Towards an Anthropology of Music and Body
(A summary of Part 2; from chapter 2 to 4)

Toyoichi Nozawa

As an anthropologist, I have always been interested in music culture, and that is why I chose Black Pentecostal churches in America as my field. For this reason, when I introduce my study to other anthropologists or scholars, they usually say "so, you're studying about Black gospel music" – I always felt it is not, yet did not have right words to explain better. My interest has moved away from the genres or styles of music since the very first days of my fieldwork. I became more fascinated with the way people "get happy" and start Holy Ghost dance to the music, where preachers' speech "naturally" becomes like a song, subtle interactions among musicians and ministers while congregations "shout" and speak in tongues, how the "inner" feelings come out through the expression of songs or possession trance, and so on.

"Towards an Anthropology of Music and Body" (chapter 2) is a theoretical discussion based on these thoughts. According to the fieldwork at Black Pentecostal churches (or, even in Uganda, where I studied about traditional dance-song-music settings), the very act of "playing music" – such as choir's gospel songs – does not play the most significant role during the worship service. Instead, they want to see when the preacher's sermon, laymen's testimonies and cries, musicians' play, and trance dancing all converge; this is when they are "really having church." Here seems to lay a serious and fundamental contradiction – although the music plays most important role at those moments (at least to my eyes), the abstract "music" played there may not contain its complexity and significance: I am not confident so that we can come to know the secret of their joy after having analyzed the "sound." In other words, we may not be able to discuss about people's encounters, or communication between people and divine as we mainly discuss about music as "genre" or "styles."

I can name at least three problems for this (and those are closely intertwined). Firstly, (ethno)musicologists have not discussed "the body" enough. They talk about bodies that play instruments, yet not "dance" well. Although they say that ethnomusicologists study about "music and dance" of different cultures (Seeger, 1994), there is not much studies done about dances. Secondly, (ethno)musicologists usually study about music as they "presented" – study of "genre" is the typical one. Yet, this becomes only possible only when they are not critical enough on the very modern concept of "music." That is to say that (ethno)musicology may have been failing to criticize the music's modern character. Thirdly, for this reason, the study of music is not spreading so that it covers music and the related social behavior (Keil, 1998: 311n4).

Some ethnomusicologists were certainly aware of those issues, especially those who enquired the "study of performances" (McLeod & Herndon (eds.), 1980; Behague (ed.), 1984; Seeger 2004 [1987]), yet even more radical criticism came from the outside musicologists. One is British cultural theorist, documentary film-maker, and music critic Michael Chanan. In his book, *Musica Practica* (1994), Chanan coins the dichotomy of "music (as the score and musical analysis)" and *musica practica*, by drawing Mikhail Bakhtin's dichotomy of "language system" and "utterance." With this, Chanan successfully describes music practice as bodily action, and writes a history of western classical music as the process of losing it. Another figure was Christopher Small, who was born in New Zealand and became a music educator in Britain. In his book *Musicking* (1998), Small rightly argues that music only comes into reality through performance, which is a part of human beings' bodily communication. According to Small, we, as modernists, think of music as object because all we have is the word "music" to stand for playing instruments, listening, dancing, and so on. By coining a verb "musicking (to music)," Small provides a perspective where we can see music as "acts," where people encounter one another bodily.

There are similar arguments among ethnomusicologists, only that some of them are not reviewed seriously. One is John Blacking – although his "relativist's side" is well acknowledged, we should also pay attention to his "univer-

salist's side" for our purpose. As an universalist, Blacking declares that musical and gestural process during the ritual is not "symbolic" in Geertzian sense (Blacking, 1977: 14-15). In addition, Blackings distinguishes ritualistic behavior and gestures from "presented," "modern dance," and names it "bio-social dance," or more simply "proto-dance" (Blacking, 1976: 10-11). Those process becomes possible through human's nature that enable interaction between humans. In other words, Blacking saw the possibilities to study proto-dance as part of non-verbal communication study.

We can see Blacking's legacy in works of two contemporary (ethno)musicologists, at least. One is Charles Keil's study of "Participatory Discrepancies (PD)" (Keil & Feld, 1994), or "groovology" (Keil, n.d.), and the other is Thomas Turino's study of "Participatory Music" (Turino, 2008). Since the importance of discrepancies in sound has been discussed (Keil, 1995), I would like to call attention to the possibilities where Keil's PD theory can be applied to the non-verbal communication study. According to Keil, music has to have some kind of discrepancies so that it grooves. That is the timing which comes out spontaneously among the bodies that communicates, not the timing following the notes. In this sense, Keil's project to study groove scientifically can be seen as a part of non-verbal communication study. Thomas Turino, who made success in questioning the modern connotation in the concept of "music" by coining the term "participatory music," has made this point even clearer: participatory performance, according to Turino, is "a particular field of activity in which stylized sound and motion are conceptualized most importantly as heightened social interaction" (Turino, 2008: 28).

As we talk of the "musical behavior," we need to consider its relation with "music(s)," too. Brynjulf Stige, a theorist of music therapy who practices "cultural-centered music therapy" (Stige, 2002), suggests a promising theory. He suggests grasping humans' musical activity in three closely related dimension: that is "proto-musicality," "musicking," and "musics," and each is related with individual's phylogeny. Here, "proto-musicality" is human's instinctive ability to interact with humans – this is "musical" because the interaction process includes a lot of rhythm, timing, and differentiation of pitch. "Musicking" stands for the actual process when people communicate or interact in the course of music-making or dancing, and this is of course based on the proto-musicality. "Musics" are culturally accumulated representation based on our ability (proto-musicality) and our daily practice (musicking) – this is what musicologists have been studying. As a cognitive archeologist Steve Mithen have argued (Mithen, 2005), humans' proto-musicality and ability of non-verbal communication is intertwined each other very closely.

By integrate those previous studies above, we will be able to elaborate a program to study the interacting bodies in ritual settings as part of study of music culture. In the short essay, "Recording the Synchronizing Body" (chapter 3), I discuss about the methodology for that. One of the reasons why performing arts have not been studied well enough lays in its difficulties with the description. We do not have the ways to describe the sound, dance, "proto-dance," and so on that happen simultaneously; for this reason, once we have the notation, we are able to talk about the micro interaction between the musicians (eg, Berliner, 1994; Monson, 1996). In this sense, video recording is an indispensable method to record the actual sonic and bodily interaction, or communication. In the next chapter, I use the videotaped ritual behavior as the first hand data for the study, and I analyzed how the participatory musicking is constructed, by looking at each action as a micro interaction.

"Synchronizing the Bodies, Sharing the Emotion: How does the Sound Function in a Participatory Music Practice of Black Pentecostal Churches in America?" (chapter 4) is a case study of our study program. Here, I look at the music and ritualistic behavior of Black Pentecostal Churches closely. I pay special attention on how each individual is encouraged to participate, and how the participatory musicking is constructed. In other words, this is a micro study of "participatory frame" (Turino, 2008: 29).

One of the main topic here is *shouting*, the holy dance that characterize Black Pentecostalism. Shouting is important not only because it symbolizes the cultural connection between African American Christianity and its African roots, or it is the most obvious sign of Holy Spirit (Holy Ghost) which is the core of Pentecostalism (or Charismatic movements). It is important because of the fact that it shows us how powerful the music can be (especially in our "modern" society) so obviously that it stimulates us to rethink our concept of "music" fundamentally - especially its rela-

tionship with body and consciousness - which, I think, is essential for anthropological inquiry on music. Concerning participatory music, shouting is also important because it is an ultimate form of participation; it is a spontaneous act, and no one can force to do this. With those points, I can phrase my question like this: "what can we learn when we place shouting in a context of participatory music?"

The first thing I point out by analyzing Black Pentecostals' musical practice with videotaped record is the uniqueness of musicians' role. Most of the time during the ritual service, they keep playing: not only that they play for the choir singing, but also to segment each scene, and to accompany the sermon and other speech. They work significantly so that the whole ritual service goes "seamlessly."

Musicians play even more important role when shouting occurs. When someone shouts to joy, others surrounding have to be involved to him/her (Nozawa, 2010), and the sound that musicians make is one of the most important type of involvement – that is to say that the interaction where the shouting occurs is one version of what a micro sociologist Erving Goffman called "focused gathering" (Goffman, 1961). Typically, musicians encourage the shouters by playing "shout music," and it can push congregations really shout. Musicians always need to pay attention to the ministers, worship leaders, and congregation to make that type of interaction happen. Since the interactions are not planned, one may want to call the process "improvisational" – as some studies in jazz pointed out, some type of improvisation (especially African Americans') is fundamentally based on the interaction (Berliner 1997, Monson 1996).

The second thing I like to discuss is that the importance of rhythmic sound that leads people to the interaction frame. Among the cases of shouting, rhythm is significant not only because it seems to - and I think it does - accelerate a person into trance, but also because that's the foundation where people come to synchronize their bodies (Reed, 1996). Here, I need to emphasize that rhythm (or the sound) does not work alone - if so, all they need was certain types of rhythm or the songs, and that does not leave room for interaction study in participatory music. Rather, as I mentioned already, we need to pay attention to how the spontaneous involvements of the participants occur, and they come in *synch*. The best example is the musicians' gaze toward the congregations, but there are many more to be studied.

The next thing I would like to explain is that the shouting is an "emotional expression." Many would think of shouting as emotional act: shouters cry and sob; you can also tell it from their facial expression. Yet, by "emotion," I am not suggesting a certain mental state that comes along with "trancing," which is based on the mind/body dualism (cf. Becker, 2004). Conversely, I like to call attention to the scenes such as when congregations cannot help but get involved someone's shouting: the key question is "what kind of mood dose the person's shouting carry to others?" With this, we are beginning to conceive "the emotion" without the implication of mind/body dualism, without thinking about certain "mental state" of a person, by placing shouting in a context of face-to-face interaction.

The fact that shouting cannot occur properly without others' involvement, or the establishment of certain relationship between a shouter and people surrounding her indicate that gesture of shouting represents "the longing to establish the certain type of relationship with others," where people get involved spontaneously. Here, I'd like to think that any gesture that long for others' *spontaneous* response can be called "emotional," or this could be another definition of emotion: my standing point here is in a way phenomenological (cf. Merleau-Ponty 2004[1948]), or perceiver-centered communication theory (cf. Sperber & Wilson 1986). In other words, certain action can be called emotional only when she has someone to respond; otherwise it cannot have any social significance.

Because shouting is highly emotional act, certain types of the sound tells that someone's shouting is emotional, too. From Rodney Needham's classical study (Needham 1967) to the most recent Judith Becker's seminal work (Becker 2004), there has been a hypothesis that the certain types of sound can work on our physical body. I am not against it - but if we are to study music in a cultural context, we need to assume some interface that bridges the gap between individuals and culture. The interface I'm using is a reality of face-to-face interaction.

I like to point out that the certain sound can be emotional means that it works as an extension of someone's gesture. That is to say, the sound can also become as an extension of other's involvement, such as "touching." This assumption is strongly supported by the musicians' efforts: they pay the closest attention to the congregations because

they are to respond to the shouters directly and immediately.

The reason why I use the metaphor "extension of the body/gesture" is to emphasize the sound is so close to the body: the strong rhythm of the shout music embodies physical movement, event to the point where it can be called "iconic." Another reason is to emphasize the fact that the way people interact through music can be so direct and immediate: if you go to a Black Pentecostal worship service, you would feel that you are immersed in the sound that is played in a large volume, sometimes you might even feel that you are directly "touched" by someone, rather than just "hearing" it. I call this "embodied sound" for the same reason.

The last point that I want to make is that how the sound works to the congregations, or why what the sound carries can be so significant to them. That the emotion is embodied in the sound has a significant meaning for the Pentecostal ritual: it helps generate collective act, and they become a unity.

To make this point clear, let me cite Walter Ong's passage from *Orality and Literacy* (1982) where he mentions about auditory perception: he writes, "vision comes to a human being from one direction at a time: to look at a room or a landscape, I must move my eyes around from one part to another. When I hear, however, I gather sound simultaneously from every direction at once: I am at the center of my auditory world, which envelopes me, establishing me at a kind of core of sensation and existence" (Ong, 1982: 71). He also says: unlike written words, "the spoken word forms human beings into close-knit groups. … the audience normally become a unity" (Ong, 1982: 73).

His observation can be proved with the help of communication theory backed up with cognitive science. Game theorist Michael Chwe's idea helps us think about this problem. Chwe answers the question "how do people coordinate their action?" with a single concept, "common knowledge," and explains from how rituals work in pre-modern society, to why some advertisement is successful and how people come to like to participate in political action. For instance, ritual speech contains a lot of repetition, even to the point where we think it's meaningless. But according to Chwe, "when a person hears something repeated, not only does she get the message, she knows [that] it is repeated and hence knows that it is more likely that others have heard it [too]" (Chew, 2003: 8).

The core of his discussion, "forming the common knowledge," or "sharing the meta-message that tells the message is shared," seems significant for the anthropological understanding of the sound, too. For instance, we do perceive the shouter's emotion through vision, but we cannot be sure if everyone else in the room sees it or not when we see it: in other words, common knowledge is not generated. But when the emotion is shared by the sound, one can immediately know that everyone perceive it, and whole the congregation share this knowledge: the sound literally unite the congregation.

Such a case is videotaped – pastor and ministers of one Pentecostal church have "casted out the demon" from a young man. Right after that, the man starts running the aisle, and musicians' shout music follow gradually; right after this, most of all the congregation (about 70 people) started shouting simultaneously. When someone's shouting is conveyed with the sound, people don't just hear his emotion, but they feel the sense that whole congregation share the emotion: at very least, they share the knowledge that everyone perceived it.

I am sure that people all around the world use those natures of the sound, most likely unknowingly; but the Black churches particularly fully exploit it. In their worship service, it is the music and the sound that segments the scene and this is how the congregations share the mood. The musicians unite the congregation this way. Musicians also facilitates the interaction; and through the interaction, people are encouraged to participate. The church musicians' effort is to make those interactions happen. Altogether, the sound here works as connective tissue.

The points I have tried to make can be summed up like below;

1) Taking part involves many elements: even those who surrounding the participants may play integral roles; this is where we can find importance of interaction, and it needs to be studied very closely.

2) For the spontaneous participation, probably the ideal way to take part, "emotion" in phenomenological sense (not a psychological category) is essential, and the sound plays integral role to share it among

the participants.

Probably, the more musicking becomes participatory (and less presentational), the more we can find the rich interaction among those who take part. The study of the interaction can contribute to the study of anthropology of music, or the study of relationship between human being and sound in general, for this reason. I am hoping that those chapters have some implication about participatory music, or human beings and sound in general, too.

References

Becker, Judith. 2004. *Deep Listeners*. Indiana University Press.

Behague, Gerald (ed.). 1984. *Performance Practice*: *Ethnomusicological Perspective*. Greenwood Press.

Berliner, Paul. 1997. *Thinking in Jazz*. University of Chicago Press.

Blacking, John. 1976. "Dance, Conceptual Thought and Production in the Archaeological Record." In G. de G. Sieveking, I.H. Longworth and K.E. Wilson (eds.). *Problems in Economic and Social Archaeology*. pp.1-13. Duckworth.

————. 1977. "Toward An Anthropology of the Body." In J. Blacking (ed.). *The Anthropology of the Body*. pp.1-28. Academic Press.

Chanan, Michael. 1994. *Musica Practica: The Social Practice of Western Music from Gregorian Chant to Postmodernism*, Verso.

Chwe, Michael. 2003. *Rational Ritual: Culture, Coordination, and Common Knowledge*. Princeton University Press.

Clayton, Martin, Rebecca Sager, & Udo Will. 2005. "In Time with the Music: The Concept of Entrainment and its Significance for Ethnomusicology." *Special ESEM-CounterPoint*, Volume 11.

Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Encounters*. Bobbs-Merrill.

Keil, Charles. "The Theory of Participatory Discrepancies: A Progress Report." in *Ethnomusicology*, 39(1).

————. 1998. "Applied Sociomusicology and Performance Studies." in *Ethnomusicology*, 42(2).

————. n.d. "Groovology and the Magic of Other People's Music."

Keil, Charles & Steven Feld. 1994. *Music Grooves: Essays and Dialogues*. University of Chicago Press.

McLeod, Norma & Marcia Herndon (eds.). 1980. *The Ethnography of Musical Performance*, Norwood.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 2004[1948]. *The World of Perception*. Routledge.

Mithen, Steven. 2005. *The Singing Neanderthals: The Origins of Music, Language, Mind, and Body*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Monson, Ingrid. 1996. *Saying Something: Jazz Improvisation and Interaction*. University of Chicago Press.

Needham, Rodney. 1967. Percussion and Transition, *Man(N.S.)* 2(4):606-614.

Nozawa, Toyoichi. 2010. Emergence of Trance Dance through Face-to-Face Interaction, *Bunkajinruigaku*. 75(3): 417-439. (in Japanese)

Ong, Walter. 1988(1982). *Orality and Literacy*. Routledge.

Reed, Edward S. 1996. *Encountering the World: Toward an Ecological Psychology*. Oxford University Press.

Seeger, Anthony. "Music and Dance." in Tim Ingold (ed.). *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture, and Social Life*. Routledge.

————. 2004[1987]. *Why Suyá Sing: A Musical Anthropology of an Amazonian People*, University of Illinois Press.

Small, Christopher. 1998. *Musicking: the Meaning of Performing and Listening*. Wesleyan University Press.

Sperber, Dan & Deirdre Wilson, 1986. *Relevance*: *Communication and Cognition*. Harvard University Press.

Stige, Brynjulf. 2002. *Culture-Centered Music Therapy*. Bercelona Publishers.

Turino, Thomas. 2008. *Music as Social Life*. University of Chicago Press.