nor do I propose that their positions may be adequately embodied in a single musical work or spoken word. But I do suggest that the composer's approach to hybridity and relationships to the categories hybridized are important components of a musical analysis of a hybrid work, that is, to the ongoing construction of musical meaning.

I have problematized Ung's claim to pan-Asian representation as potentially Orientalizing, at the same time that he attempts to subvert the question of representation by not referring to a specific musical culture. Such a

²⁹ Coombe (1997: 80).

position may also be read as a conscious attempt to avoid political meanings by avoiding specific reference, yet the dialogic nature of music renders such an attempt inevitably futile, for representation depends as much upon the listeners' perception as it does the composers' intention. With *Banyuari*, Tenzer goes beyond reference and composes ostensibly within the Balinese tradition, based on his extensive participation in that tradition. His work may therefore be read in the cross-cultural context as a representation of that tradition. Ziporyn works with a similar claim to authority but chooses to pursue a third category in which the question of representation is equally potent when asked of Euro-American or Balinese musics.

In "Who Listens if You Care," Ziporyn answers the complicated politics of representation by proposing that in the postmodern era boundaries have lost their relevance, and that the search for meaning in music is inevitably fruitless given the inherent subjectivity of musical reception and incompatibility of "rational" linguistic constructs and musical consciousness.

... to talk about music, to categorize it, define it, explain it, is to attach linguistic constructs, rational states, to phenomena that only resemble linear thought in the sense that they move uni-directionally through time. The only way to get around this ... is to separate music from linguistic thought, to stop searching for all this meaning. ...

We must begin to listen only to our inner voices, whatever their source. ... We must rid ourselves of the notion that a piece of music can or cannot be politically correct, exploitative, collective, traditional, iconoclastic, whatever. We must stop trying to explain music, stop caring whether its a sign system, a random or deliberate collection of sounds or a symbol of anything other than itself.³⁰

³⁰ Ziporyn, "Who Listens if You Care," (1991: 28).

Ziporyn takes a celebratory stance towards the conditions of postmodernity, denying the potential meaningfulness or powers in music and retreating to musical essences which are not to be implicated. By taking such a stance, Ziporyn imposes his postmodern position on all Others, denying them the right to claim meaning in music, to claim representation or misrepresentation, or to retain ownership. While at one level Ziporyn revels in the new potential of the hybrid space, at another level he denies the voice of the Other in mediating his authority over that space. Ziporyn has more recently revised this position to point out that “even rootless cosmopolitanism is in itself a type tradition that has its own trajectory”,³¹ an acknowledgment of the history and contingency of his own theoretical, political position and thus a critique of its imposition on the Other implicit in his earlier remarks. I have retained both of these moments in Ziporyn’s discourse to show not only the fluidity of one composer’s political position, but also to show two divergent ideas which are current among artists working on the hybrid.

Like Tenzer, Ziporyn is an active participant in Balinese musical culture, and his work is open to interpretation and critique by Balinese audiences and by Balinese musicians who frequent the United States.

If anything, I think [*Aneh Tapi Nyata*] was far more controversial on this side than over there. The [American Gamelan] Sekar Jaya audience is from the old, hard-core world music school, concerned about “authenticity,” and, as such, those people either didn’t have much use for it or were mildly offended. ... At the “Musik Kontemporer” concert [in Bali], where the audience was mostly young Denpasar hipsters, they went nuts, because they thought it was really “out”. ... As far as intelligent criticism, several of my old teachers said sincere, complimentary things, the nicest of which came from Wayan Sinti, who said “I got an idea from your piece.”³²

³¹ Ziporyn, personal communication (1997).

³² Ziporyn, personal communication (1995).

At the outset, I proposed that a musical representation arose from a confluence of signifiers which the listener recognized as referring to a common musical Other. The dialogic process through which music means implies that such a representation does not depend on the veracity, accuracy or authenticity of those signifiers, but merely that they be perceived as signifiers of the Other. A representation may arise as much from misperception as perception, misunderstanding as understanding. Furthermore a representation of what I have called a musical category, whether it is identified by genre, style, culture, country, ethnicity, generation, or any of countless other possible characteristics, begs the question of its relationship to its constituents, that is, the individuals who make music meaningful within those categories. No individual may completely embody what we or anyone else identify as a broader musical category, for no individual shares all the knowledge of a group, and *only* that group. No individual is constrained against crossing, reconceptualizing or redefining the boundaries of musical categories. Certainly the three composers here are not adequately positioned merely within 'Euro-American music' or 'Euro-American contemporary concert music'. And the inevitable hybridity of the act of composition with which I began this paper implies no artist is unequivocally positionable within any larger musical category.

For there can hardly be such a thing as an essential inside that can be homogenously represented by all insiders; an authentic insider in there, an absolute reality out here, or an incorrupted representative who cannot be questioned by another incorrupted representative. ...

When the magic of essences ceases to impress and intimidate, there no longer is a position of authority from which one can definitely judge the verisimilitude value of the representation.³³

This deconstruction of the subject/object paradigm gives way to an ongoing interplay and reformation of subjectivities in which musical discourse in general and this paper in particular play a part. The purpose of my analyses has not been to evaluate these three compelling and beautiful compositions for the quality of their representations or to position them on a would-be scale of hybridity, but to investigate the ways in which music becomes meaningful in cross-cultural contexts and the ways in which these pieces engage with the formalism and politics of analysis, representation and hybridity. I have not sought to uncover these potential paths of meaning in service of a political policing of art, nor would I proclaim the need for revisions based on political considerations. I instead suggest that analyses such as these can contribute to composers and musical participants alike an awareness of the potentialities of musical meaningfulness which come to bear on the creation and experience of music.

Closing

Although formalist analysis can suggest finality or rationality in structuring the fixed notes on the page, no formal scheme of analysis nor ideological position on musical aesthetics can confine its meanings or potential to mean. The act of analysis must therefore become both an engagement with and a contribution to the ongoing unfoldings of musical meaning and experience. The

³³ Trinh, *When the Moon Waxes Red*, (1991: 75).

three pieces discussed in this paper, being the result of intentional cross-cultural hybridization, foreground their hybridity by engaging in multiple, divergent ways with musical techniques, contexts and conditions, beyond those in the purview of traditional musical analysis. The case of the hybrid merely foregrounds the fluid, discursive nature of analysis by foregrounding the need to incorporate divergent analytical perspectives from multiple, potentially elusive musical categories.

The hybridity of the works analyzed here invites a hybrid perspective in analysis, and while I have engaged with this at a formalist level, subsequent studies may benefit from analytical perspectives informed by categories beyond that of formalist analysis, such as those grounded in reception studies in the multiple musical traditions being hybridized, or by examining the pieces in light of aesthetic or symbolic criteria associated with those traditions.

The hybrid space offers a realm in which new musics and new meanings can be created, but the space is not free from the politics of representation nor from the potential creation of new borders and new localities. The localities upon which hybrid spaces draw are fluid, made and remade by negotiations of discourse and ideology. The composers here exist within these fluid constructs, and simultaneously seek to move between them in the creation of hybrid genres. As such, positioning them, their work, or the features of their work is to assign an identity that is a product of the analytical moment; it is neither objective nor fixed. I argue that political considerations are a necessary component of any musical analysis which acknowledges the dialogic unfolding meaningfulness of music and musical discourse, necessary in theorizing music as a producer and mediator of culture. Furthermore, the cross-cultural hybrid foregrounds this necessity by raising questions of multiple, culturally located interpretations, questions of representation, appropriation, and authority. The exploration of

cross-cultural hybridity has become an important part of the ongoing Euro-American concert music tradition, it has the potential to revitalize old musical categories and to create new ones, and it provides a standpoint from which to reconsider the perspectives, boundaries and goals of musical analysis.

Bibliography

Texts

Coombe, Rosemary J. "The Properties of Culture and the Possession of Identity: Postcolonial Struggle and the Legal Imagination." In *Borrowed Power: Essays on Cultural Appropriation*, edited by Bruce Ziff and Pratima V. Rao, 74-96. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997.

Herbert, Patricia and Anthony Milner, eds. *South-East Asia Languages and Literatures: A Select Guide*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989.

hooks, bell. *Yearning: race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston: South End Press, 1990.

McCurdy, Charles. "East Meets West in Chamber Music." *Chamber Music Magazine* 1988, 21-23, 40-42.

Miller, Terry E., and Sam-Ang Sam. "The Classical Musics of Cambodia and Thailand: A Study of Distinctions." *Ethnomusicology* 39, no. 2 (1995): 229-243.

Myers-Moro, Pamela. *Thai Music and Musicians in Contemporary Bangkok*. Berkeley: Centers for South and Southeast Asia Studies, University of California at Berkeley, 1993.

Ramstedt, Martin. "Indonesian Cultural Policy in Relation to the Development of Balinese Performing Arts." In *Balinese Music in Context: a sixty-fifth birthday tribute to Hans Oesch*, edited by Danker Schaareman, 59-84. Winterthur/Schweiz: Amadeus, 1992.

Taylor, Timothy D. "When We Think About Music and Politics: The Case of Kevin Volans." *Perspectives of New Music* 33, no. 2 (1995): 504-536.

Tenzer, Michael. *Balinese Music*. Berkeley: Periplus, 1991.

- Trinh T. Minh-ha. *When the Moon Waxes Red: Representation, Gender and Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Tsang, David. "Ung, Chinary." In *Contemporary Composers*, edited by Brian Morton and Pamela Collins, 935–936. Chicago: St. James Press, 1992.
- Ung, Chinary. Personal communication, August 16, 1996.
- Ziff, Bruce and Pratima V. Rao, eds. *Borrowed Power: Essays on Cultural Appropriation*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997.
- Ziporyn, Evan. Personal communication, November 12, 1997.
- Ziporyn, Evan. Personal communication, November 22, 1995.
- Ziporyn, Evan. "One Man's Traffic Noise: A Case Study in Cross-Cultural Collaboration." n.p., n.d.
- Ziporyn, Evan. "Who Listens if You Care." *New Observations*, no. 86 (1991): 25-28.

Scores

- Tenzer, Michael. *Banyuari*: unpublished score, 1992.
- Ung, Chinary. *Spiral*. New York: C. F. Peters, 1989.
- Ziporyn, Evan. *Aneh Tapi Nyata: Airplane Ears Music*, 1992.

Recordings

- Fong Naam. *Ancient-Contemporary Music from Thailand*. cp1995. Celestial Harmonies 14098-2. Two compact discs. Performers: Fong Naam. Liner notes by Bruce Gaston.
- Songs Before Dawn: Gandrung Banyuwangi*. cp1991. Smithsonian/Folkways CD SF 40055. One compact disc. Liner notes by Philip Yampolsky.
- Tenzer, Michael. *Banyuari*, in *American Works for Balinese Gamelan*. cp1993. New World Records 80430-2. One compact disc. Performers: Gamelan Sekar Jaya. Liner notes by Marc Perlman

Ung, Chinary. *Spiral*, in *Aequalis*. cp1991. New World Records, 80412-2. One compact disc. Performers: Aequalis.

Ziporyn, Evan. *Aneh Tapi Nyata*, in *American Works for Balinese Gamelan*. cp1993. New World Records 80430-2. One compact disc. Performers: Gamelan Sekar Jaya. Liner notes by Marc Perlman.

Figure 1. Selected parts of the first section of *Bapang Sisir*, for Balinese Gamelan.

Figure 2. Excerpt of *Praram Doen Dong*, for Thai piiphaat ensemble, showing alignments of idiomatic heterophony.

Figure 3. Two modes of Balinese music.

Figure 4. Thai modal system in 7-tone equal temperament.

Figure 5. *Spiral*, mm. 1:2:6–7 showing alignments of idiomatic heterophony.

Figure 6. *Spiral*, mm. 2:1:4–2:1:6 showing vertical alignments, and spiraling relationship between piano and vibraphone.

Figure 7. *Spiral*, mm. 6:2:1–3 showing heterophonic alignment of dissimilar parts.

Figure 8. Passages from the three levels of *Khaek Boratet Thao*, showing the structure of the thao form.

Figure 9. *Spiral*, m. 5:3:2, mm. 5:3:3–6:1:1, and mm. 6:1:4–6:2:2 aligned to show common melodic structure.

Figure 10 *Spiral*, mm. 13:2:2–13:3:3, showing modal modulation and heterophonic alignments, and the theme of the closing section.

Figure 11. Themes of the first section of *Spiral*.

Figure 12. Themes of the second section of *Spiral*.

Figure 13. Binary rhythmic structure of Balinese gamelan.

Figure 14. Examples of kotekan, showing rhythmic end-orientation.

Figure 15. *Kebyar Ding*, opening, showing gangsa and calung parts.

Figure 16. Standard doublings of gamelan, the chord “byong” played by reong, and the opening chord of *Banyuari*.

Figure 17. *Banyuari*, p. 25, showing three-note homophony and non-binary meter.

Figure 18. *Banyuari*, p. 7, selected parts, showing disjunct melodic style.

Figure 18. *Banyuari*, pp. 38–39, selected parts, showing 5-tuple kotekan and metric modulation.

Figure 20. *Banyuari*, p. 9, selected parts showing irregular rhythmic structure and polyphony (in the latter half).

Figure 21. *Banyuari*, chart of korvai rhythmic composition.

Figure 22. *Aneh Tapi Nyata*, mm. 61–63, kotekan-style hocketing.

Figure 23. *Aneh Tapi Nyata*, m. 145, showing pelog mode created by selecting notes from pelog of reong and slendro of gender.

Figure 24. *Aneh Tapi Nyata*, mm. 121-123, selected parts playing orchestrated kotekan.