Abstract

The term ‘multipart music’ began to be used within our literature recently. Literally, it designates a generic co-presence of manifold components ‘inside a music’ without qualifying exactly what kind of co-presence is in play. Nevertheless, ‘multipart music’ is used more and more often, replacing the historically connotated term ‘polyphony’ which immediately refers to the domain of so-called western art music.

Importantly, ‘multipart music’ has the advantage of containing the term ‘part’ which can be considered in the theatrical sense of ‘role’, thus shifting the focus towards the essence of the musical action, namely the performative behaviours from which the sound intertwining springs. These actions can be interpreted as coordination of different sound gestures, i.e. bodily actions which begin and end and which have characteristic features and configurations that can be represented in terms of rhythmic-temporal dimensions and pitch chains. In such a perspective this paper focuses on what individuals do when they sing/play together in organized ways. Using different examples, the paper offers a contribution to the theoretical discourses of the ICTM (International Council for Traditional Music) Study Group on Multipart Music.

What is the point of the term ‘multipart music’?

As is usual in musicology (and in the humanities in general) terminologies are often ambiguous or far too generic and little effective: ‘multipart music’ is no exception! The term ‘multipart music’ began to be used within our recent literature mostly in order to generally replace the term ‘polyphony’, or in a vague attempt to extend the field of polyphony (see Ardian Ahmedaja’s article in this volume). Literally, multipart music designates nothing more than a generic co-presence of manifold components inside a music, without qualifying exactly what kind of co-presence is in play, what the term ‘part’ means, what the relationships among the parts are, and so forth. Thus, the locution ‘multipart music’ is simply the attestation of a compound music, made up of different elements resounding together – which is a sort of tautology since, in a sense, all music is always made up of various elements. In this regard, ‘multipart music’ works pretty much like the term ‘polyphony’ which, in an equally generic way, denotes nothing more than a co-presence among more sounds (poly-sounds), without specifying how this musical co-presence occurs.

In actual fact, such a kind of terminological vagueness seems inevitable: the phenomenon that we are interested in studying – this organized resounding of manifold sound components (let us just call it this for the moment) – manifests such a disparate variety of musical experiences that no definition could be more effective, and no expression could adequately represent this substantial diversity of musical processes – at least according to today’s knowledge and current research perspectives. Indeed, to insist on searching for a more effective and more comprehensive denomination would imply a kind of paradox, precisely because of the substantial, both formal and conceptual, variety of the articulation of the phenomenon in (and among) different cultures: it would be like trying to find a word with a potential universal meaning in order to deal with something of which one admits a substantial and irreducible cultural variability. In fact, as a conscious collectively shared human experience, making music together in a coordinated manner requires different forms of conceptualization that, as appropriate, may refer to rationalities even very different from ours.

Therefore, the choice to resort to ‘multipart music’ is not due to its literal meaning. Rather, it springs from the fact that it is a relatively recent term that does not carry as much baggage as ‘polyphony’. Furthermore, it has the advantage of containing the term ‘part’ which – beyond the common sense in the context of Western musical grammar – can be considered in the theatrical
sense of the ‘role’ (I shall deal with this later), thus shifting the focus towards the essence of the musical action, the core of my contribution.

In short, multipart music is more likely to be used to indicate a particular approach to the study of coordinated organized making music, something which the Study Group on Multipart Music of the International Council for Traditional Music (ICTM) has been trying to develop ever since it came into being in 2009. The following pages aspire to pursue this discourse just a little further, going beyond previous contributions (cf. Macchiarella 2012a). Our starting point is the definition currently adopted by our Study Group:

*Multipart music is a specific mode of music making and expressive behaviour based on the intentionally distinct and coordinated participation in the performing act by sharing knowledge and shaping values.*

**Compromising connotations**

Without doubt, ‘multipart music’ has the advantage of being devoid of the baggage of connotations accompanying the term ‘polyphony’. Of Greek origin, ‘polyphony’ (*polys-phoné*) is one of the key terms of so-called Western art music. Although it has assumed various meanings over time, and is also used outside of the specific music context with a metaphorical function (for example, a ‘polyphony of intent’ indicates accordance between persons), the term is immediately connected with the idea of the overlapping musical lines which are written down in a score. Indeed, in many ways, the term ‘polyphony’, as in a kind of metonymy, is considered representative of the formal and conceptual complexity of Western music, and even a statement of its (alleged) superiority over the other musical expressions of the world. For a long time in fact, musicological literature has corroborated the belief that the phenomenon of polyphony was a unique invention of the Western written tradition, a belief still commonly repeated in the media (and on the Internet). From the first half of the Twentieth century onwards, the awareness of a much broader and differentiated spread of a coherently organized overlapping of different sounds in the various cultures of the world slowly began to mature; the route has been a long and circuitous one, marked by various discoveries and stages that were well outlined and discussed by Maurizio Agamennone (1996).2

Specifically, ‘polyphony’ seems to mainly refer to the idea of sound combinations which are explicable and understandable only in terms of (mathematical) relations between pitches: a representation that influences the conceptualization of the extreme, and in many respects indefinable variety of processes through which people in the world make music together in a coordinated manner.

In fact, the representation suggested by the term ‘polyphony’ is resolutely oriented to the evaluation of sound outcomes. It is affected by Western Academia’s way of thinking and understanding music – a representation that is deep-rooted and also variously experimented by a wide (ethno)musicological3 literature in the study of a wide variety of musical expressions around the world (cf. Cook 2001). Pivoted on the romantic concept of absolute music, this perspective tends to consider sounds as detached from their context, with no particular (or, indeed, any) attention being paid to the modalities put into place for its performance. In this sense, using the term ‘polyphony’ implies the use of reference factors as paradigms – for example, distance interval, synchronization among the voices, accuracy of intonation, etc., – and such factors are not always relevant or important in the conceptualization and implementation of a coordinated overlapping of multiple sounds.

This pre-eminence granted to the resulting sound inferred from the use of the term ‘polyphony’ tends to reinforce a concept of music as repertoires of pieces, or ‘works of art’ in the meaning

---

2 See also the overview of Agamennone 1996 by Cámara de Landa in this volume.
3 I am among those who do not like the word ‘ethnomusicology’ because of the ‘ethno’ prefix, which is a legacy of past colonial prejudices. I believe our studies have “come to represent a conduit through which a more open, reflexive, representative, democratic and interdisciplinary approach to the study of music might be achieved.” (Stobart 2008: 1). This implies the study of all music, without any distinction on ethnic, geographic, social, etc. criteria. In this sense, I believe I am a musicologist. However, with reference to a consolidated tradition of studies and literature, I prefer to write the word as I have done on previous occasions: (ethno)musicology.
of Western Academic music, that is to say, the idea that a music piece is presumed to have an existence apart from any performance act and that it is always attributable to someone. This includes processes of imagination of bounded entities, metaphorically explained by words like forms, texts or works which are often taken for granted by people in different times and places (Clayton 2001: 6). In other words, the consideration of only (or mainly) the sound outcome of a performance (i.e. what is being played/sung and written/recorded, etc.) corresponds to a well-established way of thinking about music in the Western world (roughly starting from the second half of the Nineteenth century onwards): through the use of ‘polyphony’ this conceptualization somehow came to be projected onto the interpretation of other music cultures and practices for which it is not appropriate. This is all the more so because, due to the substantial transitional feature of sound, music cannot be an object: rather than a product, music is always a process, an “intrinsically meaningful cultural practice” (Cook 2001: 3) which is socially contextualized. Thus, beyond our common habit, granted by contemporary technologies of recording and sound reproduction (which I do not take into account here), it is not possible to separate sound from the act of its production – which, by the way, is an act where the uniqueness of those who play/sing (those who, literally, give body to the music) is manifested.4 This is even more true in the case of collectively coordinated expressions, in which the sound production is due to the mutual interaction of real men and women.

The perspective of multipart music

Free of any cultural baggage of historical sedimentation, ‘multipart music’ is therefore more practical for allowing us to focus from a different perspective on certain characteristics of making music together, compared to the ordinary one based on the immateriality of sound. Where part has the meaning of role, ‘multipart music’ may just highlight the (too often neglected) materiality of the meeting which is necessary for any collective and coordinated music making to take place. It follows that the core of the scrutiny becomes the performance behaviour from which the interweaving sounds, perceptible by listening, arise.5 These are the real organized group actions of the men and women which are led into the limelight. These actions can be interpreted as the coordination of different sound gestures, i.e. bodily actions which begin and end and have characteristic features and configurations that can be represented in terms of rhythmic-temporal dimensions and pitch chains.

The definition of sound gesture wishes to go beyond the common idea adopted in studies on polyphony of part as a melodic line.6 It is intended to include any type of sound activity which is consciously and intentionally produced during the act of making music together in a coordinated

---

4 However, there are recent approaches that take into account the agency of a group as a necessary condition for polyphony: for instance, according to Kobow (2011) “[t]he concept of polyphony […] can make a philosophical account of human agency, especially group agency, more comprehensive […] It gives us – literally – a sense of power, because hearing single-voice melodies and polyphone melodies reflects our different abilities to act alone or with others” (the definition considers agency as the intentional stance of the agent, not any physical movement).

5 From the 1960s onwards the notion of skilful body has risen within different domains, testifying the relevance that the body’s perception and behaviour has within the processes of knowledge. The body is therefore a means of interaction with the outside world but also a tool for expression and knowledge. In recent times, a large part of (ethno)musicological literature is pivoted on the essential foundation of the performance behaviours for the analysis of music results: for instance, from a different perspective, see Brinner 1992; Keil, Feld 1994; Cottrell 2004; Tenzer 2006; Baily 2008.

6 The experience of (ethno)musicological literature offers a very large palette of aural components of a multipart expression, beyond our idea of sequences of notes, and outside any presumed boundary between sung and spoken, sound and noise, and so on. Of course, sound gesture is not to be understood as a synonym of the term ‘part’ as a functionally differentiated layer of musical texture, as it is for Western academia. Besides, the same consolidated term ‘part’ is rather difficult to identify if we go beyond the Western academic tradition, see Ahmedaja 2008, Fünniss 2006 (see also Fünniss’s essay in this volume). Furthermore, ‘sound gesture’ is also different from the notion of ‘musical gesture’ which has been adopted in recent Western musicology with the aim of stressing the dynamic intervention of the body at different stages of art musical production (composition, performance, listening: see for instance Gritten and King 2006), and from other notions developed within psychological research based on the endless fascination of the concept of gesture.
way, and which is recognized as such by the performers. Any sonorous production can be a sound gesture, so that the variety of the expressions to which the term applies is imponderable and unlimited. Through the combination and interaction of sound gestures, multipart music manifests its nature of shared behaviour that acts on the lives of real women and men, namely soundful bodies (see below).

It goes without saying that this perspective is pivoted on the concept of music as a performance, which is like a lived experience to be understood and interpreted in a given space and time. Thus, it is a viewpoint that does not concern music as a stream of sounds emitted from some electronic device (nor the idea of a pure analysis of music representation written down in a paper document).7

Nowadays, music can also be a sequence of immaterial sounds that are disconnected from the hic et nunc of the performance that we listen to through speakers: this is the common experience of music (Cook 2000). But, for our ancestors (and still for many people in the world today), music was (is) necessarily the real interaction between men and women – and nothing else! There are two substantially different human experiences (both from the perspective of the producer and the listener) which are both defined with the same term: ‘music’. Although, I do not want to dwell on this point,8 I should however like to stress how the analysis of human sound production processes is unavoidable for the approach to the multipart music phenomenon.

To study this phenomenon means to focus on what individuals do when they sing/play together in organized ways. In fact, every performance is interpretable as the result of shared know-hows regulating interactions between individuals (real men and women in their uniqueness), which give rise to different music outcomes every time. Adopting and developing these assumptions, I believe that the locution ‘multipart music’ could identify a conceptual tool built on a coherent analysis of the musical behaviours from which the sound intertwining springs up. Consequently, the first word of our locution, ‘multi-part’, should be understood as (or should suggest the idea of) multi-action music, multi-role music, multi-coordinated behaviours, and so forth (rather than multi (poly) -sounds). This implies that ‘multipart music’ is not to be used to denote features that are found in the overlapping combination of sounds and perceptible by listening: that is to say, the study of multipart music cannot do without a direct observation of real performance, and it cannot be realized simply through listening to recorded materials.

The multipart music phenomenon is not, however, a straightforward matter of the mixing of music behaviours to be an end in themselves. We are well aware that, as Gilbert Rouget stated, “Music is always more than music” (cf. Lortat-Jacob 2006), and of course, if we consider its collective/inter-acting features, the approach to the phenomenon must mean to encounter (and to face) the intermingling between actions and thoughts on music, which are ‘other’ than those we are accustomed to, in virtue of our own conceptual framework (see below).9

In this perspective, the term ‘multipart music’ is not an alternative to ‘polyphony’, or, even less,

---

7 However, the performer’s body could also be present in the recordings. In fact, recordings are “reproductions of performances that never actually took place but resulted from mixing and editing multiple takes. Although such performances of popular music are immaterial, they are not truly disembodied [...]” because recordings “always imply the physical actions and presence of the human beings who produced them no matter how manipulated they may be” (Auslander 2006: 263). Cf. the interesting contribution by Alessandro Bratus in this volume.

8 That is to say I do not deal with what music is; I like to remember that “m]usic is a very small word to encompass something that takes as many forms as there are cultural or subcultural identities” (Cook 2000: 18).

9 I have come across this during my own research activity, which till now has taken place not far from my native land. Furthermore, since I am one of those so-called ethnomusicologists-at-home, I have had (and still have) a special possibility of developing very close personal relations, including confidential ones, that are practically part of my personal daily life. Inter alia, this has given me the opportunity to learn ‘how’ to deal with the music practices related to the customs of different villages or groups of singers (and over the technical aspects). In particular, I have gradually come to understand that opinions about the performance were regarded as opinions about the people who sing (or play), within a sort of aesthetics of the relationships represented by the sounds, where aesthetics is close to ethics, since music coincides with the real people who give it life (in a word: sharing a sound experience is above all sharing a human experience) (Macchiarella 2014). The local singers often allow me to take part in the intense and ‘day after day’ talking about the music practice (beyond the performative moments) which have a crucial relevance for the sound
its synonym. Dealing with multipart music means, therefore, developing a different perspective on making music together in a coordinated way, whose results may (or should) intertwine with the common methodologies of studying and analysing sound outcomes. It is a different interpretative perspective wherein, whilst safeguarding the interest in the content (i.e. what is being performed), privileged attention is devoted to what happens and what it means when collective music actions happen, i.e. to both the performative behaviours and shared conceptualizations from which the concrete intertwining of sounds derives.

I underline that multipart music must not relate to some musical typologies – and in particular it does not concern what is usually called traditional music, or orally transmitted music, or, in a word, those music practices conventionally collocated out of the range of the so-called western art music. The aim is to think about any kind of collective and coordinated music behaviours. Of course, the features of the sound outcomes, the variety of the reference of the performance (e.g. written scores, orally transmitted music traces, sound recording, and so on), the diversity of the contextual situations, of the performance’s space, time, purposes, etc. are all features that must be taken into account, since they offer indispensable interpretative elements. For what is important here, it is a question of integrating these elements with the pivotal focus on collective and coordinated music behaviour.

**Special collective actions**

On this basis, the phenomenon of multipart music immediately appears as being extremely broad. In fact, in many ways it defies delimitation, if only because of its continuous transformation (since it is, after all, making music tout court), in a constant change of the processes of interaction/combinations put in act by women and men during their collectively organized making music. For this reason, no discussion may achieve a complete inventory purpose. Furthermore, let it be clear right from the start that dealing with multipart music does not mean aiming to identify a list of repertoires, or genres, or pieces, or generic music practices to which the definition may be applied. On the contrary, it means identifying and classifying typologies of coded behaviours to which – in principle – the multiplicity of the intentional and coordinated interweaving of different sound gestures during a performance relates. Beyond an acoustic analysis, what is crucial is the clear identification of the expressive behaviours that belong to the multipart music field, and vice-versa, cases in which these behaviours are not a part.

In general, making music means carrying out actions whose goal is to achieve expected sound results, which are imagined and idealized before the performance, recognized as such during it, outcomes, and in which some conceptual points are clearly manifested. Thus, for instance, for (at least many) Sardinian and Corsican singers with whom I work, who is performing with whom is far more important than what is actually being sung: therefore the quality of the relationships among those who take part in a performance can be pivotal not only for the quality of the sound outcome (the amalgams of the voices, the acoustic harmony of the results, and so on), but also just for the contents of the same performance (what they sing), for its contextual value (when they sing, why) and so on (Macchiarella 2013; 2015a). I shall return to this point.

10 Incidentally, ‘traditional music’ is literally vague and insignificant, since in the concreteness of the performance, music is contemporaneity: cf. Lortat-Jacob 2000.

11 Besides, ‘multipart music’ does not correspond to other terms that one can find in our literature with the impossible purpose of identifying some belonging within the boundless field of polyphonic music: such is the case of the term polivocality, frequently found in Italian (ethno)musicalological literature, which is usually adopted with the aim of distinguishing a supposed folk or traditional or oral polyphony from the art/ written down polyphony (instead, the English ‘polyvocality’ concerns more the use of multiple voices in a narrative context). This is also the case of ‘multilinear music’ which proposes the vagueness of polyphony in a sort of counterpointistic sense. Another terminological variant is ‘multi-voice’, in order to focus any individual sound emission within an organized collective performance: the term works like a neutral enlargement of the definition of polyphony (cf. Pärtlas 2012: 134). And so forth: I defer an in depth study of this terminological issue to a future occasion.

12 In particular “the musical notation which underpins performance events in the Western art tradition is as much (and perhaps more) a text in the Geertzian sense, as something ethnomusicologists might pore over in situ to discover local meanings […] Musical texts become sites through which social relationships are negotiated” (Cottrell 2004: 91). Roughly the same could be said for sound recordings when they are collectively listened to and discussed as traces for a new performance (see Macchiarella 2012a).
and commented on and discussed by both performers and listeners in the aftermath. Each performance is therefore interpreted as a different manifestation each time of conducts put into action on the basis of shared rules, known by the performers (and recognized by the listeners, at least by those who share the space and time of a performance).

These rules build the scenario within which individuals and groups accomplish their choices based on what they know, what they would like to do and what they try to realize: that is to say, they put their own experience in place. At the same time, the inevitable uncertainty implicit in any performance questions any acquired knowledge in the encounter with the constantly changing situations and conditions of music-making, which requires new forms of experimentation each time, e.g. a constant building experience (in the meaning of the Latin root of the word *experiri*).

These dynamics between the experiences coming from acquired knowledge and the experience in the making are implicit in any music making, and, in general, in any performance. Multi-part musics stand out for the collective character of these dynamics, that is to say, they are always negotiated music manifestations among more individuals.

To take part in a multipart music means to be part of a group, accepting its rules and being accepted as a member. It is a way of being together: it implies having to agree to be in close proximity with others, and, at the same time, it sets individual participation in a collective meeting. Every multipart music expression is based, in fact, on collectively negotiated music conducts: what one can do and what one effectively does during a performance are the result of mechanisms of musical exclusivity/inclusivity that are based on one's individual availability to collaborate with others, to admit the closeness of others, to share a certain time and a certain space, and so on.

Negotiation is a key word. Within the multipart music phenomenon, collective negotiation is ineluctable: it is a necessary condition of the actions that the music-makers take before, during, and after the performance. It means that the single sound gesture can not resonate without listening to another one and, above all, that this interacting between sound gestures is not based exclusively on criteria of previously planned sound correspondences, but is actually born in the *hic et nunc* of the real performance, within scenarios of mutual cooperation, reciprocity, competition, conflict, and so on (see below).

This availability implies the acceptance of constraints on one's own musical production and therefore on one's own behaviour. Apart from some particular situations (see later on), anyone practising any type of multipart music recognizes the existence of the limitations of his/her own actions; he/she knows (and experiences during performance acts) that one cannot do what one wants, but has to negotiate every sound gesture both with someone else, and in reference to collectively shared experiences. In other words, it is a special way of articulating the knowledge of others and relating to them.

Thus, the fundamental character of the negotiation of musical behaviour typifies multipart music. Through it, collective music makings become special collective actions that deserve a peculiar consideration and distinct processes of interpretation. It is a feature that has a strong and particular iconic value, since it can be considered as representative of aspects of shared cognitive models inherent to the social life of men and women, which are experienced and lived in each performance. This interpretative horizon is the centre of my proposal regarding the multipart music concept.

**Soundful bodies in action**

In a sense, any musical expression might be defined as multipart, since music, by definition, is a social fact (Blacking 1989), the result of “a special kind of social action” (Blacking 1995: 223), which somehow includes a form of collective participation. Within a large majority of making music contexts, the (real or presumed) co-presence of more persons means, in any case, the occurrence of forms of social communication/interaction, even though these may differ according to the specific situations. It is rare that one makes music really alone, without someone who is listening. Often, one does it with a social purpose, that is, to rehearse something in preparation for a public performance, or to record a track for a disc intended for an imagined audience during a performance in a studio (Davidson 2002: 95).

Anyone can ‘live the music’, both as an active participant in a performativ acts or as a receiver of
music made by others. Here lie the two basic roles of music: the performer, engaged in the production of organized sounds, and the listener who receives and interprets these sounds. These two roles are not always clearly distinguished or distinguishable: they both necessarily influence each other by interacting with one another in different ways depending on the circumstances. In this wide sense, dealing with the interaction between the parts (e.g. roles) of performer and listener means to deal, in general, with music as a social experience (Turino 2008). This issue goes far beyond the phenomenon that I intend to consider here: a phenomenon that, in essence, concerns the generative processes of sound production, and therefore the general role of the performer. Thus I shall focus on the side of the performer, without minimizing the influence exerted by the listener, but deferring any systematic study of the issue to a future work.

Far from being an anodyne and faithful reproducer of sounds (something that is actually impossible due to the ephemeral nature of sound), every participant in the performance act is what he/she does, in other words, he/she coincides with the vocal and/or instrumental sound he/she produces. As such, every participant in a performance is a soundful body who manifests his/her singular musicality more or less evidently and consciously, according to the shared music mechanism, to the circumstances and the purposes of the performance, on the basis of his/her music skills, background, taste, preferences, and so forth. Willingly or unwillingly, consciously or not, everyone puts something of him/herself into his/her sound production; conversely, every performance can be interpreted as an encounter and interaction between individual musicalities. Within the extent of the rules and the resources of the performative device, any music maker shows a specific sonic signature, a musical personality, an inventiveness of his/her own, and so on.

The actual music making is therefore an act that includes more or less wide margins of music freedom, rooted in the patterns of accepted and shared behaviours, in the situation in which the performance occurs, in the memory of previous musical experiences, in the ability of knowing how to react to develop a real performance, and so on (Stone 1982). In the case of multipart music, this unavoidable component of freedom does not contradict (because it can not) the necessary acceptance of the constraints on one’s own music behaviour. Rather, this limited freedom enlarges the level of negotiation, allowing its development towards unpredictable and unlimited horizons that are able to reveal much both about the individuality of those who are making music and also about the specific music scenarios. Thus, it is a question of freedom which is conditioned twice, both by the rules of the performance pattern and by the necessary collective negotiating between the real performers. In this way, every multipart music performance ends up offering, in principle, new elements concerning the interaction of specific individual identities, the representation and the questioning of interpersonal relationships, the mechanisms of mutual musical communication, and so on (Macchiarella 2013).

Challenges and collaboration between individuals

The basic condition for multipart music is the co-presence, at least, of two people who intentionally take part in a sound emission. This condition simply does not happen by itself and, at least customarily, is not random. In fact, it needs specific requirements and procedures of interactions and coordination between individuals and groups. In such a perspective, the definition of multipart music, ipso facto, does not lead to the musical expressions made by one individual, that is to say, those consisting of only one sound gesture. As is evident, these expressions lack the element characterizing the phenomenon at issue here, namely the negotiation of music between two or more people. During a performance by one individual, the music maker is alone with him/herself. Although he/she can interact with his/her audience or may have discussed his/her musical choices before and/or after the performance, he/

13 Cf. the useful distinction proposed by Thomas Turino (2008: 23–60) between participatory performance – in which there is a non performer-audience distinction, “only participant and potential participant performing different roles” and presentational performance – in which one group of people “prepares and provides music for another group, the audience, who do not participate in making the music”.
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she is the sole protagonist and responsible for the real sound outcome, which manifests itself like a monologue with no inter-action and which is perhaps exclusive if not self-centered.

This kind of exclusion, therefore, concerns any solo performance beyond the sonic result obtained: namely, both in the case of true monodies (in which the sound emission is constituted by a single line of singing or by one monophonic instrument with no accompaniment) and in the case in which a performer plays a polyphonic instrument, or again when a performer sings accompanying him/herself with any kind of instrument (both polyphonic or monodic). As one can well imagine, there are numerous examples which go from a minister singing a liturgical chant to a pianist playing a sonata, from a woman singing a lullaby to a folk singer who accompanies his singing on the guitar, and so on: in these cases we have a unique music maker who is responsible for the sounds, who (almost) exclusively has the privilege of his/her choices in the here and now of the performance.

Let me point out again that this matter concerns the occasion of the performance and not what is being performed and/or the type of musical instruments being played. Therefore, the same liturgical song might be sung by many voices (that is, by several people), and in this case it should enter the sphere of observation of multipart music, whilst a piano sonata can be transcribed for a duo, trio or more instruments, and so on. From a different point of view, pianists (and other polyphonic instrument players) often play in differently composed music groups, interacting both with human voices and other instruments, within performance situations which fully belong to the multipart music phenomenon.

To sing/play alone refers to a subjective dimension of music expression (and possibly of so-called talent) which can be interpreted differently depending on the situation: the pleasure of being by yourself, the difficulty (or unwillingness) to collaborate with others, the exaltation of absolute musical identities within social scenarios in which the values of individuality are fundamental, since they are emphasized in the perspective of multiple juxtaposed selves, and so on. In any case, they are extraneous perspectives to the processes of socialization, interaction, and collective co-participation of multipart music, so I shall not take in account of them here.

However, within certain scenarios of social life (or at least, within specific performance situations), making music alone produces peculiar practices that show forms of inter-individual collaboration, characterized by coordinate alternating between several performers: strictly speaking, these practices can be understood in the concept of multipart music.

For instance there are the orally transmitted practices based on typologies of music-poetical duels between two or more individuals, such as the so-called Ottava rima (Eighth rhyme). Spread throughout Tuscany and Central Italy, the Ottava rima consists of regulated matches during which two or three poets, with no accompaniment, take turns performing octaves of hendecasyllables that deal with topics chosen on the spur of the moment by the listeners or other poets. Without going into the details of this performance practice (see Agamennone 2009), every duel is a clearly ritualized event whose timing is organized by the form of poetical meter: every performer sings an octave when it is his/her turn and has (more or less) the same time both to demonstrate his/her capabilities as far as poetic quality is concerned and to compete with the other participants. On the basis of the shared rules, the Ottava rima ends up being a collective-coordinated music-making, albeit alternately, through which some individuals negotiate their status within the tradition, which (paraphrasing Slobin 1993) we can call the micro-music world of the Ottava, made up of all the poets and their audience and, more in general, by all the people of the regions who are somehow involved therein. If we consider the heated mechanisms of rivalry (although they come about within a generally friendly atmosphere), the Ottava rima can be represented as a reverence of certain individuals' capabilities (in particular the idea of a gift from nature that must be nurtured/cherished) whose basis lies in some aspects of the conceptual framework of the region's peasant

---

14 This includes both the contents and the value of extemporaneous poetic production and the properties of the performance act on the whole (the pertinence of the vocal emission, proxemics, gestuality, etc.)
As a rule, this kind of pattern is regarded as being outside polyphony, on account of the lack of musical parts identifiable by listening (Agamenonne, Facci, Giannattasio 1996; Arom et al. 2005). Rather, the sound outcomes of this performance pattern are often not considered music in the full meaning of the term (Ayats 2002), such is the case of the slogans of demonstrating protesters, or those of chanting football fans, or other analogous expressions belonging to our common social experience.

At the same time, the performative principle per se would appear to be beyond the field of multipart music studies since, seeing that all the participants make the same gesture, it lacks the basic idea of interaction/negotiation between individuals. But this is only in theory, because, in actual fact, the issue is far more complex than it is usually represented. Moreover, really significant cases can be discovered by studying specific examples within the endless sets of music practices arising from the performance pattern.

This is particularly true when we consider that the requested synchronization of collective making music in unison is anything but natural (or granted, or hackneyed). As a minimum, it requires that the performers check (with relative care) their emissions and the ones of the other participants in the performance. Small lags, fortuitous overlapping among sounds, uncertainty in tuning and rhythmic stressing, approximation of synchronization, etc. are quite common. Inter alia, studies of experimental acoustics have demonstrated that sounds perceived as simultaneous (even in the presence of an external reference such as, for example, a choir director or orchestra) are never actually perfectly synchronized, since a really perfect synchronization does not exist in reality (Rasch 1988). Indeed, in some cases, the creation of perfect unison makes conducting music difficult, as it requires extreme precision and rhythmic coordination (see the case concerning the performance of chamber music studied by Giura Longo 2015: 127–131).

More in general, the apparent simplicity of the performance pattern does not promote (and

---

15 Furthermore, other ideas and practices of unison are found in different cultures: for instance, within the vast literature on the music from the Indian continent, see Napier 2006 who deals with an idea of 'flexible unison' that is "thought as a continuum way of hearing" (Napier 2006: 104); cf. also Keill 1994.
has not promoted) the carrying out of in-depth (ethno)musicological research. Contributions mostly concern the social value of the performative act. In particular, musical mechanisms have seldom been the explicit focus of examination – albeit with certain very relevant exceptions such as Ayats 1997 and 2002.

The presence of one or more individualities that assume (or are delegated to play) a pivotal role in the performance is a recurring element. As a rule, it is the singer(s) or instrument player(s) who has (or have) the task of starting the performance, and whose sound gesture is taken as a reference by the remaining participants. This is the case of the so-called megaphonist who, thanks to a simple portable speaker, leads the scanning of slogans during street protests with the purpose of synchronizing an indefinite number of individual sound gestures in order to create a unified group action against the other, intended as the State, the powers that be, another group, and so on (Ayats 2002). Selected by virtue of his charisma, the megaphonist has the task of animating the group, of continuously varying the slogans, possibly proposing new ones, and of reviving the performance (changing, for example, the dynamics, the intensity of the sound volume, and so on). His proposals are usually accepted by the group, but situations of mutual misunderstanding can bring his role and prestige within the group into question.

Accordingly, this role-leader involves forms of collective negotiation that are usually not based on music-aesthetic criteria, but on other aspects of a group’s values and hierarchies: that is to say, it is not the person with the most aesthetically beautiful voice in the group who guides the performance, but usually the figure who is somewhat more charismatic, independently of his/her vocal quality. The performance, thus, reflects group dynamics and typically reiterates and reinforces them, but special performance acts may also challenge consolidated roles.

(More or less) Consciously avoided synchronism

As I mentioned previously, within many music practices the act of collective synchronization at the unison of individual sound gestures is the reason for the performances. Indeed, the possible lack of this synchronization can have a negative impact and symbolically represent a group’s lack of unity. However, many other music practices propose different interpretations of the sense of synchronicity, since, while they are essentially pivoted on the collective performance of the same individual sound gesture, they do not intentionally aim to achieve a shared unison.

This is the limitless field of music practices which, in the perspective of the studies on sound outcomes, fall under the definition of heterophony (cf. Arom et al. 2005): the term is actually very generic, not least because it concerns a phenomenon that is seen as a border area between monophony and polyphony, and which, “being intrinsically connected with oral and collective music creation, has no direct analogies in Western written music” (Pärtlas 2012: 129).

---

16 Relevant contributions, above all on collective singing, come from the sociological literature written about social movements: see for instance Bensimon 2012.

17 This is true and has even more relevance in the cases of overlapping between distinctive sound gestures: for instance “[i]n a performance in Borsh the mayor of the village sung the marrés (first voice) despite his limited abilities as singer. He thereby intended to present and make audible his superior social role both to the foreign visitor and to members of his own community” (Pistrick 2012: 191).

18 In actual fact, research on specific music scenarios has demonstrated how, especially during special contextual occasions, the acquired roles of guiding the collective singing can be questioned through the real performance: for instance, this occurs within the music practice of the singing of the rosary in several parts of Sardinia (see Merici 2014). In a different scenario, something similar happens within the extremely synchronized collective singing of football fans: in Cagliari, the group of fans called the Sconvolts contemplates hierarchies between some capo-cori (choir-heads) (who lead the performance), their assistants and some coristi d’appoggia (supporting choristers): the individuals who are charged with these roles have a clear place on the terraces of the stadium, so that anyone in the know can deduce the status of the relationship within the fans’ leader group. Each individual is responsible for the quality of synchronization of his pertaining sector and pays the consequences if something does not go well, so that he is encouraged to have good relations with the people under his control (Garzia 2009).

19 A large and effective discussion on the term ‘heterophony’ is also in Pärtlas 2012; cf. also Napier 2006: 89–93. See also the perspective of Bouêt 2012, Ferran 2012.
As regards the present discussion, these are mechanisms of behavioural synchronizations deliberately ‘other’ than our idea of homorhythm (or homo/monophony), which manifest a different nature at a conceptual level, depending on specific performative practices (and the relative cultural framework). Within the very large and rich bibliography, diverse contributions about significant case studies have underlined the lack of collective coordination, so that any participant performs (or seems to perform) his/her sound gesture addressing him/herself, which gives rise to an effect of simultaneity of solos in the same time and space. Other works emphasize the existence of intentionality (or, on the contrary, the lack of intentionality) in the vertical dimension – but, of course, the boundary between intentionality and un-intentionality could be almost ephemeral and is impossible to fix objectively. Moving the focus towards the analysis of the musical behaviours which are at the origin of the (seemingly chaotic) resounding of this sound intertwining could offer relevant contributions.

In my limited experience of such a type of music making, there is a special case of collective performance pivoted on the same sound gesture that evidently oscillates between both intentional and unintentional synchronization: namely, the so-called Jovia ‘e lardajola (corresponding to Maundy Thursday), within the Carnival festa in the Sardinian village of Gavoi. On this day, the sa sortilla ‘s sos tumbarinos (the coming out of the drums) takes place: hundreds of men and women, organized in flexible groups, make their way around the streets of the village, all playing drums with the same sonic gesture, which is actually made up of a very schematic rhythmic pattern that allows the greatest collective participation. Normally, the groups try to achieve full synchronization, although clearly unintentional approximations are not infrequent both within each group (especially, when it contains young players or people from other villages) and between the groups. At other moments, individual drummers clearly perform intentional lacks of synchronization (including more or less conscious micro-variations of the pattern) to underline specific occurrences in their music wanderings, such as an encounter with a friend with whom they interact for a while (for instance, gradually increasing the speed of the pattern, or performing it in a back-and-forth way, or carrying out a few rhythmic variations, etc.). An otherwise large concentration of drummers in one place stimulates enterprising individuals to make ‘rhythmic jokes’ (for instance, stressing the backbeat of the pattern, or varying its agogic, etc.). Some well-known characters (including ones specialized in traditional music making) continuously differentiate themselves from the others by making use of special devices in their sound gestures, and so on: in short, there is a vast range of (mostly conscious) individual sound gestures, which are substantially due to real interactions between real men and women, according to their different intentionalities, purposes, etc. The whole event always respects the basic shared rhythmic pattern – otherwise, the sound gestures would not be allowed. The general result is a sort of organized Carnival music anarchism which is in contrast with the severity of the music making that comes about during the rest of the year, and which, above all, provides an enjoyable frame for conducting personal relationships. Once again, in a case of music densities like this one, I believe that the multipart music approach to human behaviours and interpersonal negotiations is able to give innovative interpretative elements.

**Women, men and sound gestures**

Within the general phenomenon of multipart music a substantial bi-polarization can be identified between, on the one hand, music practices consisting of interlocking between individual sound gestures, i.e. each constitutive sound gesture is

---

20 Inter alia, see the cases of Berber ahdious (Lortat-Jacob 1980: 29–43) or the Baptist congregational lining out (Titon 2006: 21). In fact, any inhabitant of the village can invite his/her friends from other villages to join in the drum performance: this symbolically represents the subversive spirit of Carnival, since, in ordinary times, every traditional music expression is exclusively reserved for the villagers (cf. Macchiarella 2012b).

21 The village’s soundscape in these days is enriched by the sound of other instrumental groups, including the pipaiolu (a kind of cane flute), triangles, and other drums (possibly with the addition of diatonic accordions); these groups also wander around the village, often meeting and interweaving with sos tamburinos. Unfortunately, an in-depth study on this music practice is lacking: see its description in Marras 2012: 46–48.
performed by one voice or by one instrument;\textsuperscript{23} and, on the other, music practices in which each distinct and perceptible aural component is realized by two or more persons who synchronically sing (or play) the same sound gesture (or try to do so), thereby giving less (or no) relevance to their single individualities as performers. This basic distinction has never been given due consideration in studies on polyphony which consider sound outcomes in terms of texture. In actual fact, it does assume a crucial importance within multipart music approaches and has a significant impact on the real results of a performance, beyond what is permitted by the mechanisms of musical combination/superposition.

There is no clear hiatus between the two poles and one can find a continuum of intermediate possibilities, including patterns where one or more individual sound gestures are combined with aural components performed in unison by more than one individual. Furthermore, depending on the scenario, the same multipart pattern could also be performed by either an individual or a collectively synchronized rendition: this variability gives meaning and value to the performative act with specific social contexts, both in participatory and presentational performances (see the case in Macchiarella 2009: 52–60).\textsuperscript{24}

At the first pole lie music expressions in which the contribution of each performer (that is to say his/her sound gestures and through these his/her music identity) is evident. Together with the vocal/instrumental amalgam, each individual contribution is (more or less) immediately perceptible by listening and has a basilar value since it directly characterizes and qualifies the musical image of a performance. At the other extreme, the individual performers lose (or tend to lose) their individuality and become part of a kind of different micro (or, sometimes, macro, in the cases of large choirs or big orchestras)\textsuperscript{25} collective identities. The latter come into play with other analogous identities according to the mechanisms of intentional collective synchronization mentioned before (including possible unintended approximations, although the special attention needed to achieve unison is assumed by those who are synchronized with each other, especially in the cases of ensemble performances led by a conductor).

This different individual involvement contains various implications: firstly, of course, a different value is assigned to the individual performance engagement. As summed up by several Sardinian singers of orally transmitted multipart practices, it is a matter of responsibility. For instance, Mario Carboni, the contra of the a cuncordu quartet from Bortigali (cf. Macchiarella 2015a: 47) states

> when one of us fa una voce [makes a voice, i.e. takes part in the a tenore / cuncordu singing] and he makes a mistake, then you suddenly understand that he is wrong, that he is responsible for the mistake and consequently for a bad performance; instead, when one sings in a choir a sa nuoresa [polyphonic choirs with a conductor, whose repertory is made up of written harmonizations of Sardinian traditional tunes], if he is wrong how can you become aware of it? When we sing [in four voices] we assume our own responsibility for what we do; the others do not do this.\textsuperscript{26}

Another singer, Gianluca Beccu, member of an a cuncordu quartet from Santulussurgiu emphasizes the matter and points out that singing

\textsuperscript{23}At the moment I consider the use of monophonic or polyphonic instruments as equivalent, identifying the single personality of the player in a distinctive participation towards a combined emission: I shall deal with the matter in the near future.

\textsuperscript{24}In presentational contexts (for instance on the stages of the world music stream), performances of multipart patterns characterized by individual sound gestures often lose their fundamental unpredictable character, as they are very predictable concert music (Lortat-Jacob 2000) on account of the redoubled rendition of every aural component. The specific influence of auditory feedback on multipart music performance is a very interesting issue for future research (cf. also Turino 2008: 23–60).

\textsuperscript{25}For instance, the great Soviet orchestras of the past were made up of hundreds of instruments synchronized in unison, immediately representing an idea of cultural homogeneity (During 2005: 156–159).

\textsuperscript{26}This could determine a sort of performance anxiety (the so-called stage fright) which influences the musical outcome. This anxiety has a double value in multipart music because any mistake also affects the collective performance, that is to say, the efforts of the other participants. It “is a common problem among both amateur and professional musicians. It affects individuals who are generally prone to anxiety, particularly in situations of public exposure and competitive scrutiny, and so is best understood as a form of social phobia (a fear of humiliation).” (Wilson, Roland 2002: 47).
in four voices offers the possibility to customize the musical emission so that, if a singer is able to “do something nice with his voice” these abilities are recognized and appreciated by the listeners, whereas this cannot happen when singing in a choir (Macchiarella 2015b).

It is evident that performing music in a situation oriented towards interlocking between individual sound gestures provides a (relatively) greater music freedom than can be offered by the situation of the overlapping of collective synchronizations. This relative freedom works effectively when singing/playing in small groups, which offer the best possibility for integrating the close attention of individuality with amalgams with other ones. These are very representative situations of multipart music practice because there is a real and conscious interaction-negotiation between different soundful bodies. The real sound overlappings have an immediate representative value since they can be read as depictions of both interindividual and collective relationships. At every performance these relationships are reshaped, reinforced or questioned, since the performers have the opportunity to present challenges, to engage in private rivalry or other kinds of relationships, etc. (Lortat-Jacob 1996, 2011; Macchiarella 2013, 2015a). Thus, the performance constitutes very complex and unpredictable performance mechanisms which have their own relevance: any sound gesture is the result of conscious choices made by the particular singers in relation to the real circumstances of the given performance, which, above all, means the identities of the other singers taking part in the music-making and the listeners to whom the performance is addressed.27

On the contrary, performances constituted by overlapping between collective synchronizations customarily give an image of overall harmony. They are often a consequence of preceding coordinated operations (including formalized rehearsals) during which musical mechanisms are experienced. Individual comparisons, conflicts or rivalry are not revealed in the performance (they are possibly encountered during the preceding meetings),28 while individual desires to be the centre of attention are banned (for instance, if someone sings at a high volume or embellishes their singing/playing too much). Within the galaxy of the musical mechanisms between the two extremes, blends of both individual and collectively synchronized sound gestures lead to mechanisms symbolizing rivalries between individuals and groups within a society (see, for instance, the two different competitive systems of the multipart singing analysed respectively in Sassu 1978; Castéret 2012).

Iconic values

Another relevant issue for the conceptualization of multipart music concerns the complex relations between sound gestures, i.e. musical roles within the mechanism of musical overlapping/interaction: this has a crucial significance for both the behavioural aspects and the related meanings. In short, depending on the different musical scenarios and local practices, not all the performance roles are considered as being of equal importance. There are essential or main roles, second leads or complementary roles, inessential or subordinate ones, and so on. One could probably epitomize what is known about the issue as lying along a continuum, where at one end there is a clear distinction between a leader role and one or more accompanying roles, while at the other, we find the co-presence of two or more equivalent music roles. The different relevance of the roles may be interpreted as the projection of the organizational patterns of the society expressing them, following John Blacking’s concept of music “understood as expressions of cognitive processes that may be observed to operate in the formation of other structures” (Blacking 1974: 24).29

On the one hand, many multipart music practices are pivoted on a main role, usually performed by one individual (even though collec-

---

27 “The individual singer […] is valued both for his voice and for his behaviour. At any rate singing is but the acoustical form of a moral quality” (Lortat-Jacob 2011: 30).
28 See the typical case of conflict/comparison among people within and between the sections of an amateur choir belonging to the so-called Alpine tradition, in Macchiarella 2004.
29 This kind of representation must not induce a mechanical connection between certain music features and (abstract) social models. In actual fact, there are some aspects of music organization (such as the idea of hierarchy) that in the awareness of the performers (and their listeners) refer to a common way ‘to think the world and life’ which is “somehow fitting with the general conceptual framework with which one is familiar” (Patel 2008: 326).
Multipart Music as a Conceptual Tool. A Proposal

Relatively synchronized leader roles are not rare. Of course, a solo singer with an instrumental accompaniment constitutes the most common practice, of which there is an indefinite and almost illimitable variability. Usually, the leader role offers someone the opportunity to widely express his/her musical individuality, with the feeling of putting something of him/herself into the performance: in fact, the role has a (more or less) large margin of variation, without however ignoring the other roles. In some way, a singer/player who usually performs a leader role in multipart music enjoys special consideration and a good reputation within the ordinary social relationships of his/her group. Leading a multipart performance means leading a group of people in a collective and coordinated action and, consequently, not all the members of a group are capable (or considered capable) of carrying out this task. Indeed, a kind of leadership quality is required to maintain the musical group (and must be recognized by all the performers), and this attitude concerning interpersonal relations is confirmed and depicted by the music performance. The other roles are essentially subordinated to the leader’s musical choices but actively contribute to the entire music result. According to the specific performative pattern, music creativities may occur in any of these parts, often including a large component of flexibility and adaptability.

This is particularly evident in so-called homophonic music, i.e. the common pattern of the current mainstream of popular music, conceived as a single melody with accompaniment (or backing) by functional chords, according to general Western harmonic principles. This melody-accompaniment dualism is the common basis for constructing musical meaning: the foreground/background relationships propose a clear distinction between the individual and the rest of the social reality that has immediate iconic contents referring to social experiences. For our purposes, however, the notion of homophony is far too reductionist and deterministic: notwithstanding the relatively rigorous musical constraints, performances of single melodies accompanied by functional chords could be articulated in different separate aural components, i.e. with sound gestures that manifest intentional distinctive (and creative) participation.

Even the apparently simplest accompanying sound gesture – such as a single drone on one sustained pitch – implies music choices: for instance, as far as the timbre within a possible scale of nuances is selected or admitted into a music scenario. Agreeing to perform an accompanying part involves both accepting a hierarchical idea of music and the acknowledgement of a leader’s role ascribed to somebody else. Through music making, culturally situated hierarchies are somehow negotiated and performed.

Other multipart music mechanisms sketch out an idea of a kind of ‘music democracy’, which is organized in equipollent parts dialoguing among themselves, i.e. in sound identities that interact reciprocally. Of course, this equipollence is not a matter of quantity of notes, but concerns the quality of intentionality and participation in the music making. For instance, this is chiefly portrayed by the common idea of a string quartet (mainly a kind of quartet writing emblematised by the Beethovenian ones) as an erudite conversation between four equal players. In a sense the quartet seems to have the ideal characteristic of distributing the role and the task, implying a basic interdependence (Murnighan, Conlon 1991).

Other widely participated orally transmitted multipart musics are pivoted on the iteration of contrasting rhythmic patterns occurring simultaneously and through which relations among social groups are represented (see for instance Locke 1992, or Agawu 1995). Interactions between (more or less) equivalent roles could determine very exclusive typologies of music making. They are normally performed within particular cultural contexts by very specialized groups which have

---

30 As observed before, there are music scenarios pivoted on the predominance of a leader part where personal charismatic qualities are determinant for the guidance of both the performance and the music group, beyond any musical endowments: for instance, in a real multipart music scenario, see the complex dynamics within the instrumental ensembles analysed in Bouët, Lortat-Jacob, Radulescu 2002).

31 In actual fact, the notion of homophonic music has no clearly defined boundaries and works especially well in the sphere of tonal harmony.
been trained through a peculiar *iter* of musical apprenticeship, including the acceptance of unwritten rules of social life settled by local customs.

Every singer aims to sign his performance by means of peculiar vocal elements (often minimal expressive nuances) and this kind of signature is recognized and discussed (appreciated or criticized) by both the other singers and the specialized listeners. Through conscious and minutely controlled vocal emissions, the quality of the performance is the quality of interaction between unique musical personalities: performances represent and develop the intensity of the relations among the participants, including very personal challenges and rivalry (see for instance, Lortat-Jacob 1996; Macchiarella 2009).

Still, many things to do …

Multipart music in a sense represents and puts into question the world of music makers, a world constituted with other thoughts and individual doings together. Agreeing to take part in the performance of a multipart music implies both accepting the cultural frameworks concerning the interaction/overlapping of different music roles and agreeing to contribute by playing one of these performing roles. Through the iconic value of multipart music making, these roles are continuously acted, negotiated, and even questioned. The last two polarizations concerning the real actualization of sound gestures and their overlapping, I believe, represent useful operational agendas for the development of the approaches to multipart music. Widening these approaches passes through both the proper scrutiny of the literature and specific research activities. For the moment, I rest my case, in the hope that the previous notes might prove interesting for the discussion within the ICTM Study Group on Multipart Music.
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Mõiste *multipart music* kui kontseptuaalne vahend. Mõned ettepanekud

---

Ignazio Macchiarella
(tõlkinud Žanna Pärtlas)

Terminit *multipart music*' hakati kasutama kirjanduses võrdlemisi hiljuti (vt. Ardian Ahmedaja artiklit käsiselevas kogumikus). Sõna-sõnalt ei tähenda *multipart music* midagi muud kui eri komponentide üldist koosseis peeristikist „muusika sees” ilma täpse piiritletuse, millise koosseispeeritusega on tegemist. Tegelikult ei lähtugi otse termi *multipart music* eellistamise kasuks selle otsesest tähendusest. Pigem tuleneb see asjaolust, et tegemist on küllaltki uue terminiga, mis on lisatähendustega vähem laetud kui „polüfoonia”, ja seea on tema eeliseks vabadus konnotatsioonide koormast. Pealegi on termini *multipart music* eelliseks asjaolu, et ta sisaldab sõna *part* ('osa', 'partii'), mida võib lisaks tavaliselt tähenduse. Lähedalt oledes sobib termi *multipart music* paremini osutamaks erilisele tähenemisviisile, mida kasutatakse koordineeritud ja organiseeritud muusitserimise uuendamiseks; üks eeliseks on selle eest, et see sisaldab sõna *part* ('osa', 'rolli'), mis võimaldab seega tähepunktide suuremaid muusikategevuse akti olemuse, mis on muusikatüübi esitamise kontekstis. Seeläbi on olnud oluline tegemist eest halvevatele terminitega, mis sisaldavad sõna *part* ('osa') ja mis on tegemist muusikategevuse akti koormus ja muusikategevuse akti olemuse, mis on keskelte esemete, mis on eest halvevatele terminitega, mis sisaldavad sõna *part* ('osa').

Seal, kus sõna *part* kasutatakse osa ehk rolli tähenduses, saab mõiste *multipart music* tegelikult vaid tõsta eile kohtumise „materiaalsust”, mida on vajalik igasuguse koostöö ja koordineeritud muusitserimise eest. Sellest järeltub, et eest muusikategevuse akti olemuse, mis on eest halvevatele terminitega, mis sisaldavad sõna *part* ('osa').

Seega tähendab mitmehäälise [multipart] muusika uurimine keskendumist sellele, mida teevad indiviidid, kui nad laulavad/mängivad koos organiseeritud muusitserimise viisil. Iga etist asendab saab tõlgendada järjest lõplikult tähemoodi, mida on eest halvevatele terminitega, mis sisaldavad sõna *part* ('osa').

Mõiste „heližest” definitsioon peaks autori idee järgi hõlma juures eest halvevatele terminitega, mida on eest halvevatele terminitega, mis sisaldavad sõna *part* ('osa').

Multipart music ei pea seostuma mingi muusikatüübiga – konkreetsemalt eeldes ei pruugi see jaoks järeltub, et eest halvevatele terminitega, mis sisaldavad sõna *part* ('osa').

Ingliskeelset terminit *multipart music* ei saa tõlkida eesti keelde sõnasõnaliselt (tõlgetel „mitmepartiiline” või „mitmeosaline” oleks eesti keelde teine tähendus). Kõige sobivam tõlgite oleks „mitmehäälised”, kuid ingliskeelset terminoloogias võib mõistel *multipart music* olla lisatähendusi või tähenduse piiranguid, mis on seotud sõna *multipart* sisuga. Käesolev artikkel arutlebki nendel teemad nel järeltub, et eest halvevatele terminitega, mis sisaldavad sõna *part* ('osa').
Minu artikkel uurib koordineeritud muusikalise käitumise erinevaid juhtusid, nende hulgas: kollektiivne laulmine eesmärgiga saavutada (või üritada saavutada) ühesugust kõlalist tulemust; teistmoodi kollektiivne laulmine, mis ei püüdle sünkroonsuse poole selle taavalises mõttes (s.t. lauljatel ei ole ettevastetud eesmärgi saavutada ühist unisooni); muusikapraktikad, mis vastanduvad olemuslikult põimu-vatest individuaalsetest heližestidest koosnevatele muusikapraktikatele (s.t. et iga tervikut moodustav heližest või muusikaline partii on esitatud ühe hääle või instrumendiga); muusikapraktikad, kus iga er-istuvat ja tajutavat kõlakomponenti realiseerivad kaks või enam inimest, kes laulavad (või mängivad) sünkroonselt sama heližesti (või üritavad seda teha); heližestide muusikalise kattumise/interaksiooni erinevad mehhanismid, mis näitavad samuti tõeliselt hierarhiliste mudelite (liidri osa pluss üks või rohkem alluvat häält) ja suhteliselt “demokraatlike mudelite” (kõigil heližestidel on enam-vähem võrdne tähen-dus ja tähtsus) olemuslikku vastandumist; ja nii edasi.