

# Problems of the Panerusan

Mantle Hood

During the past few years I have had the privilege of participating in a number of congresses, conferences and symposia—sometimes related directly, sometimes quite indirectly to the field of Ethnomusicology. For the record, I would like to state that the conferees assembled here represent, in my opinion, one of the most distinctive conclaves of active participants in the field of Ethnomusicology in my experience. I believe that I speak for all of us when I say that the common affliction of most congresses is a great quantity of short papers, little or no time for discussion, a heterogeneous assemblage of subjects loosely grouped under a broad title with little meaning and many, many fragmentary, hurried and highly frustrating short conversations with colleagues seen once or twice a year under similar frantic circumstances. I think that I speak for all of us, again, when I say that this conference, sponsored by the Center for Asian Arts here at the University of Washington, by the manner in which it has been designed and by the nature of its selectivity holds the promise of panacea for those of us who have been suffering from an acute case of “conferitis.”

The declared focus on field problems seems to me to be the vital concern of all of us present. By way of introduction to my problem in working with the *Panerusan*, I would like to call attention to the ambivalent nature of our discipline as it affects field methods. The primary disciplines, musicology and anthropology, considered for a moment without relation to ethnomusicology, would seem to have little in common from the standpoint of

field work. I am now speaking, of course, of the musicology of European art traditions.

In 1954, Manfred Bukofzer made this statement:

Only relatively few scholars have seen the need so far for entering the difficult and seemingly remote field of anthropological musicology, although the Second World War and recent political events have suddenly brought into focus its immense practical importance.

Then he went on to say:

Non-western music presents a number of difficult problems, differing radically from those normally encountered in musicology. The basic musical concepts in oriental music have almost nothing in common with those of the West, and as a result, Westerners cannot directly understand the music of the East and vice versa.

The anthropological branch of musicology is attempting to collect the various musics of the world and derive from them new concepts for proper evaluation. Comparison of the western and non-western concepts will ultimately give musicology a truly worldwide perspective—a perspective which is the goal of our study.

And I am continuing this statement:

We are as yet very far from this ideal. The gathering of non-western music has only just begun, and we have as yet but a sampling of the musics of the world. They can be

recorded properly only by means of phonograph, recording tape, and sound film because they cannot be written down in our limited notation. The situation is aggravated by the paradoxical fact that the phonograph and radio are destroying the native musical cultures at a pace more rapid than the same means can record it.

We still have to learn the important lesson that the nature of the non-western music calls for specific research methods of its own. Due allowance must be made for the difference between western and non-western types of music. A thematic analysis appropriate



for Beethoven quartets is not even valid for the music of *Okeghem*, let alone for a comparative analysis of primitive melodies. It would be simple indeed to show that a Scottish folk song and a Chinese melody make use of the same scale, if not even the same melodic contour, but as we know, this would be an irrelevant observation based on our notation. The real differences can be heard only in actual performance. It is not the abstract scale that is essential in this case, but the tone, color, and style of performance—precisely those features which resist notation. It is one of the most urgent tasks of the study of non-western music to develop a method that permits clear reference to and comparison of the various forms of tone, color, attack, performance, and the like. So long as we lack the elementary tools we cannot hope to cope with the larger problems that a more profound study of non-western music is continually unfolding before us.

For those of us who have had a primary training in musicology and who have gone on to the study of music outside the rather limited sphere of the European art traditions, Bukofzer's admonition is hardly new. Coming from one of the most prominent musicologists identified with European art traditions, however, it is a forceful pronouncement of the fact that the ethnomusicologist must find his own way. I need not cite the innumerable instances in which scholars involved in the study of non-western music have given evidence that they are unaware or insufficiently aware of Bukofzer's pronouncement. In short, I am saying that during the discussions in the next three days, those conferees who have had their training in musicology have the opportunity and, I must add, the responsibility of critical and constructive analysis of the various field and by implication, laboratory methods which will be discussed.

I also wish to suggest as strongly as possible that, just as the field of musicology traditionally applied to European art music is grossly inadequate in its methods for the field of ethnomusicology, so the methods of anthropology ought to be examined in the course of this conference by those of us with a primary training in this field quite as critically. Representatives of both of these disciplines as applied to ethnomusicology are indebted to some extent to the field of linguistics. I think it is significant, however, that none of us is prepared to apply linguistic methodology in a one-to-one ratio. In other words, the materials of our study, not the

theories of derived disciplines, must determine appropriate methods of research. If from force of habit I begin to sound like a schoolteacher, consider it, with my apology, as an invitation for others to do likewise in the course of the discussions.

-----

My problems with the *Panerusan* began one frosty morning in 1954 in Holland when Jaap Kunst handed me a 21-page manuscript just received from the Conservatory of Gamelan Studies at Solo in central Java. I did not realize at the time that this slim packet was to become the start of a research project which would eventually involve almost two years of field work in Java, hundreds of hours of transcription and analysis, the Western Data Processing Center and Brain Research Institute of UCLA, a team of graduate research assistants, IBM programmers and, in all probability, a number of other implications which lie ahead in the next few years.

To the best of my knowledge, this 21-page manuscript was the first attempt by the Javanese themselves to render some kind of orchestral score. Although a single manuscript, and especially an initial attempt at reproducing the sounds of the gamelan orchestra, might hold more historical than musical significance, I was fascinated by this first visual representation of the so-called *Panerusan*. The concept of the *Panerusan* is closely although not exclusively related to group improvisation. Those of us who have some familiarity with the jazz idiom, I think, are reasonably familiar with the manner in which a single man, backed by a group of musicians, improvises. But when we consider that 60% of the forty or more musicians in a large gamelan orchestra are coordinating in a kind of group improvisation, we meet a more complicated problem—one I find rather fascinating.

By our standards this orchestral score was incomplete. For example, there was no part of the *chelempung*, a zither plucked with the thumb nails; or the *suling*, end-blown flute; or the *gender panerusan*, the smallest of the family of instruments with thin bronze keys resonated by bamboo. The whole *bonang* family was missing (sets of bronze kettles played by two wooden beaters). The score did,

however, contain parts of the female soloists, a male chorus, the *gender barung* (a large gender), the *rebab* (a kind of bowed lute), the *gambang* (or xylophone), the principal melody played by the *saron* family (think bronze slabs over a trough resonator), and the *gender panembung*, the biggest of the *gender* family. Also included were the structural divisions sounded by various size gongs, the principal drum strokes and the text of the song. I was surprised to find that the part for the two-stringed bowed lute, the *rebab*, was quite detailed, indicating not only pitches to be played but bowing and fingering.

Aware by now of the principal features of modal practice, I decided to do a thorough stylistic analysis of this one piece, guided by the requirements of mode and also by a rhythmical principle fundamental to Javanese *gamelan*. In the course of the limited practical studies in performance, which had been available to me in the Royal Tropical Institute at Amsterdam, I had learned that the Javanese have a different way of counting. I was told that one should not think: 1-2-3-4, 1-2-3-4, but 1-2-3-4, 1-2-3-4. Now intellectually this would seem to present a debatable point. After all, it might be argued, it's only a matter of visual representation, and what does it matter if you call an implied strong beat "1" or "4"? However, in learning to play 4, 8, 16, or 32 notes of one of the *panerusan* parts—the improvising parts—for every single note of the main melody, it becomes apparent that the phrases are designed to lead toward a melodic emphasis on the beat 4 or multiples thereof, rather than to begin with an emphasis on beat 1. Perhaps it should be pointed out that the Javanese do not play an accent, as such, on all fourth beats any more than the western musician emphasizes beat 1 of every measure. It is probably more accurate to say that, like his western counterpart, the Javanese performing musician *feels* an implied emphasis on these beats.

Taking this rhythmic practice as a clue to a kind of working hypothesis, I surmised that beats 2 and 4 might have more rhythmic, melodic, modal, and structural importance than beats 1 and 3, and, further, that beat 4 probably had more importance

than beat 2. This was purely speculative in the beginning.

The hypothesis was tested at various levels of rhythmic activity. This particular orchestral piece (or *gending*) being studied has the title "*Pangkur*." *Pangkur* is a poetic form. It is one of the best known traditional pieces among *gamelan* in Java, and I know commercial recordings, made during the 1930's, in which this piece has been performed in five and six possible modes of two tuning systems, *slendro* and *pelog*. The longest melodic phrase of this form—the *ladrang* form—is terminated by a stroke on the big gong. This *gongan*, or longest phrase, is in turn subdivided by four strokes on the *kenong*, a kind of horizontal gong.

I began, therefore, with the assumption that every second and fourth stroke on the *kenong* had more importance than the first and third strokes. The fourth beat of the *kenong* coincides with the stroke of the big gong, thereby gaining actual stress by its terminal position and by reinforcement of the large gong. The relative importance of the second stroke of the *kenong* had to be revealed in relation to other contributing gongs used in what we call "colotomic" structure.

After a good many weeks of intensive work, I could state with certainty that this particular piece supported my working hypothesis that beats two and four of the *kenong* structure indeed have a structural, modal, melodic, and rhythmic importance.

The results of this study were read as a paper for the Southern California chapter of AMS in 1954. Jaap Kunst read the paper a few months later. He was very excited about it and wanted to have the Royal Tropical Institute publish it, but I suggested that a study based on only one piece was too tentative to put in print. Subsequently I devised a long-range research project, based on this 21-page manuscript, which took me to Java. How did the *Panerusan* operate? How did the elaborating instruments improvise as a group?

In Java, the first task was to get an understanding of the *Panerusan* instruments through a study of actual performance. I had some knowledge of performance practice before going to Java, but the most difficult instruments of the *gamelan* were still strange to me. The leader's

instrument is the two-stringed bowed lute, the *rebab*. The next in difficulty is the *gender-barung*. So I began lessons on these two instruments immediately as well as vocal practice in the royal court at Jogjakarta and, within a short time, the various drums.

The problems I encountered in learning these instruments would take more than the remaining ten minutes to discuss, but I might give a few of the highlights which seem to me rather important points that might have application in the study of other cultures. I found that as a western-trained musician, my inclination was to resist the methods of imitation used by the teacher of the *rebab* or the *gender* and instead, in the course of a lesson, I would jot down in cipher notation all that he played (they use a number of notation in recent times). This, it seemed to me, was the only way I could remember what was being taught. So I followed this mode of learning for the first few months. There were some problems involved, especially with the bowed lute, the *rebab*, because I had never played a stringed instrument before. Later I discovered this lack was probably an advantage, although I wasn't aware of it at the time, because the *rebab* has no fingerboard, has a very high bridge and a loose-haired bow; so there were a lot of strange techniques to acquire all at once. But there were other challenges in studying the *rebab*. I remember the first piece I was given: "*Ladrang Wiluchung*." The title means "good health"—a sort of blessing for the study lying ahead. (A similar tradition is characteristic of beginning *koto* pieces, I believe.) This seemed to be the principle *raison-d'être* behind starting with this particular piece, because it's one of the most difficult in the repertoire.

The teacher, in the course of my attempts to imitate what he was playing, constantly corrected my intonation on pitch two. He kept indicating I was playing it too high. Well, we all have our strong points of confidence, and if there was one thing I was confident of, it was my ability to hear Javanese *slendro* or *pelog* tunings. So, puzzled, I would try every time I came to pitch two to play flatter than I thought it ought to be, and a few times it worked. Then suddenly he'd say, "oh no, that's too flat!" Well, this went to apace and it took

me about a month to learn that in this particular piece "*Ladrang Wiluchung*," all pitch two's in the first *gongan* are played *seluring*, which means "lowered," except one, which is played *plung*, "in tune." It did not occur to the teacher to impart this information verbally, I had to discover it by trial and error.

I met the same kind of experience in learning to handle the loose-haired bow. After learning, again by observation and a lot of trial and error, I could intellectualize the requirements of proper bow techniques for our western students back in the States, imparting in two or three lessons what had taken me several months to discover by imitation and rote learning.

Quite by accident, I had another important bit of education in the learning process. It occurred on the *gender*, a two-handed instrument played with round beaters on bronze keys. The technique is rather difficult because, after you have struck a bronze key and go to the next one, you must damp the one you've just left with the same hand which has done the striking, or else the sounds run together. I had been following the same method of jotting down in cipher notation the piece being taught by imitation.

One day at the Conservatory, my *gender* teacher had just finished a two-hour lesson in which I had been learning what is called the *patetan*—a kind of modal prelude, fairly short. In an attempt to help me, he had finally written out the piece on the blackboard in cipher notation, and I had learned to play it. This was in free rhythm, which can only be learned by imitation. After two hours I had mastered this little *patetan* and, content with the day's work, was about to leave when another musician stopped to listen to my last run-through. When I had finished, he sat down opposite the instrument and said, "Would you like to learn another version of the *patetan* for this particular mode?" I was tired, but out of politeness said, "Oh I would of course, indeed!" "Good! I'll teach you," said he, so facing me from the other side of the instrument and with his fingers playing the part upside down and backwards to him, he began to teach me by rote. Well, again I couldn't very well say, "I'm sorry but I want to put all this in cipher notation," so

prompted by fatigue and lack of resistance I began to follow him. I learned a much longer *patetan* and a much more difficult one in about a half an hour by this method. So I began more and more to accept the Javanese mode of teacher. Later when I got home, I would write down what I had learned from memory. I had finally realized that a purely western approach interfered with Javanese teaching methods and actually slowed down the learning process.

Well, these are a few of the practical problems involved. I'd like to mention very briefly why it seemed to me that this was an important study, and why I continue to think so. There are some indications that the art of *gamelan* may have reached its zenith around the 18<sup>th</sup> century, perhaps extending into the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is possible that it has been in some state of decline since then. But a major weakening occurred during World War II and the aftermath of the revolutionary period in Indonesia when the oral tradition broke down. Today in Java there is a generation of professional musicians who are very good, who learned by imitation and by rote over a period of years, and fortunately are still practicing in the best style. But then there are younger people who want very much to become experts at *gamelan*, who now, under an enlightened democracy, are spending most of their time in grammar school and in high school. Some go on to the university. They no longer have the time to sit and to absorb by imitation and rote learning. There are three different conservatories of *gamelan* study, including dance, the puppet theatre, literature etc.

The problem is this: the fine professional musician has no conscious knowledge of basic principles underlying his art; he is not able to verbalize the very complicated and, in my judgment, musically sound theories underlying his practice. The teachers at conservatory Krawitan complained of a typical problem. A student on *gendér* was able to learn two or three written versions or "improvisations" for a piece, but he could not improvise a fourth because the teacher could not impart the fundamental principles, which support improvisation.

So it seemed to me that a study of group improvisation was critical. In Jogjakarta I decided

the best approach was to go to the head of the radio station *gamelan* and the *gamelan* in the palace of the Paku Alam, and ask him to select six pieces in each of the six modes of *slendro* and *pelog* which he considered representative of various forms. He spent some time and thought on this matter and selected thirty-six traditional orchestral pieces.

Then I began a series of special recordings with professional musicians in central Java. In most instances the main melody is played by the *gender panembung* along with the improvising instrument. Transcriptions and analyses of all the pieces played by all the *Panerusan* instruments—those for which we did not already have a knowledge of theory—should yield a reliable reconstruction or composite of the techniques of improvisation. We have nearly succeeded; I think we have enough material to manage a reliable description of this tradition of improvisation. We have transcribed all of the *gender barung* parts and manually I have selected one of those thirty-six pieces for *gender* and have made an analytical and comparative study of three different professional musicians improvising on the same piece. This was presented in a paper in Canada last year. It was a rich yield. Quite a few of the results I had anticipated, but many emerged that I hadn't expected.

We are using that study now as a guide. Realizing that we are going to be working with thousands of notes, and remembering the long hours it took me to do one piece manually for one *Panerusan* instrument, I could project about a fifty-year plan, proceeding in that manner. So we went to the Western Data Processing Center at UCLA to see in what way we might become involved with automation.

We have developed a notation system for IBM cards for the keyed instruments; e.g. the *gender*, the *gambang*—those with fixed pitches. In telling the director our total problem we pointed that special challenge in this study of improvisation was the vocal parts. The *rebab*, for example, plays more pitches than those available on the bronze instruments. This flexibility of pitch and microtonal ornaments are of course typical of the vocal parts themselves and the flute parts.

The director suggested a machine used in the study of the brain waves. It produces an amplitude waveform, which is converted into a digital tape sampled a thousand times per second. That's a lot of information! The digital tape can be fed directly into the computer and programmed in the same

way that the IBM cards are. Our hope now is that the fifty-year project might be accomplished in a more reasonable time. We are so convinced that the computer probably won't replace the musicologist, but we do think that it can save him a lot of time.

## Discussion Following Mantle Hood's Paper

Malm: I have two questions. First, was the point intended in playing the three or four excerpts in a row to hear that the improvisation was more of a repeated thing and less of an involved thing? I wasn't quite sure what we were listening for.

Hood: In the short amount of time I was trying to crowd in as much contrast as I could in one short example. The principle difference between the modern and traditional would be in the melodic construction. Improvisation, and this is an important point, so far as I am able to judge, seems to be pretty much a constant but the change in principal melody itself, in some cases a direct violation of some centuries of model practice, makes a tremendous stylistic difference. I hope you could hear something. The vocal style is different. The phrasing is different. They are using in the first infix and again in the second one, strangely enough, although the tempo doesn't justify it, *batangan*, a dance drum. Normally that is used only in tempo three in the classical tradition. So they have gone into all kinds of experimentation in orchestration and especially in three female soloists singing at the same time. Occasionally that is done in the old tradition but here they make a kind of jolly chorus out of it.

Malm: But the individual Panerusan is still using the same, basic...

Hood: He is using the same idiom but the main difference, which reflects in his idiom, is the fact that the model concept has tended to disintegrate and it does change the style as a result.

Malm: One more question in a little more general sense. You mentioned the Conservatory method, in which they are now using notation, and one can teach one piece, then another piece, then there is improvising where they draw a blank. In the rote system if you caught one piece and then another piece and then sat down to improvise, would you draw a blank?

Hood: Absolutely. The difference is their educational pattern. One couldn't enter the Conservatory until he had had training in primary schools so he would probably enter the Conservatory at the age of fifteen or sixteen I suppose. In the old oral tradition by the time he is sixteen, he's been studying for ten years probably.

Malm: Then the problem is not one of notation but one of point of contact.

Hood: I suspect, and this has been stated before by Kunst and others, that notation in itself will ultimately destroy improvisation as they know it. If principles of improvisation could be given to the student, if they were known consciously by the teacher, I know one could impart information far more readily.

Malm: Is it your goal then in this research to make that innate knowledge articulate so that a person acquainted with the Conservatory system could do it?

Hood: Yes. One hoped-for goal ultimately would be to present the findings of this in the language of the Javanese, not in the musicologist's tongue but in their own tongue.

Malm: Then it is actually not the notation that is the problem but a much larger problem.

Hood: Yes, it's the conscious understanding of underlying principles.

Malm: Would you say that if you are able to articulate these principles, at the age of sixteen with notation, you could conceivably end up improvising as effectively as if you had started as a child, learned by rote and no one ever said anything but innately.

Hood: It would be pretty hard to evaluate. I'm not sure.

Malm: One would have such a hope at least.

Hood: I would hope to come as close to it as possible. At the moment I would say unless there is something like this to fill the lacuna.... I'll tell you what the youngsters were doing when I was in Java. The one who has been at UCLA for five years, he simply learned a little fixed pattern that would go with every tone. Of course this will ruin anything called an art in nothing flat and of course when you record the professional musicians improvising they will go along repeating *gongan*, one after another. It's fascinating to watch the way in which they are able to bring very subtle variation in what they are doing and in this one piece I did a comparative analysis on, you find that there is no single repetition that is at all the same by a man who knows improvisation.

Malm: So given the spirit of the times and the inevitability of certain education systems, simply the idea of making articulate the ideas which you say were learned by rote was essential, but I got the impression from your paper that there was a real feeling that notation was going to kill it.

Hood: I think notation is a real threat. None of the musicians perform from written notation. It's almost impossible on the improvising instruments. While one doesn't improvise from notation, there's a big difference between the products of the conservatory and even the amateur musicians outside the conservatory. There is a stiffness about the conservatory, for example.

Malm: There is a question that will come up again and again about the relationship between the time the student has to spend with his guru and with the modern world. It's a real problem and I know one that will come up in our next

paper. I think we have to say that this is the modern world and what compromise can we make and still save the tradition.

Powers: How far advanced now, in the case of the teacher teaching the student to do improvisations and make up a third, how good technically would that student be?

Hood: Very.

Powers: All right, then this seems to me kind of strange. Suppose you were technically able to get around on the instrument with great facility and the teacher teaches you two improvisations and tells you to make up a third. You'd have a bash at it wouldn't you?

Hood: I would, but I'm not Javanese.

Powers: Why won't the Javanese student have a bash at it?

Hood: Well, he might have a bash at it but he does so poorly that I think the guru intimidates him to have a try at it again. I am giving you the opinion of half a dozen teachers in the Conservatory who are wringing their hands over people graduating from the Conservatory, their accomplished students, because they don't know how to improvise. But technically they are very proficient and they are accomplished students. Technically they are proficient but they are unable to improvise principally because the teachers do not know how to impart fundamentals of improvisation. The system, as it has worked for heaven knows how long, is a very patient, trial-and-error process on the part of the student so that he will try on, let's say, the fifth version to improvise and the teacher corrects him and says, "No, this isn't right. Do it this way." The student won't know why but he works it out that way and they proceed and over a number of years that student will make no mistakes in the tradition but he in turn will not be able to tell you why he doesn't make mistakes.

Powers: So it's really a question of attitude. They tend not to think, "Now what did I do and why did I do it that way?"

Hood: That's right. They don't think about it consciously.

Powers: Then it seems to me that the really important thing is not so much to work up a system of some kind which would then be translated into Javanese, but rather to try and teach the students to think. In other words, Westernize them to the extent that they are perceptive on a more conscious level.

Hood: Well, I believe that the best way to lead them to thinking in the sense that you mean, that is to become objective about the practice of art, is this idea of trying to get the gurus familiar with underlying principles which will be a beginning of thinking.

Powers: On the basis of my on experience in India, I would expect that this is going to be socially and culturally an insolvable problem because generally speaking, they don't like to think about it.

Hood: That's right. They're not accustomed to it.

Powers: And when they do, and they teach theory in Indian schools, it's pretty dreadful and completely valueless.

Merriam: You first brought up the parallel between jazz and improvising. It seems to me that the parallel perhaps lies in the fact that jazz began being non-notated, depending on improvising. Now we have moved more and more into notation and now you can go to Berkeley School of Music and learn how to be a jazz man. But we're not losing improvisation.

Hood: I am not suggesting that they will lose the ability to improvise but simply that the young people I saw trying to learn are certainly going to come up with a venal kind of improvisation in comparison with the professional musicians.

Merriam: Then what you are really saying is not that they will lose improvising, but the whole music style.

Hood: I suppose. "Style" is a big word. Let's say I think they'll lose the fine art of improvisation, which they still retain among the older generation of professional musicians.

Merriam: I think you are saying something much broader than what you are actually saying.

McAllester: Mine is just a short question as to whether we can get broader still and say that you are on the threshold of cultural change.

The development of a new musical style may seem venal to someone who is interested in the classical mode. But you may have young musicians learning to improvise at what may, at first, seem like a deplorably simple and unexciting level out of which may grow something altogether new. This, in turn, may develop into something quite exciting as they mature in their particular skill and genius and keep working at it.

Hood: I would expect that and encourage it actually. Please don't misunderstand. I think change is a part of any art and you can go on changing and that's fine. It's simply that there is no composer who is capable, so the Javanese say, of producing pieces in the best of their tradition. When they attempt to, they say it comes out sounding like a patchwork quilt of things that have gone before. Maybe that fifteen to seventeen-year break with the oral tradition has taken from them that immediacy of contact with the art of composition as well as improvisation. I simply think that, to go on in their evolution of development traditionally, they must comprehend in some fashion what their heritage is in order to develop it. Otherwise it does become sort of half-baked. Some of the things they do I think are outlandish, but fun. I sort of enjoy them. They take them in that same spirit, but they would still want to write something beyond this.

Malm: Are you optimistic that, if you can present an articulate theory and you have notation, the tradition can survive?

Hood: I think the tradition will survive in some form. I would like to see it made accessible to them in its best form and let them do with it what they will. I think the hope is not with the old guru, but with the young people like Susilo and some others who are open and resilient, who are trying to learn what objectivity means, and who can comprehend the principles.

Merriam: I don't believe it will work. This will be an imposition from outside. There will be so many other factors that will enter into it that there is no reason at all why your contribution will be accepted.

Hood: If it is taken as an imposition from the outside, then I agree with you. In view of the fact that in the last year of my stay there and ever since, there have been many overt demands for this, I think it would get a pretty good reception.

Merriam: I just have a hunch that once the process is in motion, it will be very difficult to stop it and reverse it.

Hood: I would hope that it might complement what is in motion. I don't think it will reverse it, but might complement it, might improve it. I think if we can have some understanding of it and if those Javanese who are interested want to have some understanding of it, let them do with it what they will, that's all we can do. Any time you study something, I think there is going to be some influence. I say, let's try to help the Javanese understand what they have as a heritage and let them do with it as they see fit.

England: Could I just ask you, Mantle, about this fact that the teacher was not usually able to verbalize.

Hood: They're not consistent.

England: He does these things, and you were talking about the second tones and the first notes too. He would do these things and it would happen that way every time. When is it that he is consciously aware of that principle even though he is not able to verbalize? In other words, there is a "theory" behind it if it happens each time.

Hood: He is well aware of it and, when I called his attention to it, he said, "Oh yes, we played that pitch too slurring." But I said "But you don't here."

England: Then he did not withhold that information from you in order to make you come to your own discovery of it.

Hood: No I don't believe so. I think it's just his method. He played the piece and asked me to imitate it and when I played pitch two too high, and was playing it in tune, he said, "That is too high." That was his criticism and he was right. Of course he didn't say that the style of

the piece demands that you play pitch two slurring. He didn't think of it that way.

England: But there was a conception in his mind that the thing must be that.

Hood: Of course, he knew it. But again, it is a method of how you can get this across. It took me a month to find it out. It would have taken him two minutes to explain it and, if he has a conscious knowledge of it as a student in the Conservatory, he could have explained it in two minutes because it is not an abstract thing to understand. But he himself learned it probably the same way I did: by imitation.

I think if we can have some understanding of it and if those Javanese who are interested want to have some understanding of it, let them do with it what they will, that's all we can do. Anytime you study something, I think there is going to be some influence.

Maceda: Alan said something about this that, if you instruct with this analysis a certain group of students, it would influence the culture. But by the same context I think that, while this specific analysis might influence the culture in a larger context, the influence of studies in linguistics, anthropology, and other realms of science would influence the culture in an indirect way, so how can you prevent a change in the culture in both ways, that is in a smaller way and in a larger way?

Malm: There is no one here I think who feels that we will stop change. The whole point is that change is going to happen and it seems to me that the most important point is that when people change, and they do the changing themselves, they know what they're changing. When things change, we have to know what's changing.

Hood: This is my whole point, I say, let's try to help the Javanese understand what they have as a heritage and let them do with it as they see fit. In one specific illustration, which goes back to the remark David made, they have this very important literature called *Wayang Kulit*, or *Wayang Wong* which is derived from India: the story of the *Mahabharata*, they say, or the *Ramayana*, presented in all-night puppet plays.

Now with this is a large literature of standard repertoire, if you like, but a very large number of classical pieces appropriate to the drama, to various moods, to various characters, and so on. It would be something like taking our literature, let's say of the nineteenth century, and using it as we do in concert hall reference and so on. This is an important part of our cultural life as it is staged in America.

Well, let's suppose that something happened to us by a magic flit gun and all the notation of the nineteenth century disappeared and this continued until the generation of practicing musicians who had memorized it (I wonder how many have memorized it?) had lost it. Then we would have lost a great treasury of music. In the same sense with their *Wayang Purwa*, the all-night accompaniment for these plays, which are going on constantly and are very important to them in every way, I think the identity of the Javanese can be seen in this drama and all of its ramifications. If the younger generation can no longer keep alive this style, they will have lost their Beethovens and their Haydns and their Mozarts. This is one thing. This is a value of the society, recognized by them and they are painfully regretful that they are losing this touch. These come in the nature of requests from principle teachers, from the head musicians of Djogjakarta. They wish they knew what to do about it.

Merriam: It's the older generation...

Hood: And the younger ones too. They feel it keenly. They encourage the new pieces. They think they are fine and slightly wacky. Hence some of the titles, but they really regret that they see this other slipping away from them. They have verbalized about the need.

Powers: They have a sense of historical depth in their own culture.

Hood: Yes, and how they have.

McKinnon: I didn't feel that there has been any reference either directly or by implication in your talk, Mantle, that indicated that the traditions of music simply have if necessarily by force, declined.

Hood: No. Music is rampant in Java.