HOLISTIC PERSPECTIVES: A REPORT ON SCORING BEYOND EUROLOGICAL TRADITIONS

Terri Hron

TENOR Network, matralab, Concordia University
Independent researcher
Montreal, QC
terrihron@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In 2021, the TENOR Network supported a consultation with artists to investigate scoring practice beyond Eurological traditions towards a publication of edited interviews. This paper presents results from the initial round of interviews with a report on the emergent connections that brought out a relational ontology and a holistic perspective of scores. Starting with a critique of the composer-centered work concept, the author presents how consulted artists reflect on roles implied by scores, temporal considerations and definitions of scoring technology, and how these can be expanded with a holistic perspective. Orality, ancestral knowledge, witnessing practice and collective creativity are recurrent themes. The last section offers a number of ways to consider scores that might open the TENOR community to practitioners outside its current purview. Interviewed artists are quoted at length in anticipation of the publication of edited interviews.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper offers a status report on a consultation project on scoring sound practice beyond Eurological practice funded by the TENOR Network at matralab. Within the scope of this project, I interviewed and consulted with 18 artists; my initial aim was to expand the TENOR community beyond its current cultural and geographical focus on Western European art traditions. During this ongoing project, through the discussions and further reading, I have started developing new definitions and boundaries around the notion of score that come together under a holistic approach. As these interviews are as yet unpublished, I often quote the respondents at length here to give their voices space to resonate.

2. CONTEXT & BIAS

2.1 The TENOR Network consultation project

My relationship to the TENOR community was, pre-pandemic, as the coordinator of the TENOR Network, and the part of that job that I have taken most to heart is trying to expand that community beyond its heavily Eurocentric

research base. A Survey project was organized by the Network that revealed that a practitioners concerned with TENOR issues outside Western European traditions were not simple to find or connect with, and that a more invested, in-depth approach would be necessary. Meanwhile, my own practice and cultural work outside of TENOR was focusing increasingly on decoloniality, equity, pluralism and access, which similarly required intense investment, time and a critical stance towards existing methodologies and definitions. From the outset, then, I committed to proceeding with the project willing to allow the collapse of my plans and premises rather than seek confirmation, and to reconsider the very basic definition of score and its practice.

2.2 Questioning Eurological bias

In framing my initial research, overviewing the proceedings of TENOR conferences, and drawing up an initial list of respondents, I conceived of the project as an exploration of scoring beyond Eurological traditions, underscoring not only the Eurocentrism of TENOR research, but also the sensibility that Lewis describes [1] in the initial formulation of Eurological music, which answers challenges to the accepted narrative with racialized denial and unacknowledged appropriations. I would argue that there is an inherent Eurological bias in conventional and widespread definitions and examples of scores for creating and organising sonic experience. I consider the regular interchangeability of the term notation with score as underlining the assumption and privileging of written or marked forms of scoring. Furthermore, I see most canonical or historical narratives of the musical work, and by extension especially art music itself, celebrate the increasing expertise, precision, and affordances of writing (and by extension printing and eventually digital mark-making technologies): complexity, repeatability, and fixed ownership/capital. These narratives seem to follow on the tracks of the principles of the industrial revolution, with its divisions of labour and privilege within capitalist, colonial and dominant-culture enterprise. Such principles lead to investment in the standardisation and universalism that deeply affected and shaped the pedagogy, institutions, functions and creative tools of music and continue to do so. Although a worthwhile discussion of the intersections of these and the narratives around scoring are beyond the scope of this paper, they are some of the driving forces behind this research project itself, with

a desire to "destabilize cultural hierarchies" and for "cross-cultural contact."[1]

- What happens if we pull at the strings that tie definitions of scores to reading or writing?
- What happens if we consider all the senses in the memory, definition and transmission of sound practices?
- What happens if we ask people positioned outside or troubling Eurological scores--by practice, by choice or by geography--to respond to these ideas?

These questions were the starting point for the Scoring beyond Eurological traditions consulting project.

2.3 Practitioners interviewed

The respondents included: composers whose practice started in the Western classical music tradition (WCMT) and moved into interdisciplinary or cross-cultural work (Sandeep Bhagwati, Linda Bouchard, Giorgio Magnanensi), visual or dance artists working with (sound) scores (Hannah Fischer, Charlotte Hug, Lou Sheppard), Indigenous artists (Suzanne Kite, Dylan Robinson), composers actively working on scoring outside WCMT (Cat Hope, Luke Nickel), artists from non-WCMT traditions (Kohei Nishikawa, BC Manjunath).[2] Some respondents fit into several categories.

Once I had completed a first round of interviews and their transcriptions, I noticed that the emergent cohesive tissue that could bring many of the reflections together was a more holistic notion around scoring on several different levels. What follows are some initial observations with connections to certain respondents—ideally each could be the subject of its own paper or chapter. Ideally, a continuation of the project would include their reaction to these ideas and further clarification of how their practice might enlighten this perspective.

Because most of the categories we use to speak about scores in music, especially in academic or research contexts come from WCMT, I often quote the respondents at length because I did not propose to them neat categories to respond to, and therefore my groupings of their observations are not always very succinct.

3. HOLISTIC ROLES

In many scores, the sonic exchange described assumes certain roles, whose boundaries can be fluid and overlapping, and include initiator(s), creator(s), facilitators(s), participant(s) and witness(es).

3.1 Beyond a composer-centered work-concept

In Eurological music and its scoring practice, however, these assumptions create a specific definition. Lydia Goehr argues that *Werktreue* and the work-concept took firm grip around 1800 and focused almost all creative energy on fixing the roles of the composer as initiator/creator/meaning-maker, with the executant performer preferably participating as an invisible vessel for the composer's intention [2]. The target consumers, a learned audience, as witnesses, consumed the composer's meaning, possibly acquiring prestige by subsidizing the composer's genius through patronage. This increasingly firm division of formerly – and in other cultures often still – more fluid labour roles, alongside the creation of the cultural capital of "art music," coincides with industrialization, imperialism, and universalism.[3] Unsurprisingly, the standardization and normalization of Eurological music's notation developed in parallel. As Jesse Stewart notes, "[i]n general, the field of new music has actively maintained hierarchies of this sort. This is due in large part to the institutional contexts in which new music continues to circulate and be discursively constructed, notably within university music departments, festivals of new music, and concert halls designed for performances of Western classical music and/or chamber music." [4] I would argue that what is true of new music is true of its scoring, and by extension the design of software for that end and the standards by which we evaluate merit.

Many other configurations of roles do exist, however. Oral tradition might replace the composer with legacy and/or tradition, a connection to ancestral knowledge. When I questioned him about how music is transmitted in the different Japanese flute traditions he practices, Kohei Nishikawa kept circling back to the hereditary nature of the music and its unbroken practice. In *Hungry Listening*, respondent Dylan Robinson explains that the transmission of sound or songs themselves might be considered living entities that can only be shared through embodied experience [5]. In such situations, could ceremony be the only appropriate score format? In describing her scores to me, Indigenous artist Suzanne Kite scores highlighted the importance of the participatory witnessing role, with a special focus on Lakota semiotics and ontology: "I'm very much interested in scoring and manipulation and the arrangement of bodies and my body's relationship to the audience.

---

[1] For an in-depth discussion of these issues, see Jesse Stewart's "Intervections" [2]. The arguments and connections he makes around "new music", most clearly illustrated in the vector diagram on p. 324, are valid for scoring and TENOR as well.

[2] In order to find artists from non-WCMT traditions that would be able to speak to me about scores (in English or French), I consulted with a number of (white) musicians with a specialty and knowledge of non-Western traditions, specifically Japanese music. These included Nancy Beckman & Tom Bickley, Ralph Samuelson and Elizabeth Brown, who eventually connected me with Kohei Nishikawa and others who I am yet to interview. I also consulted with Craig Vear, to know to what extent his recent work on Digital Scores takes non-WCMT into account.

[3] "In particular, music's growing reliance upon the score is almost unanimously understood as a major development in the advent of the musical work. In reality, the score is only one part of a much larger story, which must necessarily also include issues such as compositional (or authorial) control, the possibility of repeatability, the notion of permanence, and the emergence of aesthetic autonomy as a core European ideology." [3] I found Steingo's analysis of and expansion upon Lydia Goehr's placement of this shift towards conflating the musical score and the musical work at the beginning of the 19th century particularly useful, including the footnotes that contextualize the relationship between the work and commodity. The fascinating nexus of score, performance and the industrial revolution is a topic beyond our scope here; Goehr provides a starting poing: "[A]s long as the composers provided incomplete or inaccurate scores, the idea of performance extempore could not acquire its distinct opposite, namely, the fully compliant performance of a work. Such a contrast emerged fully around 1800, just at the point when notation became sufficiently well specified to enable a rigid distinction to be drawn between composing through performance and prior to performance." [2]

The most important thing to say about my composition practice is it's very much focused on a circular relationship between my body and potential non-human beings." [6] So while most Eurological scores focus on doing, what might come of considering scores for listening, reacting or witnessing as a creative act? Likewise, perhaps even the binary of oral/notated traditions is anchored in Eurological ontologies or even the prevalance of European languages in writings on music transmission has narrowed our understanding of both scores and roles: "Western research that serves to extract and externalize knowedges in categorical groupings aligns well with the categorical premises of Western languages" [7].[4]

3.2 Annotation and community

A holistic discussion of roles also involves the experiences of performers and researchers. The WCMT, at least since *Werktreue*, concentrates on scores as the composer's domain, with less attention, value and tools created for annotations. When important enough, these are upgraded to "arrangements." In my conversation with Cat Hope, the importance of annotation came up with relation to upcoming versions of the Decibel Score Player, which would add the important annotation functionality, making it a tool not only for composer but also for performer creativity [8]. Likewise, validating work on scores beyond the composer, (critical) editions could work not only to distinguish among manuscripts, but to support the importance of contextual and performative informations for better and broader potential for sonic transmissions: "editorial art [is] just one step in the imagination of a musical score, using the edition not to satisfy the ned of the user but to encourage the user to question, explore and reinterpret. Editing music is an act of creative interpretation as criticism" [9].

To sum up the importance of people and community in the transmission of sonic ideas, I offer two more moments from the consultations that decenter the composer within the creation and discussion of scores. Craig Vear affirms that: "For me, as somebody who came in through theater and the world of performance, having spent 20 years or so doing that, the notion of any discussion of transference of ideas between people that doesn't take those people into consideration, or put that in prime place is just ridiculous" [10]. And weaving in some Indigenous ontology, Suzanne Kite explains: "I just had a really long conversation with Santee [Witt] about this, it is definitely related to Lakota concepts of truth and epistemology where their relationship to data or fact is not remotely similar to Western European ideas of fact. One of the scholars I read on this subject is Jim Cheney, who says that things are true in these communities, if they're responsibly true for the whole community. So you take that concept, and then you get all the way to me trying to make scores, and there's no way I could tell a musician what to do or that the note they played was wrong. I couldn't even begin to have a relationship with notes like that" [6].

4. HOLISTIC TIME

Many scores manipulate and shape sound in time, in the lived experience. Most Eurological scores are to be interpreted sequentially with a maximum of synchronicity. In the WCMT, the technologies of writing and distributing scores, extended by the increasing normalization of printing, allowed for and encouraged increasing polyphony, complexity and repeatability, creating an addiction to specific synchronous sonic moments [11].

4.1 Spontaneous and protracted practices

Other temporal organizations exist, however, where moments might be built or emerge spontaneously or through long-term interaction. A a Canadian artist working in interdisciplinary audio, performance and installation based practice, Lou Sheppard describes this space of devising: "I've been pushing my work more towards trying to figure out how to notate time and space within some system that people can look at and fall into and then having a conversation about what happens within that time and space and that being more what the score is, rather than actually this sound" [12].

In other contexts, music can be created coordinatedly or in quasi unisons using a common language, formulas, site or occasion. Karnatic mridangam player and konnakol virtuoso, BC Manjunath describes learning a common interarts language: "When I went for the first time to play for a dancer in India, I played just as I would for classical music, and they said, 'No no no, it doesn't work like that. You're so used to playing to the vocalist and play along with that.' But here, the main person I had to be watching was the dancer, and not even the dancer, the feet of the dancer. The rest of the body might be doing something else. That's why I would put Bharatanatyam as the highest form of polyrhythm. They're probably the masters of polyrhythm, but they don't know how to explain it… you have to go there, be with them for a long time and then you try to understand, decipher it yourself" [13].

4.2 Avoiding fixed timelines

Unlike such long processes of coming into unison, interdisciplinary artist Charlotte Hug developed a form of scoring that allows for individual flexibility in timing within a group setting of diverse artists and makers: "It's really fantastic to work with InterAction Notation (IAN) in an intercultural context, especially because of the timing. In conduction, you still have a certain kind of timing even if the conductor is listening and very receptive. In an intercontinental, inter-cultural context, the feeling of a timing can be very, very diverse. And I had this experience with a dance company in South Africa, where even each dancer could dance the Son Icon[5] in their own tempo and timing and IAN has this particular, precise quality that the timing is flexible. Each person who has the signal for the next sign has the responsibility for how long the section should be.

---

[4] Kovach's later paraphrasing of R Struthers also underlines that discounting oral scores is unecessarily exclusive: "Given the philosophical basis of a complementary, non-binary thought pattern, it makes sense that narrative encased in the form of oral history would be the natural means to transmit knowledges" [7].

[5] Son Icons are a hybrid score/visual artwork developed by Charlotte Hug in her practice. See https://www.charlottehug.com/en/about-me/son-icons-gallery

The duration that creates had me very much puzzled sometimes: I thought 'Oh, it has to move on,' but then the person just kept going and it was wonderful. So I feel IAN is a real melting point for cultures to understand different timings and also to invent symbols because you might need them" [14]. Indeed, the linearity and often fixed timing that WCMT notation assumes and imposes is one reason why verbal, visual and digital technologies can be so liberating.

4.3 Beyond a single human lifetime

Scores offer relationships beyond human lifetimes. If the category of score were to include oral transmissions beyond individual lifetimes, such scores could carry legacy, tradition, performance practice and the past itself in ways we do not often discuss in TENOR. The notion of *rag* in India or *shōga* in Japan are both systems that connect and develop specific sonic ideas over time and decenter the notion of single authorship. When attempting to correlate score with the various Japanese flute traditions he practices, Kohei Nishikawa said: "I still understand the onomatopoeic phrases [*shōga*] as coming down from a very, very old hereditary system. That is very important, like the score in Western music: a score coming from a composer doesn't change. But my master, perhaps he or she plays differently and they teach me that they are person with their own personality. I can read the 'score' and understand what the composition wants, and still realize my master has their own personality" [15]. Complementing this is Morita Toki's *shōga* research: "the mnemonics become a medium that transmits musical substances. She adds that those who have experienced oral transmission can look at the *shōga* and hear oneself chanting the shōga and thereby reimagine one's own performances" [16].

In Eurological, WCMT practice, contemporary scores often endorse innovation; this novelty obsession leads to scores possibly only meant for the future, created by an avant-garde of "visionaries," to be understood and valued posthumously. Outside this paradigm, there are transmissions of (sonic) ideas that rely on repetition, participation and the embedding of collective description, carried across generations and that survive if they adapt and inspire for each present moment. Dylan Robinson: "We have protocol, which is a guide, that is always still in relation, it's not a guide that says, 'It always needs to be done in this way.' I think this is actually the one of the ways in which protocol is misunderstood through a Western framework: a protocol is understood sometimes as the law or the unchanging method to do something to be in good relations, but we understand protocol as always shifting, as a score with a wide amount of variation, that actually seeks to standardize maybe only a value or a sentence, that only serves as a mnemonic for value, that is expanded quite a bit in relation to the context specificity of what we're doing" [17].

4.4 Forgetting with time

In another different realm, there are (oral) scores that are meant to exist only ephemerally, both in time and memory, again decentering the composer. This is true for the work of Luke Nickel: "In the end, I arrived at using my own voice and recording instructions and poetic concepts, then transmitting that to either a musician or to an ensemble's members separately, who would then communicate it to each other. And those were temporary, only to be listened to once and then they would disappear. The forgetting/memory of the person who listened to it also became its owner. In a weird way, they knew more about it than me because they had listened to it more recently than I had. There was a difference in power, where I suddenly stepped back a bit" [18].

If a holistic conception allows for and seeks out all these different ways of organizing sound in and over time, it should also consider imagining beyond human generations into geological and cosmic temporal relationships in which we also participate. This might bring non-human beings and agents into the score-making potentiality. Further research is ongoing and needed in this area.

5. HOLISTIC TRANSMISSION TECHNOLOGIES

5.1 Notation ≠ Scoring

Now that the agents involved in the transmission of sound ideas can be expanded, perhaps also the definition of the technologies used might be as well. First of all, let us address the interchangeability of the term notation and score in most conversations about Eurological music, and the subsequent privileging of mark-making technologies in the definitions of sound transmission. In my consultation with Craig Vear, he agreed with my discomfort with this lack of holistic vision: "I think there's a real distinction between the score and notation; they are two completely separate things. Notation is a very closed space. It's a very, like you say, privileged vehicle with which to communicate ideas, because it presumes the other person you're communicating ideas to knows the codes. But actually, my notion of the score is just a communications interface, which could be verbal, oral, it could be tactile, it could involve robotics, or motorizing wheelchairs." [9] What follows is that familiarity with the interface of exchange is the key.

5.2 Fluency & Musicianship

Often the word *literacy*, when speaking musically, is used to denote familiarity with conventional WCMT notation, once again assuming reading and writing as the only means. The word *fluency* might offer a broader fit, and move out from (mostly) reading- and writing-based technologies to encompass other senses and ways of knowing.[6] What might fluency aspire to within scoring technologies? Cat Hope connects knowledge of the interface with musicianship, which "has to do with their craft and training… I know that my pieces are made for trained musicians (not necessarily classically trained). People who have a very deep musicianship, whether it be Western or any other kind of musicianship. I really believe in musicianship. That's what interests me, is drawing on musicianship." [19] How might the notion of fluency act as a way to

---

[6] Quote from adrienne maree brown on water.

respect musicianship in communities and bodies of knowledge and encourage deep study? A holistic view of fluency – or rather fluencies – celebrates multiple knowledges and means of transmission, multiple technologies and communities.

5.3 (C)overt interfaces

Widening our understanding of scores as technologies of transmission or the interface for (sonic) ideas does not necessarily mean a more universal perspective. Respecting scores might entail the privacy or primacy of connection within a specific group. Just as with languages, the worldview that generates such scores is not always meant for translation, at least not without initiation. In speaking of what she considers to be a successfully functioning score, Suzanne Kite explains: "when I make things, there really must be layers. One of the layers must be easily interpretable by my community, my family. Obscurity of meaning doesn't happen for them. It happens to everybody else. That's how I know I'm successful in my meaning-making or lack thereof. When I made Listener, there's a text that goes with it, and it was up in a space I was performing in and some family came in. A woman who had forgotten she was my family member came in and she could interpret the entire piece that was up, she knew every reference, she knew what was sacred text for us, she knew what was a dream of mine, she knew references. It was clear as day to her. Then I did this piece in Austria, three or four times: just meaningless. It was horrible. I knew I was good piece, because that's what I want." [6]

Other times, composers fluent in the technologies of dominant culture might use these to bring about sonic events that might subvert the usual directions of those technologies and even work towards healing. This seems to me to be the case in Raven Chacon's (in progress) *Amercian Ledger* series,[7] where elements of Eurological scoring and accounting are used to recount and grieve sonically the forced migrations and violence towards oppressed communities. In this series, the score is to be present in the form of a flag, a billboard, a blanket, a newspaper; this along with the *ledger* in its title creates an uneasy relationship between the score, the accounting and reality, to say the least.

Culture-, place- and kin-specific transmission technologies and interfaces, and their inversion/subversion, do not narrow the possibilities of scoring. On the contrary, refusing the imposition of a dominant convention or language of research might make a broader field of tools emerge.

5.4 Performance Practice

In WCMT, instrument-specific notation – systems of marking legible only to practitioners of one instrument – were all but sidelined until the resurgence of extended techniques and electronic instrument scoring, which have mostly eschewed standardization. In other parts of the world, instrument-specific notation or language is fairly common, and is intricately tied to oral tradition, serving as a mnemonic aid. My conversations with BC Manjunath about *konnakol* and Kohei Nishikawa about various Japanese flute traditions confirmed that these auxiliaries to scores abound. Indeed, even in medieval (and to some extent pre-industrial Europe), it is assumed that what is marked is but one part of the transmission—the instruments themselves and the oral tradition would have been essential interpretive collaborators.[8] Once again, such instrument-specific scores assume that there is no bypassing the performer and their intimate relationship with the interfaces of both the score and their instruments.

5.5 Current and future technologies

To take this further into digital technologies and artificial or non-human intelligences, possibly in augmented or virtual realities, there is an expanse of opportunities to engage not only with other senses but several at once, multiplied by the possibilities of poly-dimensionality, multiple formats, transdisciplinarity and more. In these early years of digital realities, a holistic approach to technologies of scoring can work to disrupt normative, universalist, capitalist and/or colonialist values (and perhaps if we succeed in the virtual/augmented world, we can do so IRL).

6. HOLISTIC SCORES

The holistic perspective that guided this consultation process was tuned towards listening for the emergent properties, qualities and characteristics that are more likely invisible when focussed on individual and/or dominant culture practice. Despite its broad aspiration, however, the choice of consultants is still specific to the positionality and network of a white woman settler musician interviewer, working adjacent to academia, with curiosity but limited knowledge of non-eurological, even non-WCMT traditions. Nevertheless, a holistic perspective is assumed possible even from such a local node, acknowledging that this is but one iteration of something much greater, an invitation.

Similarly, a holistic score is not itself an object or a goal, it may be one iteration from within a perspective of something larger. It may be a conventionally-written eurological score from the sixteenth century performed with an awareness that much about the organization and quality of sound remains orally transmitted. It may be the sense for what does or does not fit melodically within the pitch and ornament combinations of a certain *rag* or *shōga*. It may be the ceremonial and spiritual context or protocol within which a sound or song can exist. Any score or organization of sound or music to share can be understood holistically, and therefore I offer no other working definition for a holistic score. There are, however, many useful ways to look at and experience scores that add to a holistic definition.

The consultations revealed understandings of scores that might help broaden perspectives or definitions and include a larger number of practices and practitioners. What follows here is an incomplete list of some configurations or practices of score, which came up: scores as *mnemonic devices*, as *ancestral knowledge*, as *spaces of resonance*, as *interfaces*, as *boundary objects*. This pluralism encourages relationships beyond individual experience and facilitates processes rather than outcomes. This points to a relational ontology when considering the nature or definition of scores, wherein, depending on the relationships between those involved, multiple answers are encouraged and may apply.

6.1 Mnemonic Device

As in the pre-industrial Eurological tradition or in the instrument-specific notations mentioned earlier, scores in many cultures serve as memory aids, simply to help either a single practitioner or a lineage recall knowledge that was communicated orally. Orality, therefore, is a fundamental component in this type of transmission, repeatedly underlined by consultants Kohei Nishikawa, Nancy Beckman, Elizabeth Brown & Ralph Samuelson (Japanese music), and BC Manjunath (Karnatic music), who all describe mark-making systems as essentially auxiliaries to teaching within a guru or master system. One might argue that the score itself is a combination of both these rudimentary markings and the explication of a practitioner with acquired knowledge. Luke Nickel offers a different approach to the notion of scores as imperfect and fallible mnemonic devices as his practice often relies solely on the incomplete memory of collaborators [17]. Both he and Cat Hope point to Eliane Radigue's oral transmissions which rely on the retention of the performer and their own mnemonic devices in the score of the work. It also implies a nascent performance practice for those works, knowledge held and carried by the performers to be hopfully transmitted orally onwards.

What might happen if we experiment with scores as mnemonic devices rather than considering that somewhat antiquated? This question came up in the conversation with BC Manjunath, when he marvelled how recording and social media technologies are affecting the speed and dissemination of formerly individual oral transmissions, with all the benefits and risks that entails [13]. *Konnakol* in general – and BC Manjunath's YouTube feed in particular[9] – has seen a mushrooming of practitioners since its availability online, so much so that since the pandemic, a new *konnakol* competition has been established.

On the other end of the speed spectrum from digital connectivity is Kundera's argument for the place of memory in a too-frenetic world: "there is a secret bond between slowness and memory, between speed and forgetting… The degree of slowness is directly proportional to the intensity of memory; the degree of speed is directly proportional to the intensity of forgetting" [21]. Perhaps the slowness of scores written in memory and the use and

interpretation of memory devices is an asset to investigate as well.

6.2 Ancestral Knowledge

More time-defying qualities come up when considering trans-generational knowledge-holding and transmission practice. While innovation and individuality is often a focus in scoring research, with an arrow of development pointing forwards, ancestral – and what Kohei Nishikawa describes as hereditary – knowledge seems rather to spiral and orbit around communities. Once again related to orality and transmission beyond the fixity of a medium, ancestral knowledge is therefore quite challenging for colonial or authorially-minded score and research understanding. Likely the strongest conclusion and/or suggestion that emerged from these interviews, is that the concept of scores would benefit from expanding to engage with and consider ancestral knowledge traditions, since these are quite prevalent in pre- and extra-colonial communities and practices. How to initiate such an expansion remains much murkier as yet, but that's perhaps understandable from within a research landscape so dominated by a different mindset, but conversations about intergenerational score/knowledge holding could be a good starting point. Finding English- or French-speaking interviewees for this has been a challenging (and the colonial irony is not lost on me) but most necessary investment.

Recognizing sonic ideas/transmissions that are part of traditional knowledge as scores, or more broadly, as protected materials is also an issue that can have wide-ranging implications. Some can impact what spaces are appropriate for the singing or playing of such scores, as Dylan Robinson points out in his critique of the concert ritual and halls and the kind of mutual responsibilities, the "new social contract where individuals become accountable in the act of witnessing, of face-to-face encounters," that are inherent in certain Indigenous sound practices [5]. Other issues might involve how to expand and challenge individual authorship so as to legally protect musical expressions as creations belonging to all the members of a community. Copyrightability is a controversial issue: some argue that there is precedent in protections created, curiously enough, for traditional knowledge pertaining to medicinal plants and other resources [22]. However, copyright is underpinned by notions of 'originality' and 'personality', which are again tied to authorship and commodity in a way that essentially devalues knowledge held in community.

6.3 Space(s) of Resonance

Thinking beyond, yet possibly also inextricably linked to language and epistemologies are the many scores that require or encourage response, reception and sympathetic (or perhaps antipathetic) vibration from those using them. Pointing to the work of Hartmut Rosa, Charlotte Hug uses the score as a space of resonance as a guiding principle in her intercultural work, where the oftentimes unexpected

---

reactions that emerge become integral in her understanding of the score's potential. Sandeep Bhagwati describes his scores as relational, resonating not only between those who play them, but also in their material, beyond the sonic realm: "An important insight that I had was that a score can activate much more than the musician and really engage with the human being in general, with the biome, and so on" [23].

Likewise scores that are created in relation to specific places and their histories, like many of Raven Chacon's works, require the particular resonances of those places and histories in their performance. The resonance or not of places, peoples and their epistemologies comes up also, as mentioned above, in Suzanne Kite's scores.

6.4 Interface

Both Suzanne Kite and Craig Vear give a definition of score as an interface, a place of linkage. If an interface is a shared boundary and place of information exchange, a locus of interaction between a number of communities or systems, then considering scores as interfaces prioritizes the facilitation of relationships and the kinds of protocols that support interaction. This underlines collective agency and creation. Linda Bouchard also talks about interface as one of the iterations of the Ocular Scores project, where a performer plays the score-making device as an instrument, connecting the input and outputs of the other instrumental performers [24]. Charlotte Hug calls InterAction Notation an interface between media and disciplines. An interface allows for a much broader conception and agency for the score, far less dependent on *chronos* but engaged with *kairos*, a quality that appeals to Sandeep Bhagwati, who is likewise interested in devising systems rather than focusing on sounds.

Once again, score as interface implies a relational ontology, where the focus is on connection and collective creativity, rather than a unidirectional device issuing from an individual.

6.5 Boundary Object

Adjacent to the interface, I would suggest considering the score as a boundary object, both plastic enough to adapt to local needs and constraints of their multiple users, yet coherent enough to maintain a common identity. Boundary objects are artifacts or ideas that help people from different backgrounds come to a shared understanding. While thy are weakly structured in common use, they become strong in individual-site use. Their structure is common enough to more than one world to make them recognizable, a means of translation. Raven Chacon's *American Ledger* Series springs to mind as a good example of score as boundary object, made even more powerful in its function as a historical and site-specific calling to account through the personal investment of the performer and the collective. This definition of a score is also in dialogue with notions of standardization or convention, which often are not focused enough on plasticity and local needs or on making many worlds recognizable.

Furthermore, considering scores as boundary objects makes it possible to use them as a site of collaboration, which would give an important place to annotation and the collective improvement and/or critical edition of scores.[10]

7. CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

If anything, these initial interviews established that expanding potential of scores beyond Eurological conceptions offers panoply of options. This report is by no means either a comprehensive account of them or even of the many insights shared with me. The main difficulty in launching such research without the expectation of a certain result is that only after a first round of interviews does a pattern or a cohesive story begin to emerge. Yet this is precisely the attraction of a pluralistic and holistic approach to definitions and conceptions of scoring: it strives for greater awareness and openness – to connection, participation and difference. Starting from consultations with an eclectic group of voices, some of whom seem underrepresented in studies and research groups focused on the scoring of sound, it quickly became clear that the hermeticism of the notation/score research community might be related to definitions of scores themselves, and that expanding those might help bring in practices and practitioners outside WCMT. This often involves pushing against the categories, methods and values, not to mention the languages, of Eurological thinking, which certainly is slowed in this case by my background and belonging to white Western musical culture. It has, however, offered many avenues of inquiry that I can follow up on, as well as a much better idea of the amount of time it can take to find respondents I can exchange with—and for me to learn enough about their practice to ask reasonable questions. This is therefore but the very beginning of what is an incredibly vast pool of fascinating practitioners. Furthermore, this research and report on scoring is in dialogue with fundamental questions about what music is and what sounds and music are of interest,[11] yet diving into that is beyond the scope of this paper. Finally and doubtless, communities of sound and their modes of transmission will continue to change as they encounter digital technologies as well as (artificial) intelligences or beings—these are areas of specific interest to me and where I think such expanded definitions might serve.

---

[10] Indeed, the only mention I found of scores as boundary objects was in the ethnographic research on annotation by Megan Winget [25].

[11] Specifically in relation to Georgina Born's work on relational musicology [26].

8. REFERENCES

[1] George E. Lewis, "Improvised Music After 1950: Afrological and Eurological Perspectives," in *Black Music Research Journal*, vol. 16, no. 1, 1996, pp. 91–122.

[2] Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*. Revised ed., Oxford University Press, 2007.

[3] Gavin Steingo, "The Musical Work Reconsidered, In Hindsight," in *Current Musicology 97* (Spring 2014), p. 81.

[4] Jesse Stewart, " 'Intervections' " in *Contemporary Music Review*, vol. 29, no. 3, 2010, pp. 323-335.

[5] Dylan Robinson, *Hungry Listening: Resonant Theory for Indigenous Sound Studies*. University of Minnesota Press, 2020.

[6] Suzanne Kite, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, 27 April 2021.

[7] Margaret Kovach, *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*. University of Toronto Press, 2009,

[8] Cat Hope, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, 9 March 2021.

[9] Mark Clague, "Portraits in Beams and Barlines: Critical Music Editing and the Art of Notation," in *American Music*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2005, 39–68.

[10] Craig Vear, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, 22 February 2021.

[11] Sandeep Bhagwati, "Prana," *Changing Places Sensing Times Lecture Series,* 19 May 2021, matralab, Montreal.

[12] Lou Sheppard, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, 31 March 2021.

[13] BC Manjunath, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, 27 January 2021.

[14] Charlotte Hug, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, 23 February 2021.

[15] Kohei Nishikawa, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, 13 April 2021.

[16] Paraphrased in Mariko Anno, *Piercing the Structure of Tradition: Flute Performance, Continuity, and Freedom in the Music of Noh Drama*, Cornell East Asia Series, an Imprint of Cornell University Press, 2020.

[17] Dylan Robinson, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, 30 April 2021.

[18] Luke Nickel, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, 9 April 2021.

[19] Cat Hope, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, 11 January 2021.

[20] Leo Treitler, *Reflections on Musical Meaning and Its Representations*. Indiana University Press, 2011.

[21] Milan Kundera, *Slowness*. Translated by Linda Asher, HarperPerennial, 1997, p. 34.

[22] Giovanna Carugno, "How to Protect Traditional Folk Music? Some Reflections Upon Traditional Knowledge and Copyright Law," in *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale De Sémiotique Juridique*, vol. 31, no. 2, 2018, pp. 261–274.

[23] Sandeep Bhagwati, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, March 25, 2021.

[24] Linda Bouchard, Interview, conducted by Terri Hron, April 2, 2021.

[25] Megan A. Winget, "Annotations on Musical Scores by Performing Musicians: Collaborative Models, Interactive Methods, and Music Digital Library Tool Development," in *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, vol. 59, no. 12, 2008, pp. 1878–1897.

[26] Georgina Born, "For a Relational Musicology: Music and Interdisciplinarity, Beyond the Practice Turn," in *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, vol. 135, no. 2, 2010, pp. 205–243.