UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

"Walking like a crab"

Analyzing Maskanda Music in Post-Apartheid South Africa

Titus, B.

DOI

[10.5406/ethnomusicology.57.2.0286](https://doi.org/10.5406/ethnomusicology.57.2.0286)

Publication date

2013

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Ethnomusicology

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Titus, B. (2013). "Walking like a crab": Analyzing Maskanda Music in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Ethnomusicology*, 57(2), 286-310. <https://doi.org/10.5406/ethnomusicology.57.2.0286>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

“Walking Like a Crab”: Analyzing *Maskanda* Music in Post-Apartheid South Africa

BARBARA TITUS / Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Abstract. This article addresses a South African music genre: *maskanda*, often marketed as “Zulu blues.” It describes the various ways *maskanda* is musically analyzed and interpreted by musicians, audiences, producers, and scholars, including myself. By treating music analysis as a form of participant observation (and indigenizing my own analytical conventions) the article aims, foremostly, to foster a cross-cultural dialogue about musical experiences (hearings) and the practices of finding words for these experiences (conceptualizations). Music analysis as participant observation also sheds light on local historiographies, critiques, and structural analyses of *maskanda*, and it bridges the artificial academic dichotomy of object-related observation (music analysis) and discourse-related theorization (cultural analysis) that still impairs much music research.

What do ethnomusicologists participate in when they research music through participant observation? As defined by Christopher Small’s term “musicking” (1987:13, 1998), it can range from hearing, playing, singing, dancing, and performing music to organizing, publishing, broadcasting, analyzing, and criticizing it. Still, participant observation in music analysis and music criticism as social practices remains rare.¹ With this article I provide an account of my analytical participation in *maskanda*, a South African music genre, often marketed as “Zulu blues.”² In doing so, I treat *maskanda* both as a performance practice and as an intellectual activity. I noted that musicians, audiences, producers, and scholars (*maskanda* musickers) framed *maskanda* in divergent and sometimes contradictory ways within the span of a few sentences. The interpretation of *maskanda* as Zulu traditional music (Rycroft 1977; Davies 1992; Miya 9 October 2008; Shiyani

Ngcobo 12 August 2009; Nkwanyana and Khoza 23 September 2009; Ngwekazi 22 September 2009; Nzimande 23 September 2009) was prominent. Just as important were the explanations of maskanda as a contemporary expression of a “black Atlantic” consciousness (Gilroy 1993) actively responding to R&B, hip-hop, and gospel (Ngwekazi 22 September 2009; Nzimande 23 September 2009; Olsen 2009; Majozi 7 July 2011), or as Pan-African music (Nkwanyana and Khoza 23 September 2009). Several musicians specified maskanda as their own individual invention (Shiyani Ngcobo 5 August 2009; Kunene 29 August 2008), while others generalized it as music for everyone (B. Ngcobo 23 September 2009). All these maskanda musickers substantiated their framings with music analytical conceptualizations of their listening experiences.

My participation in this analytical discourse serves the primary aim of the present essay: to foster a cross-cultural dialogue about musical experiences (hearings) and, notably, the practices of finding words for these experiences (conceptualizations). The disparate practices of what could be called “finding words for what you hear” shed light on the manifold ways in which meaning can be attributed to music. In a necessarily ethnocentric account I confront my conceptualizations of my aural experiences with those of other maskanda musickers, revealing that music analysis is a culturally specific social practice rather than a transcendental capacity to objectively dissect a unit into parts. In order to expose my participation in the conceptualization of aural experiences among maskanda musickers, I use and renegotiate analytical categories and notational conventions derived from my indigenous (but also hegemonic) musical frame of reference, which includes elements such as tonality, form, meter, texture, and staff notation.

Building on Kofi Agawu’s postcolonial notes (2003), I argue that “analysis [of African musics] matters because, through it, we observe at close range the workings of African musical minds” even though “it minimizes certain forms of cultural knowledge, and . . . principally rewards the ability to take apart and discover or invent modes of internal relating” (ibid.:196–97). Agawu suggests that precisely this “discovery and invention of modes of internal relating” enables a dialogue between researcher and researched and exposes the (ideological) terms on which comparisons are made between musical genres, styles, techniques, and cultural traditions. Agawu and Jean Ngoya Kidula observe an absence of such dialogue in Africanist musicology, resulting in a musical scholarship that is decidedly uncritical, which reinforces the marginalization and exoticism of the music it undertakes to represent (Agawu 2003:61; Kidula 2006:109).

Music analysis as a way of participating in maskanda is relevant in several other respects. Firstly, it sheds light on local historiographies, critiques, and structural analyses of maskanda. Thus, it intends to compensate for the scholarly tendency (identified by, among others, Scherzinger 2001:6ff, Agawu 2003:20,

Pyper 2005:166–67, Kidula 2006, and myself in Titus 2008:45) to regard “the musics of Africa more as artifact than art” (Kidula 2006:105), as if they are not accompanied by indigenous critical discourses.³ Secondly, it enables the combination of micro and macro levels of cultural analysis, showing how object-related observation (the close reading of musical structure) is embedded in discourse-related theorization (the interpretation of musical culture). As such this essay attempts to surpass what Martin Scherzinger calls the “(false) dichotomy . . . between music’s formal autonomous aspect and its socio-contextual one” (2001:10ff) that still characterizes much musicological research.

Music analysis as a way of participating in maskanda is also deeply problematic. The account of my participation laid down here privileges and even centralizes my listening experience, my ability to “invent modes of internal relating” (Agawu 2003:197), and my tools and conventions for conceptualizing this experience and ability. Thus, this essay may be read as an old-fashioned articulation of my Self against the background of subaltern Others: music analysis as exoticism. I have struggled with this and realized that I do not want to run away from this situation. There is a staggering inequality in the opportunities for the various maskanda musickers to foreground their musical experiences. Pretending that this inequality has not always been part of music analysis as social practice is the worst way of fighting it. In its ethnocentrism this essay is hence also an attempt to expose this inequality, with the hope and intention that it will diminish or vanish through a reciprocal (if initially imbalanced or asymmetrical) exchange of analytical knowledge and critical dialogue. Such dialogue can only commence when all participants, including myself, are explicit and honest about their analytical and critical starting points. Thus, this article is a deconstructivist ethnography of my own (Eurogenic) music analytical background as much as it is of maskanda discourse.

The analytical focus of this essay will be a musical practice that maskanda musickers describe as a prominent feature of the genre: call-and-response. It is conceptualized as a texture, a performance practice, a didactic tool, and a starting point for composition. Call-and-response is also prominent as a rhetorical concept among maskanda musickers, fraught with stereotypes of Pan-Africanism, primitivism, and collectivism, and bolstering claims on heritage, tradition, and identity. Through its analytical, performative, didactic, political, and metaphorical applications, the practice/concept shows the inextricability of structural close-reading and cultural analysis, addressing text and context simultaneously.⁴ Since the idea of call-and-response features in discourses about many musics worldwide,⁵ both as a musical practice and as a rhetorical tool, it is a suitable practice/concept to use to discuss the divergent—and sometimes contradictory—ways in which maskanda is analyzed, criticized, and interpreted.

Conceptualizing Music

Maskanda, the Zulu pronunciation of the Afrikaans word *musikant* (musician), emerged in the early twentieth century from the condition of the South African labor migrant system. Hundreds of thousands of people were forced to exchange their rural existence for work in cities and mines, but since black people were not allowed to settle in urban areas, they moved back and forth between their villages and the towns. Maskanda emerged in this space in between village and town. Lodged in urban hostels, workers encountered languages, customs, belief systems, and musical conventions from all over southern Africa, as well as popular musics broadcast on the radio and instruments such as the guitar, concertina, and violin. All these musical experiences were reworked in maskanda performance. Initially, maskanda performance entailed the songs of individual labor migrants plucking their guitars on their long commute from home to work, singing about the events they encountered on the way.⁶ It also encompassed fierce guitar, dance, and rap competitions in the hostels. Currently, maskanda is primarily studio produced, with a mainstream pop band format (guitar, bass, drums) complemented by concertina and dancers performing traditional *ngoma* dance routines. Maskanda can be heard throughout urban areas in KwaZulu-Natal and Gauteng, with Durban (eThekweni) and Johannesburg (eGoli) being the historical cradles of the genre which is consumed as local pop music in shopping malls and taxis, at cultural events and political rallies, and in many other public spaces.

Maskanda musickers are, each in their own way, extremely outspoken about maskanda as Zulu traditional music, with the awareness of Zulu identity and tradition being one of the more controversial issues in the social and political arena of post-apartheid South Africa. Ethnomusicologists, predominantly South Africans, have written several thorough reports, published and unpublished, on maskanda's rootedness in earlier Zulu musical practices (Rycroft 1977; Clegg 1981; Davies 1992; Nhlapo 1998; Collins 2006/2007). Its status as a genre, however, is determined by rather divergent musical characteristics, and the attribution of those features is often informed by ideological or political motivations. A number of recent South African publications carefully deconstruct these motivations, exposing the role of maskanda in the articulation of a Zulu identity in apartheid and post-apartheid South Africa (Muller 1999; Olsen 2000; Coplan 2002; Olsen 2009). This literature builds on the earlier accounts of maskanda's rootedness in Zulu musics in that it regards these accounts as research subjects in themselves, and attempts to unearth their extra-musical motivations. Whereas the reports on maskanda's musical roots pay limited attention to the researcher's position in the representation of the genre's musical features, the

deconstructivist literature provides little musical detail to substantiate its interpretation of maskanda as a constructed aspect of an invented Zulu tradition.⁷ Thus, there seems to be a gap between these two strands in maskanda research, the former focusing on musical analysis (object-related observation) and the latter focusing on cultural analysis (discourse-related theorization). This reflects a similar dichotomy in the musicologies at large, still distinguishing between musical texts and contexts (also observed by Agawu [2006] and Solis [2012]).

Coming from Europe, with a Ph.D. on nineteenth-century German music criticism (Titus 2005), I was largely unfamiliar with maskanda when I started my fieldwork research. Soon I noticed a discrepancy between what I knew about maskanda and what I was able to hear in it. This discrepancy decreased only very slowly, making me aware of the difference between my conceptual and aural understanding of music. Knowing that maskanda was a hybrid music did not make me hear it as a hybrid music. My aural experience of maskanda was colored by personal familiarity with mainly Western tonal music: with reflexive expectations of triadic harmony and an unequivocal beat, all I could hear was the alternation of two or three chords in steady $\frac{4}{4}$ meter. Despite knowing what my South African colleagues could hear apart from these features, I took years to develop an ear for maskanda. By reporting on my process of aural adjustment, I show how conceptual identifications of techniques, styles, genres, histories, or compositional rules are mutually dependent with aural frames of reference.

Two examples elucidate this process of adjustment. The first example is the distinction between *isiZulu* and *isiShameni* styles in maskanda practice, which took me years to fathom aurally. Maskanda practice is often likened to language or speech; for instance, different styles of maskanda are indicated with the prefix *isi-* (*isiShameni* style, *isiMandolini* style), just as languages are: *isiZulu*, *isiDashi* (Dutch), *isiNgesi* (English). It is possible to explain the difference between musical styles in terms of tonal material (Dlamini 4 July 2011), the choreography of the maskandi's hands on the guitar (Collins 2006/2007:5), or dance routines (Davies 1992:214; Dlamini 4 July 2011). Adjacent and substyles (such as *Umsanzi*, *isiManje-manje*, *isiGupu*) make categorization by means of clear-cut features a hazardous endeavor. My explanation here is necessarily determined by the conceptual tools that emerge from my own aural frame of reference—European classical music and mainstream popular music—which might result in some maskandi disagreeing with my intellectual identification of the styles' distinctive features. Aurally, however, there is little chance at disagreement in distinguishing *isiZulu* from *isiShameni* styles, once one is tuned into the musical style.⁸

Songs in *isiZulu* style (not to be confused with *isiZulu* with reference to Zulu language) and adjacent styles rest on a hexatonic or pentatonic scale arising from the alternation of two fundamentals a minor or major second apart, with their

respective harmonic partials as points of reference. The traditional gourd-bow practice from which this tonal material is said to be derived will be the subject of later discussion. isiShameni practice, by contrast, is quasi-diatonic in applying an ostinato progression of I–IV–V–I, also often heard in the more urban *mbaqanga* and *isicathamiya* genres.⁹ In maskanda, the operative tonal framework becomes immediately apparent in the introductory *isihlabo* of a song: a preluding run, often descending, through the tonal material on the guitar. The differences in style, however, are defined as much by dance routines as by tonal consciousness; more constrained, stepwise paces are reserved for (urban) isiShameni style, while isiZulu-related styles feature vicious kicks that also emerge in ngoma dance (Rycroft 1977; Dlamini 4 July 2011). It took me a while to discern the pentatonism in isiZulu songs, since their texture (to be discussed later) enabled me to mentally fill in those tones that allowed me to hear them in the heptatonic scale with which I am familiar. Distinguishing isiZulu from isiShameni style was only possible once I knew that isiZulu was non-heptatonic, and I then had to unlearn my heptatonic aural framework as well as my aural assumption of harmonic rhythm and direction.

Another concept that exposed the frictions between my aural experience and those of many maskandi was the word “tuning,” which seemed synonymous to “tune” (Miya 9 October 2008; Shiyani Ngcobo October 2008; Ntuli 22 September 2009). At first, I assumed the maskandi struggled with the English language. Only later did I realize that my confusion emerged from my limited aural understanding of maskanda. I knew that maskanda guitar tuning deviates from standard guitar tuning (E–A–D–G–B–E): usually, the upper E string is tuned down to a D, but many maskandi adopt alternative tunings which they consider to be their own. I also knew that various songs of one maskandi are often based on the same two fundamentals with their harmonic partials. The songs I learned from maskandi S’kho Miya were all based on the descending scale g–f–d–c–b flat, but it took me time to learn and hear that she treats her tonal material as (often descending) motives rather than as a scale or a mode. What I would call a scale is Miya’s tuning as well as her tune.

This slow adaptation of my ear to maskanda’s peculiarities was valuable, because it unearthed a clash between my listening experiences and those of other maskanda musickers. This clash revealed that my aural and intellectual understandings of maskanda were sometimes interdependent and at other times completely disjunct. My intellectual understanding of maskanda highlighted its hybridity and unclassifiability, whereas my aural understanding, by contrast, was shaped by the inherited indigenous musico-intellectual categories I used to aurally grasp the unfamiliar sounds I encountered. By acknowledging and theorizing about my own propensity toward categorical cultural listening and thinking, I intend to bridge the discursive gap between, on the one hand, scholars’

deconstructivist theorizations of maskanda and, on the other, musicians' framings of the genre as an unquestioned marker of their identity. Especially in the South African context, a dialogue between these two maskanda discourses is much needed. A prime concern of post-apartheid South African music scholarship—reflected in research by David Coplan (2002), Louise Meintjes (2003), Carol Muller (1999, 2004) and Kathryn Olsen (2000, 2009), among others—has been the deconstruction of the legacies of apartheid ideology that still strive to establish purist cultural categories. These authors unearth the commercial exploitation that accompanies consumers' quest (both in South Africa and elsewhere) for "authentic" cultural expressions (see also Taylor 1997:21–31). Maskanda musicians, by contrast, adhere to categories not only out of economic desperation, but also because they aurally perceive these categories, as do their audiences. It is this aspect of hearing—and, by implication, the conceptualization of such hearing—that I want to bring to the fore.¹⁰

Call-and-Response I: Representing the Voices

In August 2008, I started my fieldwork research, aiming to reveal whether—and if so, how—maskanda has been affected by its recent exposure to global audiences. I got in touch with maskandi Shiyani Ngcobo (1956–2011), who taught maskanda guitar in the Community Arts Project of the University of KwaZulu-Natal, where I was employed as a visiting lecturer. I decided to take guitar lessons from him in order to familiarize myself with him and his music. I was delighted to be able to work with Ngcobo, because he had made a number of successful international tours in the United States, Europe, and Asia. In 2004, he released a CD in the World Music Network *Introducing* Series produced by Ben Mandelson (Ngcobo 2004). His music and experiences would provide an excellent opportunity for me to investigate the exchange of aesthetic expectations between northern hemisphere audiences and Zulu musicians. In the period of seven months that Ngcobo taught me maskanda guitar on a weekly basis, the lessons gradually turned into an aim in themselves. They enabled me to engage with the practical and structural aspects of maskanda music, which turned out to be indispensable to my understanding of it.

What struck me most in Shiyani Ngcobo's demonstration and explanation of his music was the antiphonal manner in which he related to his guitar. "It is the guitar that speaks," he told me in one of my lessons. When I asked him how he knew what the guitar was saying, he mildly laughed at my ignorance. "Because I tell it what it should say," he replied (21 October 2008). Ngcobo elaborated on his conception of his guitar in one of my last lessons. He said I had progressed so much that I should start composing myself. He gave me very detailed and stern instructions about how I should do this. He prepared me by saying it would

not be an easy process. “You have to sit on your own, quietly, where nobody can disturb you.” This was something he often urged me to do, also for practicing. He told me that “the fingers do things and you have to listen: what are the fingers doing? What does it say? You can find words with the sounds the fingers make. For instance, you have the words: ‘ekhaya’ (home) and ‘Sawubona’ (Hello). Then you have to reflect: now what do these words mean? Which other words come with these words? Then you have to imagine how the audience will respond to those words and to those sounds, for instance by saying ‘Ninjani?’ (How are you?). This response you also have to incorporate in your song. A good song is featured by all this.” (7 October 2009)

With maskanda practice often being likened to speech, it is not surprising that Ngcobo referred to spoken dialogue in order to make his point.¹¹ The elaborate Zulu greeting formula: “Sawubona (Hello)—Yebo, sawubona (Yes, hello)—Ninjani? (How are you?)—Ng/Siyaphila (I am/We are fine). Wena unjani? (And what about you?)—Ngisaphila nami (I am also fine)” always precedes the start of a conversation, even when only asking directions in passing. In referring to this salutation formula, Ngcobo might have wanted to illustrate that some words (or sounds) inevitably need certain other words or sounds in response in order to make sense. One simply never utters a greeting without expecting one in return. Crucial in this respect is that Ngcobo consciously incorporated this into the composition process, imagining, anticipating and allowing for a group of people outside himself who would respond to his sounds. Whether this would occur in the actual performance or be represented or replaced by voices in the composition seems of secondary importance.

There are various levels of dialogue, or call-and-response, in Ngcobo’s instructions. First, there is the interaction between the sound the fingers make and the words the composer connects to them. Second, there is the interaction between (the words of) the composer and the response by the (imagined) audience, people, or congregation. Ngcobo’s instructions use the idea of call-and-response as a structural device in a holistic conception of music in which performer and audience, performance and composition, and musical sounds and text (“lyrics”) are not strictly separated. That being said, his instructions could easily apply to any music making in the world, ranging from Pérotin to Amy Winehouse to Javanese gamelan. In fact, it is difficult to imagine music that is not dependent on some form of antiphonal practice or idea. The particularity of his instructions as a maskanda practice became clear to me only once I talked to other maskandi, who consciously presented maskanda as a continuation of an existing Zulu musical tradition rather than an imitation of Western musics.

Very informative, in this respect, was my conversation with maskanda guitarist Bongani Nkwanyana and jazz guitarist Bheki Khoza, who offered a subtle and concise account of maskanda as Zulu traditional music, centered around

the idea of call-and-response (Nkwanyana and Khoza 23 September 2009). Both guitarists have successful national careers in their respective maskanda and jazz domains, combining musicianship with producing, teaching, and advisory functions. Crucial in their explanation was the distance (both temporal and spatial) they observed between urban Zulu and what they called “deep” Zulu culture. Deep Zulu culture embodies everything that predates the displacement that emerged from the forced labor migrancy of the twentieth century, and it has normative implications for almost every Zulu South African I talked to. Differences between urban and deep Zulu emerge in linguistic idiom, rituals, values, social etiquette, and musical conventions (Hadebe 20 August 2008; Selby Ngcobo 4 October 2008; Nokwe 18 August 2009; Miya 5 July 2011). The perceived gap between colonial and pre-colonial culture is deepened through an explicit separation of rural and urban experiences that emerged from the perennial commute between town hostels and villages. Up to this day, most black people in South Africa have a place to stay in town, which is seldom their home, and a real home (*ekhaya*) which is invariably in the countryside. This situation is emblematic of how contemporary Zulu South Africans consider themselves removed from their authentic heritage. One of the reasons why maskanda is so popular is its presentation of allegedly deep Zulu musical conventions clad in an urban musical format. This is a much-rehearsed truism in all maskanda literature. I would like to illustrate it by discussing call-and-response as a musical practice and rhetorical tool that constructs maskanda as an urban and contemporary reference to deep Zulu heritage. Ingrid Monson’s musical theorization of Henry Louis Gates’s term “signifyin’” (1996:103), to be discussed later, is a useful tool for clarifying maskanda’s referential capacities.

Nkwanyana and Khoza explicitly stated that maskanda, as an urban music, is not “real Zulu music,” but nevertheless refers to the deep Zulu practice of *amahubo*. *Amahubo*, plural of *ihubo*, are a cappella choral (dance) songs for a range of specific functions: prayers for events such as funerals, initiations, weddings, child births, and war. David Rycroft reports that *amahubo* are considered to be “the highest form of musical activity” (1977:225) in Zulu culture, with a distinct antiphonal structure of lead singer and responding chorus. Nkwanyana and Khoza made it clear, however, that maskanda does not refer directly to *amahubo*. Rather, maskanda guitar practice has striking technical and structural similarities with *umakhweyana* practice. The *umakhweyana* is a gourd bow with one divided string and a calabash for resonance. The string is beaten with a thin wooden branch and can be stopped with a finger. The three tones that are thus produced serve as fundamentals for overtones that emerge from the resonator. Higher partials can be heard when the calabash is open, while lower harmonics come through when the higher ones are muffled by holding

the resonator against one's chest. By adjusting the position of the calabash, the umakhweyana player is able to construct barely audible melodies composed of overtones. Similar intricate overtone melodies are played on a mouth bow, indicated in Zulu language with the onomatopoeic name *isitorotoro*.

Many publications about maskanda state that the people who encountered guitars and concertinas in the cities used these instruments to conjure up the sounds they knew from the umakhweyana and the isitorotoro (Rycroft 1977:216; Clegg 1981:5; Davies 1992:214; Collins 2006/2007:1–2; Olsen 2009:44).¹² Nkwanyana and Khoza confirmed this.¹³ They asserted that Western guitar playing practices predominantly rest on strumming (*ukuvamba*), whereas maskandi increasingly adopted a picking style (*ukupika*) which better approached the melodic contours of the umakhweyana and isitorotoro harmonics. Khoza illustrated this with an anecdote, situating himself in between Zulu traditional and Western metropolitan practices in his capacity as a Zulu jazz guitarist:

When I started playing guitar, my grandmother used to play the jewish harp [his term; the interview was conducted in English] . . . My grandmother was a master of that who happened to be our baby sitter at home. When I started playing guitar, of course, I was more attracted towards pop . . . so I was vamping, and my grandmother, she said: “the way you are playing, you are like a crab. You know, a crab walks this way [makes a clumsy side-way movement] . . . You are just going this side and not coming back.” . . . And I looked at her and said: “You don’t know anything about guitar. What are you telling me?” She said: “You are playing one-way. Kwang, kwang, kwang. You are walking like a crab.” That is what Bongani [Nkwanyana] is saying: . . . vamping was not representing the voices. (Nkwanyana and Khoza 23 September 2009)

Nkwanyana and Khoza explicitly specified “the representation of the voices” as call-and-response, “where I call with my first, second, and third strings and respond with the sixth, fifth, and fourth strings.”¹⁴ They elaborated on the wide adherence to call-and-response as an African communal way of music making: “[Maskanda] is not made for one person. It is made for everyone . . . It’s like communal speaking . . . The Zulu music . . . most of the African music, is like call-and-response” (Nkwanyana and Khoza 23 September 2009).

Call-and-Response II: Picking Overtones

As stated earlier, Bongani Nkwanyana and Bheki Khoza’s account has been documented in literature, but the full implications of their idea of call-and-response as a structural device and rhetorical concept only became clear to me when I visited maskanda guitarist Josefa (Joe) Nkwanyana in the village of Mandeni near Tugela River in northern KwaZulu-Natal. Joe Nkwanyana toured internationally (in Norway, France, and Mozambique) and had his 1984 album *Ngihamba*

noMngani produced by Hamilton Nzimande, who operated at the center of the national music industry. His career was cut short by an illness that forced him to move back to his parents in rural Zululand and grow vegetables. "The guitar has not been fair to me," Joe Nkwanyana sighed (20 October 2009).¹⁵ During the afternoon I spent with him and his family, Joe Nkwanyana stated that he had matured musically thanks to his mother, who was seated just within earshot of our conversation. She was a master on *umakhweyana* and *isitorotoro*, exactly those instruments that Bongani Nkwanyana and Bheki Khoza had identified as seminal for the *maskanda* sound. It took some effort to persuade Joe's mother to play for us—as Rycroft already observed in the 1960s, traditional musical instruments have a very low social status among many South Africans—but eventually Mrs. Nkwanyana agreed with much pleasure to play both instruments.

When she accompanied her singing on the *umakhweyana*, Joe started playing along on his guitar, filtering out the harmonics that otherwise remain barely audible (Figure 1). The lower two fundamentals of the bow (*g#* and *a*) offer the tonal material for the song through their harmonic partials, with *e* (the third partial of fundamental *a*) as a reciting tone for the solo singer and the guitar highlighting overtones in a high register, resulting in a descending hexatonic scale: *e–d#–c#–b–a–g#*. Apart from articulating the distinctive tonal material, Joe Nkwanyana's playing was a forceful demonstration of the roots of *maskanda*'s distinctive heterophonic texture (to be discussed later), substantiating Bongani Nkwanyana and Bheki Khoza's account of it as a continuation of Zulu musical heritage rather than as a response to Western guitar styles, as I was still hearing it.

Although Nkwanyana and Khoza were emphatic about the rootedness of *umakhweyana* and *maskanda* practices in *amahubo* singing, they did not specify this in their explanation. The referential qualities of *umakhweyana* practice to *amahubo* are documented, however, in the literature. Central to this reference is the idea of call-and-response that forms the basis for much, if not all, *amahubo*. Angela Impey, in her thesis about Zulu bow music, paraphrases Rycroft's explanation of this:

[In unaccompanied choral singing] there are always at least two voice-parts which normally carry non-identical texts and melodies. The music is characterized by staggered voice entry points ("non-simultane[a]ous" entry) which form a call-and-response, or antiphonal structure. The basic scheme of this form is as follows: an initiatory, or "call," voice (which is generally a solo voice and high in pitch) is balanced some bars later by a chorus, or "response," voice part (which is lower in pitch range). In any antiphonal song, a sequence of phrase-pairs (these may range from two to seven pairs) will make up a single strophe which is repeated for as long as is wished. While the chorus voice-part normally remains constant throughout the piece, the leading voice solo will add variations to the "call" phrase, but will always remain within the temporal and tonal limits of the initial phrase. (1983:13)

Figure 1. Mrs. Nkwanyana, Cradle song. *umakhweyana* ostinato with Mrs. Nkwanyana's voice part and the "highlighting" of harmonic partials by Joe Nkwanyana's guitar playing.

Cradle Song

Mrs Nkwanyana

The musical score is presented in two systems. The first system contains three staves: Voice, Umakhweyana, and Acoustic Guitar. The Voice staff shows a melody starting with a triplet of eighth notes. The Umakhweyana staff features a continuous, rhythmic ostinato. The Acoustic Guitar staff provides harmonic support with chords and single notes. The second system contains two staves: Umakh. and Ac. Gtr. The Umakh. staff continues the ostinato, and the Ac. Gtr. staff continues the harmonic support.

Both Impey (1983) and Rycroft (1977) explain how this texture also underlies *umakhweyana* practice, stating that

The role of the gourd-bow can in fact be seen to be like that of the vocal chorus, and while playing this form of self-accompaniment on the bow, the singer assumes the position of “leader,” singing in antiphonal relation to his simulated “chorus.” The projection into the instrument, therefore, is not that of the singer himself, but of an imaginary group external to himself, which he brings to expression through his musical bow, and against which he can set his vocal creativity. (Rycroft 1977:225)

Thus, the structural similarities between *umakhweyana* practice and *amahuho* encompass 1) the bow providing an ostinato phrase comparable to the constant (although not always continuous) chorus voice-part; 2) one or more

“singers”/parts joining in at a later point (staggered entries); and 3) an overlapping relationship between solo and chorus phrases (228). Impey states, however, that the bow part, though it does provide the tonal foundation, is seldom identical to the chorus voice part, since chorus “responses” are not continuous in traditional vocal polyphony, and the struck ostinato in bow playing is usually so rapid that it is unlikely to have been derived from vocal phrases (Impey 1983:14).

All the sources I consulted had their own specific motivations for pointing out the stylistic similarities between amahubo, umakhweyana, and “urbanized Zulu musics.” Rycroft wrote his essay about “Evidence of Stylistic Continuity in Zulu ‘Town’ Music” in 1977, within a scholarly discourse that (even outside apartheid South Africa) still valued stylistic purism. Urban musics were regarded as corrupted, westernized practices embodying an irretrievable loss of heritage. His essay was meant to counter this accusation, but was nevertheless concerned with sketching a continuity in the urban practices he observed. Nkwanyana and Khoza, too, were concerned with sketching continuity in Zulu musical traditions (amahubo—umakhweyana—maskanda), emphasizing that maskanda is not an attempt at imitating Western musics. The metaphor of the crab, clumsily walking sideways, unable to switch direction, is a particularly illuminating representation of Western music, especially because it comes from an authority on Zulu tradition: Khoza’s grandmother. Nkwanyana and Khoza consciously oppose Western guitar playing to the intricate exchange of voices (call-and-response) featured in Zulu musical tradition. Their use of the phrase “deep Zulu” and their emphasis on call-and-response as a Pan-African musical practice further elucidate their framing of call-and-response as a meaningful musical idea.

Call-and-Response III: Private Dialogue

In order to reveal how I learned to hear maskanda as Zulu traditional music, I offer my own analysis, with special focus on the musical idea of call-and-response, of Ngcobo’s song “Siyafunda” (We are learning), which he taught me and which he released on his 2010 CD *Shiyani Ngcobo Featuring Njabulo Shabalala*, with *djembe* player Njabulo Shabalala. I am aware that by assessing the song’s reflection of the practices of call-and-response observed by Rycroft, Impey, Nkwanyana, and Khoza, I might reify the claim that maskanda is “deeply rooted in older forms of Zulu music” (Davies 1992:207). My participation in the construction of maskanda as a Zulu musical practice, however, is not an uncritical one, but is consciously aimed at demonstrating how call-and-response functions as a meaningful musical idea to maskanda musickers: those who perform, debate, and scrutinize this music and provide it with a strong connotative (“signifyin”; see below) power with respect to the “deep Zulu culture” that has been deconstructed in existing literature about maskanda and adjoining genres (Coplan 1993:306; Olsen 2000:10; Meintjes 2003:174–216).

My aim, rather than to deconstruct those connotations as “invented traditions” or “imagined communities,” is to treat them as sources of musical knowledge about maskanda in their own right that can be confronted and combined with *my* connotations, which emerge from my own (changing) aural frame of reference. By reporting on this confrontation and combination I am able to talk in detail about the emergence of musical meaning in both aural and conceptual respects. My attempt to address maskanda’s connotative capacities has been inspired by Ingrid Monson’s musical theorization of Henry Louis Gates’s term “signifyin” (Monson 1996:103). I treat call-and-response as an “intermusical” practice with ideas, techniques, and customs that emerge and re-emerge, and are linked, disconnected, and combined in performances, broadcasts, recordings, audience perception, and critiques, thus fostering “the development of culturally variable meanings and ideologies that inform the interpretation” of music in society (ibid.:3). Monson argues that “[i]ntermusical relationships are not merely of theoretical interest; they are also an important aspect of how musicians talk and think about communicating in music.” (ibid.:128)

The musical preconception of antiphonal voices can be said to determine maskanda’s form, texture, and tonal realm in many respects. Like a gourd bow player, Shiyani Ngcobo incorporates lead call and “chorus” responses in his composition that can be executed by one man and his guitar. He describes the sounds produced by the guitar as an “imaginary group external to himself” (Rycroft 1977:225)—“what are the fingers doing?” “how will the audience respond?” (Ngcobo 7 October 2009)—but his composition surpasses the idea of a straightforward call by the lead singer alternated with a response by the guitar. I discovered this gradually through my lessons. Since my guitar playing skills were nonexistent when I started my lessons with Ngcobo, he made me start with riffs that had been stripped of their melodic elaborations, bringing them back to the two fundamentals with easy fingerings around them. As I progressed I was allowed to add notes in different pitch ranges, which to me sounded like different voices with staggered entries. Figure 2 demonstrates the heterophonic texture of Ngcobo’s song “Siyafunda” as he taught it to me, with the different layers or “voices” I was allowed to add to my playing as I progressed. The material, consisting of a descending pentatonic scale (f#–e#–c#–b–a#), is centered around c# and b as fundamentals and their respective harmonics, with an absent fifth partial (d#) of the fundamental b, and with the third partial (g#) of the fundamental c# replaced by a#. All “voices” draw from this material in intervallic structure and melodic direction. They are discernable through their different entry points, different pitch ranges, and/or rhythmic diminutions represented in the phrases A, B, and C.

In many ways, this texture resembles the umakhweyana song performed by Mrs. Nkwanyana (see Figure 1). The lead voice in Figure 1 is echoed and melodically enriched in the guitar “response,” which highlights the harmonic partials of the umakhweyana resonator, a process explained by Rycroft as a simulation of

Figure 2. Shiyani Ngcobo, “Siyafunda.” Various vocal and instrumental layers or “voices.”

Siyafunda

Shiyani Ngcobo

Acoustic Guitar

Riff/Refrain

A

B

C

Call

2010 Shiyani Ngcobo

choral responses in amahubo (1977:225). Similarly, in Ngcobo’s “Siyafunda” in Figure 2, the phrases A, B, and C (present both in the guitar and Ngcobo’s singing) are variations on the Call phrase, remaining “within its temporal and tonal limits,” which Impey identified as a structural feature of amahubo singing (1983:13). As demonstrated in Figure 2, “Siyafunda” starts with an f#, the fifth (third partial) of the fundamental b (first system of Figure 2: Riff). The Riff phrase is symmetrical and includes an antiphonal gesture, with the antecedent “two eighth-notes and one quarter-note” movement repeated at a lower pitch. This is the structural skeleton of the song that functions both as an ostinato in the guitar and as the “response” that Ngcobo sings to his own lead voice. In groove (represented here as sixteenth notes) and motivic arrangement (descending tones and semitones) it is an elaboration of the umakhweyana ostinato shown in Figure 1.

The main material of the lead voice encompasses a high-pitched call on the f# (Call), the third partial of the fundamental b, recalling Mrs. Nkwanyana’s

Figure 3. Shiyani Ngcobo, “Siyafunda.” Formal lay-out of vocal part, revealing call-and-response in the alternation between “lead voice” (with Call, B and C material) and “response voice” (with Refrain/Riff material).

recitation on the third partial (e) of the fundamental a in the umakhweyana song. As in amahubo, the recitation is the starting material of the lead voice, a call in quite a literal sense, featuring an ascending leap (in this case a sixth), a sustained reciting tone, and a descending leap. This arched melodic shape has rhythmic drive only in its lower-pitched start and finish. Other important lead voice material, represented in both the guitar texture and in the phrases of the singer, are Phrases A, B, and C, all set against the ostinato riff, with Phrase C running through the entire pentatonic scale and including the riff in rhythmic diminution and a higher octave.

The idea of call-and-response performed by one man is enhanced by the contrast in pitch and the organization of the lyrics. The Call phrase (not represented in the guitar) and phrases A, B, and C stay a fifth to a thirteenth above the fundamentals in the Riff phrase, which carries contrasting lyrics as a refrain or “chorus response,” something Impey observed as a structural aspect of amahubo singing. The “lead voice” sings variations on the text “Siyafunda kuyogcina thina” (We are learning and we will get there), whereas the “response voice” (the riff) has the text “Sizinkani kuyogcina thina” (By force we will make it). Because the responsorial riff is present as an ostinato in the guitar, it “responds” in a quite continuous way to the Call phrase and its A, B, and C elaborations, while also overlapping them as in amahubo singing. Figure 3 shows how the formal lay-out of the vocal part is determined by call-and-response interaction.

Conclusion: Situating Maskanda Aurally

The metaphor of the “walking crab,” coined by Bheki Khoza’s grandmother to describe the lack of reciprocity in the texture of Western guitar playing, could easily characterize the music analytical endeavors in (equally Western) ethnomusicology.¹⁶ There have been numerous analytical calls (i.e., analyses, particularly of musics considered indigenous and traditional) emerging from this discourse, but there has not been much attention paid to indigenous analytical responses to these calls. The hesitance to intellectually engage with indigenous analytical knowledge may emerge from the fear that the confrontation with analytical

Others undermines the universalist pretensions of music analysis. Quite a different reason for this hesitance could be the fear that this confrontation thrives on asymmetries of power in cross-cultural intellectual exchange, asymmetries that are difficult to reconcile with a self-proclaimed postcolonial ethnomusicology. Both hazards—the undermining of a universalist music analysis and an unbalanced cross-cultural intellectual exchange—have emerged in this essay, and they illustrate the fraught relationship between music analysis and ethnomusicology as academic disciplines. A discursive alternative to the evasive “walking crab,” in the form of a more dialogical “representation of analytical voices,” has compelled me to raise my own analytical voice and culturally locate myself. From a postcolonial scholarly perspective, this is both problematic and insightful.

In order to be able to articulate what I hear, I have distinguished various aims and dimensions in the antiphony of Shiyani Ngcobo’s “Siyafunda”: compositional, didactic, textural and formal. I have suggested that call-and-response is a compositional idea. Ngcobo emphatically accommodates various “voices” in his composition. Secondly, I have suggested that call-and-response is a didactic practice. Not only does Ngcobo pass on his material orally, requesting me to respond by mimicking what he does, he also reduces the material of his songs to a motivic skeleton, allowing me to add layers as I progress (Figure 2). Thirdly, I have suggested that call-and-response is a texture; its various layers can all be retraced to the motivic skeleton, and together they constitute a heterophonic web of echoing staggered entries. Fourthly, I have suggested that call-and-response determines the form of Ngcobo’s song, horizontally rather than vertically (Figure 3).

However, pulling apart these dimensions, treating them as separate musical parameters, might say more about *my* indigenous analytical frame of reference than it says about maskanda. Figures 2 (displaying texture) and 3 (displaying form) suggest that texture and form can be analyzed independently from each other, but I have not met maskanda musickers who made explicit distinctions between these parameters. Their analytical accounts revealed that the form of a maskanda song emerges from its texture and vice versa. Similarly, Ngcobo’s didactic practices and compositional ideas directly inform each other. So where does my inclination to make those distinctions come from? It is unlikely to have emerged from my indigenous aural frame of reference: distinguishing texture from form in a Bruckner symphony, or composition from pedagogy in a Scarlatti sonata, is as contrived as making these distinctions in a maskanda song. Still, the distinctions are being made, and it is being considered as insightful to make them, at least with regard to Bruckner and Scarlatti. Thus, it is likely to be hegemonic modes of analysis, such as thinking in terms of musical parameters, and hegemonic forms of representation, such as staff notation (Figure 2) and formal plans (Figure 3), that inform my analytical observations.¹⁷ As Nicholas Cook points out:

Observation is itself a form of response, and as such culturally located . . . [Music theory] is based on a musical ontology—a set of foundational premises—which is not just characteristically Western and twentieth-century, but characteristic of East Coast American academia in the decades after the Second World War. (Cook 2012:198)

So why is it worthwhile to use this indigenous East Coast academic social practice to acquire insight into South African maskanda? This article has shown that, if their indigeneity is acknowledged, music analytical close readings touch on the relationship between hearing and conceptualizing, and between aural and intellectual understanding. As such, they can be a means of foregrounding (musical) experiences and positions that otherwise remain implicit and unacknowledged.¹⁸ In other words, music analysis is a unique and important ethnographic practice because it engages with the aural sensitivity of musical experience. Like all ethnography, it can be used as an extension of cultural imperialism, but when accompanied by sufficient self reflexivity, it can be an impetus for cross-cultural musical and intellectual dialogue. In all analytical accounts of maskanda—those by Rycroft (1977), Impey (1983), Collins (2006/2007), and myself (present article)—the potentiality for both imperialism and dialogue is present, and it is precisely this double potentiality that makes these accounts engaging. Accessing aural sensitivities forces the analyst to drop her guard and expose her own position, both aurally and intellectually. Let me illustrate this with an example of how my conceptualization of listening to maskanda exposes the sonic archive I bring to the process, and how this sonic archive seems to function independently from my intellectual understanding of maskanda.

Let us compare two explanations of the sound of maskanda guitar playing. One, an aural explanation—“maskanda guitar sounds like bluegrass”—describes maskanda sound in terms of another sound. The other, an intellectual explanation—“maskanda guitar sounds as it sounds because it combines traditional rural with current urban playing techniques”—describes the sound in words. The first appeals to my prior hearings, often culturally specific. The second appeals to knowledge about maskanda that can be relatively easily acquired. Whereas this intellectual knowledge can just as easily be dropped and replaced by another statement about maskanda, the aural knowledge is less easy to erase. No matter how much I have played, sung, and danced maskanda, I am still able to associate the maskanda guitar sound with bluegrass, although I have also learned to associate it with many new aural experiences such as umakhweyana bow and isitorotoro playing and amahubo singing. As I have shown in this article, it took me years to adjust to these new aural frames of reference.

The difficulty of accessing and reflecting on my own sonic archive indicates how difficult and problematic it is to shed light on those of Others. It also indicates how crucial this sonic archive is for understanding music in aural and intellectual respects, and, hence, how important it is to bring such sonic archives to the fore.

The music theory indigenous to East Coast American academics can be one way of doing this, and since it has shaped my analytical background as an inhabitant of americanized Europe, I explicate it rather than try to escape from it. However, as demonstrated in this article, there are music theoretical and analytical practices within maskanda discourse (walking like a crab, representing voices, hearing what the fingers are doing, deep Zulu and urban Zulu sounds) that could exist in dialogue with the analytical practices I derived from the East Coast Americans (texture, form, timbre, harmony). This kind of dialogical knowledge has been described by Gary Tomlinson as “parallax”:

Parallax is a metaphor for the decentered, dialogical construction of knowledge. It represents a way of knowing in which all vantage points yield a real knowledge, partial and different from that offered by any other vantage point, but in which no point yields insight more privileged than that gained from any other . . . It suggests that our knowledge is fundamentally indirect, not a knowledge of things-in-themselves, but a knowledge of the negotiations by which we make things what they are. (1991:240)

Tomlinson hints at the importance of an aural experiential dimension of this negotiable knowledge (*ibid.*:247), but then seems to ascribe the ability to conceptualize aural experiences to European (= East Coast American?) academics only:

Placing the music first will always distance it from the complex and largely extramusical negotiations that made it and that sustain it. It will always privilege the European bourgeois myths of aesthetic transcendency, artistic purity untouched by function and context, and the elite status of artistic expression . . . Emphasizing the musical appreciation of jazz only transfers to the study of African-American music the formalist view that remains debilitatingly dominant in Eurocentric musicology, with its continuing emphasis on internalist music analysis. (*Ibid.*:248)

While I fully subscribe to Tomlinson’s concept of parallax, his presentation of music analysis as a transcendental academic preoccupation reflects the ethnomusicological fear of engaging with someone else’s aural experience. As has become clear in this article, this is indeed problematic, but also indispensable for the parallaxic kind of knowledge that Tomlinson advocates. Two arguments substantiate my claim. First, it is precisely the relationship between aural experience and intellectual conceptualization that enables us to talk about the micro level of musical structure and the macro level of extramusical cultural expression at the same time. Notions of cultural difference and sameness, for instance, may be more affected by aural experience than by conceptual knowledge about the music, precisely because aural reference frames seem more ingrained than conceptual reference frames. From the material displayed in this article, it is tempting to hypothesize that the inflexibility of aural frames of reference might be the reason why music is such a powerful medium for the articulation of identity, but to substantiate such a hypothesis would require detailed scrutiny from the domains of music historiography, (ethno)musicol-

ogy, and cognitive science. This cannot be done without attention to a variety of indigenous analytical practices.

This brings me to my second argument: the ability to conceptualize aural experiences is not unique to Euro-American academics, but is a universal (rather than a universalist) social practice. The issue of identity articulation and (de)construction in maskanda, again, serves to substantiate this point. Some South African scholars claim that maskanda—shaped by selective or sometimes even censored recordings and broadcasts—gradually developed into a musical equivalent of a homeland during the apartheid era, increasingly centered around simplified versions of Zulu ngoma dance and dress (Coplan 2002:108; Olsen 2009:21). Various formal entities of a maskanda song—the guitar prelude (*isihlabo*), the call-and-response (*ukubiza nokusabela*), and the spoken self praise (*izibongo*)—can be found in many musical practices worldwide, but with their Zulu names they were appropriated as essences of Zulu music. Without wanting to disprove these valuable identity deconstructions, I have wanted to point out aurally informed structural similarities between contemporary maskanda and earlier Zulu practices not in order to prove this music to be Zulu music, but rather to discuss the framing of maskanda as Zulu music as one of many framings of maskanda I encountered during my fieldwork. While it is beyond the scope of this essay to juxtapose all these framings in equal musical detail, it is important to regard them—including the framing of maskanda as Zulu traditional music—as sources of knowledge in their own right rather than as subjects for deconstructivist research conducted from the safe critical distance of metropolitan debate.¹⁹ Only once so regarded can they become subject to a scrutiny and criticism that softens the binary between (the framings of) researcher and researched, and between musical text and context. Maskanda can thus emerge as a meaningful form of musical expression from a variety of aural perspectives: not as a hybrid (as it is often described by musicologists), but as an assemblage of aural demarcations that emerge from specific socio-political-aesthetic positions, which are in some respects fluid and changeable, but in other respects reified and inflexible.

Acknowledgements

My research was funded by the Research Institute for History and Culture (OGC) of Utrecht University. I want to express my gratitude to all those mentioned in this article, sharing with me their knowledge about, and enthusiasm for, maskanda, as well as to my colleagues and friends from the University of KwaZulu-Natal, who offered me a warm and safe academic and social environment. Nandi Qhawekazi Khumalo went to great effort to reach the heirs of the composers, to ask them for permission to publish the transcriptions of their compositions. I thank Dr. Wim van der Meer, Dr. Timothy Cooley, four anonymous readers, and Prof. J. Lawrence Witzleben for commenting on earlier versions of this article, and I express special thanks to Dr. Nishlyn Ramanna for his articulate comments at various stages of the writing process that helped me refine my argument. I

dedicate this article to the memory of uBaba uShiyani, who is with the ancestors now, and whose musicality, knowledge, and warmth will stay with us.

Notes

1. Notable exceptions from the past thirty years include Feld (1982), Seeger (1987), and Rice (1994). The distrust toward structural analysis in ethnomusicological research has waned, as witnessed by publications by Kubik (1994), Scherzinger (2001), Agawu (2006), and Cook (2012). International conferences on Analytical Approaches to World Music were held in 2010 and 2012, and the journal *Analytical Approaches to World Music* was established in 2011 (www.aawmjournals.com). For a critical overview of the role of music theory and analysis in current ethnomusicology, see Solis (2012:534–41).

2. According to the Wikipedia stub of *maskanda*, available at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maskanda> (accessed 21 February 2012).

3. An example of this tendency can be found in Kathryn Olsen's otherwise splendid doctoral thesis on *maskanda*:

An experiential type of knowledge that may never translate into articulated thoughts and ideals appears to be the most common way that *maskanda* performance is processed and understood. It seems that most often those who claim it as their own do so almost unconsciously and are rather taken aback when asked why they choose to play *maskanda* rather than any other kind of music. This would suggest that *maskanda* is engaged as an experience rather than a set of ideas, one that is rooted in the body rather than in the mind. The body grasps knowledge in a deeply subjective and embedded way that takes on performed identities as reality. It believes in what it does. It does not simply represent something outside of itself; it pulls these realities into the here and now. (2009:15)

Although I can empathize with the tangible fieldwork experience Olsen reports here, my article is meant to refute the binary she sketches between body and mind, and her suggestion that *maskanda* practice is hardly accompanied by a conceptual knowledge system.

4. A similar attempt to address structural and societal aspects of music simultaneously can be witnessed in Carol Muller's theorization of the "musical echo" in South African jazz (2007:63ff.; Muller and Benjamin 2011), which she seems to regard as a possible postcolonial alternative to the historically charged concept of call-and-response. However, as Nishlyn Ramanna pointed out to me, the idea of "echo" takes away agency on the part of the respondents (Ramanna 14 August 2012). I will hence adhere to the term "call-and-response."

5. These discourses are documented in ample literature, including the work of Monson (1996:151), Negus (1996:104–05), and Frith (1981:18), to name but a few examples from jazz and popular music studies.

6. *Maskanda* or *maskande* is the noun for the genre, while *maskandi* is the singular and plural noun for the performer. Neither written sources nor recordings of *maskanda* survive from the period prior to the 1950s. Eyewitness reports are the sole source of knowledge about *maskanda*'s early years, as documented by Clegg (1981), Davies (1992), Olsen (2000), and Collins (2006/2007), among others.

7. An exception to this situation is provided by Kathryn Olsen, who includes some musical detail to substantiate her interpretation of *maskanda* as a constructed aspect of an invented Zulu tradition (2009:41–75). Louise Meintjes has provided a thoughtful and thorough account of sound experiences being categorized and articulated as "Zulu" in her monograph about *maskanda*'s somewhat more urban "cousin" *mbaqanga* (2003). Whereas Meintjes reveals the consistency with which *mbaqanga* is framed as Zulu heritage, I am ultimately concerned with teasing out the ambiguities, contradictions, and overlaps in the various ways in which *maskanda* is interpreted. Framing *maskanda* as "Zulu" is just one of these ways. In this respect, this article is part of a larger project.

8. Compare, for instance, the song "Uthando Selungehlule" in isiZulu style by the great

maskandi John Bengu, a.k.a. Phuzushukela (1930–1985) (available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NsfU7EZV6kg>, accessed 14 August 2012), with the more harmonically driven song “Bayede,” in isiShameni style, by Johnston Mnyandu, a.k.a. Phuzekhemisi (available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BHqHBLUBlMA>, accessed 14 August 2012).

9. It is tempting to interpret these two tonal frameworks as an outcome of maskanda’s fraught position between rural and urban ways of existence.

10. Listening experiences as sources of music(ologic)al knowledge, and the ways they are situated in bodies, cultures, and ecologies, have come to the forefront of music research (Small 1998; Erlmann 2004; Clarke 2005). Cognitive research on aural perception in an intercultural context is proliferating, too (Patel and Daniele 2003; Sadakata and Sekiayam 2011). The tension between insider and outsider aural perspectives and the subsequent processes of adjustment have been extensively theorized (Rice 1994:3–8; Titon 1997:92ff.; Nettl 2009:195). Although I refrain from explicitly discussing these fields of interest, they provide the “canvas” on which I “draw” my argument about music analysis as social practice.

11. Ngcobo’s suggestion that his fingers musick with a certain degree of autonomy from his mind, and his subsequent reference to his playing as a (private) dialogue, can also be found in many accounts of jazz musicians when they talk about their solo improvisations. See Sudnow (1978:xiii), Berliner (1994:192ff), Monson (2003:68), and Cook (2004:13–14).

12. The *ughubu*, a gourd-bow with an undivided string that produces two fundamentals, is also often mentioned as source of inspiration for maskanda (Davies 1992:214; Collins 2006/2007:1–2).

13. Nkwanyana and Khoza have interacted with maskanda scholars (notably Collins), so the exchange of knowledge about maskanda is without doubt reciprocal.

14. Collins, who collaborated intensively with Bongani Nkwanyana, notes that this might be the reason why “maskandi prefer using plectrums on the thumb and forefinger rather than the flat pick or all five fingers” (2006/2007:3). Davies reports that the three bass strings are commonly personified as *amadoda* (men’s voices) and the three treble strings as *amantombazane* (girls’ voices), tightening the association with choral practice to be discussed later (Davies 1992:208).

15. Collins reports that Bongani and Josefa Nkwanyana were cousins who fell out in the early 1990s (2006/2007:22n). When I told Joe in 2009 that I had spoken to Bongani, he just mentioned him as a distant cousin. In 2012, I was informed that Joe Nkwanyana passed away; I was unable to find out the exact date.

16. See Witzleben (1997) for ethnomusicology’s locatedness in Euro-American thinking.

17. Another consequence of this notational choice is the fact that timbre—generally an underresearched musical parameter—is almost absent from my analysis, whereas it is crucial in the maskanda idea of call-and-response. The gruff quality of the voice is an immediate trigger for maskanda musickers to connect maskanda with an amahubo “cry” (Nzimande 23 September 2009; Ngwekazi 22 September 2009), the leap in the lead voice mentioned above that compels a response in a lower register. The peculiarity of this sustained vocal timbre distinguishes the maskanda sound from the elaborate voice inflections of other black musics, such as gospel, R&B, and jazz, which are hugely popular in South Africa but signify a globalized aesthetic mainstream.

18. Gabriel Solis has recently described the importance of music theory and music analysis for ethnomusicology in similar terms in this journal: “[C]lose analysis and the production of theory remain significant . . . because they are some of the most important ways we have of coming to know music deeply. Akin to performing, this activity draws our attention to the many significant details that inform music as part of social worlds” (2012:549). Whereas Solis addresses the role of analysis in the ethnomusicological academy, I am ultimately concerned with the academic attention to local, indigenous analytical discourses. They could foster the development of new music theories and replace the transcendental employment of music analysis and theory with more social ones. To follow up Solis’s comparison between analysis and performance: music analysis as social practice is as insightful as music performance as social practice.

19. Or, as Nishlyn Ramanna concisely phrased it: “When powerful metropolitan voices do

this deconstruction, it can drown out the on-the-ground reality—that on one level Zuluness as (musical/cultural) experience really does exist” (Ramanna 14 August 2012).

References: Primary Sources

- Dlamini, Sazi (composer, musician, university lecturer). 4 July 2011, personal communication, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban.
- Hadebe, Theminkosi Dennis (gardener). 20 August 2008, personal communication, 137 Penzance Road, Glenwood, Durban.
- Khoza, Bheki (jazz guitarist, producer). 23 September 2009, personal communication, Restaurant Mimmos, Eastgate Shopping Center, Johannesburg.
- Kunene, Madala (guitarist). 29 August 2008, personal communication, Playhouse, Durban.
- Majozi, Mxolisi [a.k.a. Zuluboy] (hip-hop artist). 7 July 2011, personal communication, Bambanani Restaurant, Melville, Johannesburg.
- Miya, Khombisile [a.k.a. S'kho] (maskandi). 9 October 2008, personal communication, Musgrave Shopping Center, Durban.
- . 5 July 2011, personal communication, Florida Road, Durban.
- Ngcobo, Bheki [a.k.a. iHashi Elimhlope (White Horse)] (maskandi). 23 September 2009, personal communication, Downtown Studios, Goudstreet, Johannesburg.
- Ngcobo, Selby (taxi driver). 4 October 2008, personal communication, *en route* from Durban to Phezulu Game Park, Botha's Hill, KwaZulu-Natal.
- Ngcobo, Shiyani (maskandi). 21 October 2008, personal communication, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban. Translator: Thokozani Khuzwayo.
- . 5 August 2009, guitar lesson, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban.
- . 12 August 2009, guitar lesson, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban.
- . 7 October 2009, guitar lesson, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban.
- Ngwekazi, Nhlanhla (television presenter, anchorman). 22 September 2009, personal communication, Office J. Mofokeng & Associates, 76, 4th Avenue, Melville, Johannesburg.
- Nkwanyana, Bongani [a.k.a. Bambata] (maskandi, CEO of Kora Records). 23 September 2009, personal communication, Restaurant Mimmos, Eastgate Shopping Center, Johannesburg.
- Nkwanyana, Josefa [a.k.a. Mziwoxolo (House of Peace)] (maskandi). 20 October 2009, personal communication, Tugela, Mandeni, KwaZulu-Natal.
- Nkwanyana, Mrs. (umakhweyana and isitorotoro player). 20 October 2009, personal communication, Tugela, Mandeni, KwaZulu-Natal.
- Nokwe, Tu (actress, singer, composer). 18 August 2009, personal communication, KwaMashu Arts Centre, KwaMashu Township, Durban.
- Ntuli, Nothi (maskandi). 22 September 2009, personal communication, Downtown Studios, Goudstreet, Johannesburg.
- Nzimande, Tshupo (record producer). 23 September 2009, personal communication, Zuz'muzi Music Offices. 83 Von Brandisstreet, Johannesburg.
- Ramanna, Nishlyn (ethnomusicologist, jazz pianist). 14 August 2012, personal communication, Gmail chat.

References: Secondary Sources

- Agawu, V. Kofi. 2003. *Representing African Music: Postcolonial Notes, Queries, Positions*. London: Routledge.
- . 2006. “Structural Analysis or Cultural Analysis? Competing Perspectives on the ‘Standard Pattern’ of West African Rhythm.” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 59(1):1–46.

- Berliner, Paul. 1994. *Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clarke, Eric. 2005. *Ways of Listening: An Ecological Approach to the Perception of Musical Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clegg, Jonathan. 1981. "The Music of Zulu Immigrant Workers in Johannesburg: A Focus on Concertina and Guitar." In *Papers Presented at the Symposium on Ethnomusicology*, edited by Andrew Tracey, 2–9. Grahamstown, South Africa: International Library of African Music.
- Collins, Tom. 2006/2007. "Constructing Maskanda." *SAMUS: South African Music Studies* 26/27:1–26.
- Cook, Nicholas. 2004. "Making Music Together, or Improvisation and Its Others." *The Source: Challenging Jazz Criticism* 1:5–25.
- . 2012. "Anatomy of the Encounter: Intercultural Analysis as Relational Musicology." In *Critical Musicological Reflections: Essays in Honour of Derek B. Scott*, edited by Stan Hawkins, 193–208. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Coplan, David B. 1993 "A Terrible Commitment: Balancing the Tribes in South African National Culture." In *Perilous States: Conversations on Culture, Politics, and Nation*, edited by George E. Marcus, 305–58. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2002. "Sounds of the 'Third Way': Zulu Maskanda South African Popular Traditional Music." In *Playing with Identities in Contemporary Music in Africa*, edited by Mai Palmberg and Annemette Kirkegaard, 104–16. Uppsala, Sweden: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Davies, Nollene J. [1992] 2005. "A Study of the Guitar Styles in Zulu Maskanda Music." M.A. thesis, University of Natal, Durban. In *The World of South African Music: A Reader*, edited by Christine Lucia, 207–15. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Erlmann, Veit, ed. 2004. *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening, and Modernity*. Oxford: Berg (Wenner-Gren International Symposium Series).
- Feld, Steven. 1982. *Sound and Sentiment: Birds, Weeping, Poetics, and Song in Kaluli Expression*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Frith, Simon. 1981. *Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, and the Politics of Rock 'n' Roll*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. London: Verso.
- Impey, Angela. 1983. "The Zulu uMakhweyana Bow: Ndabisehlele Myeza and her Songs." B.A. (Hons.) thesis, University of Natal, Durban.
- Kidula, Jean Ngoya. 2006. "Ethnomusicology, the Music Canon, and African Music: Positions, Tensions, and Resolutions in the African Academy." *Africa Today* 52(3):99–113.
- Kubik, Gerhard. [1994] 2010. *Theory of African Music*. 2 vols. 2nd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Chicago Studies in Ethnomusicology).
- Meintjes, Louise. 2003. *Sound of Africa! Making Music Zulu in a South African Studio*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Monson, Ingrid T. 1996. *Saying Something: Jazz Improvisation and Interaction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Muller, Carol. 1999. "Chakide—the Teller of Secrets: Space, Song and Story in Zulu Maskanda Performance." In *Oral Literature and Performance in Southern Africa*, edited by Duncan Brown, 220–34. Oxford: Currey.
- . 2004. *South African Music: A Century of Traditions in Transformation*. Oxford: ABC-Clio.
- . 2007. "Musical Echoes of American Jazz: Towards a Comparative Historiography." *Safundi: The Journal of South African and American Studies* 8(1):57–71.
- Muller, Carol, and Sathima B. Benjamin. 2011. *Musical Echoes: South African Women Thinking in Jazz*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Negus, Keith. 1996. *Popular Music in Theory: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Nettl, Bruno. 2009. "On Learning the Radif and Improvisation in Iran." In *Musical Improvisation: Art, Education, Society*, edited by Gabriel Solis and Bruno Nettl, 185–99. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Ngcobo, Shiyani. 2004. *Introducing Shiyani Ngcobo. Zulu Guitars Dance: Maskanda from South Africa*, produced by Ben Mandelson/World Music Network, London. Compact disc.
- . 2010. *Shiyani Ngcobo Featuring Njabulo Shabalala*, recorded by Jürgen Bräuninger and co-produced by Kathryn Olsen/UKZN School of Music, Durban. Compact disc.
- Nhlapo, Phindile. 1998. "Maskanda: The Zulu Strolling Musicians." M.A. thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Olsen, Kathryn. 2000. "Politics, Production and Process: Discourses on Tradition in Contemporary Maskanda." M.Mus. thesis, University of Natal, Durban.
- . 2009. "Musical Characterizations of Transformation: An Exploration of Social and Political Trajectories in Contemporary Maskanda." Ph.D. thesis, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban.
- Patel, Aniruddh D., and J. R. Daniele. 2003. "An Empirical Comparison of Rhythm in Language and Music." *Cognition* 87:B35–B45.
- Pyper, Brett. 2005. "Two Position Statements Concerning the Proposed Founding of a Southern African Ethno/musicology Association. To be read at the opening of the Joint 32nd Congress of the Musicological Society of Southern Africa and the 19th Ethnomusicology Symposium, at the University of Cape Town, 25 August, 2005. 1. Prepared by Brett Pyper on behalf of the 19th Ethnomusicology Symposium Working Group." *South African Journal of Musicology: SAMUS* 25:161–67.
- Rice, Timothy. 1994. *May it Fill your Soul: Experiencing Bulgarian Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rycroft, David K. 1977. "Evidence of Stylistic Continuity in Zulu 'Town' Music." In *Essays for a Humanist: An Offering to Klaus Wachsmann*, 216–60. New York: The Town House Press.
- Sadakata, Makiko, and K. Sekiyama. 2011. "Enhanced Perception of Various Linguistic Features by Musicians: A Cross-Linguistic Study." *Acta Psychologica* 138:1–10.
- Scherzinger, Martin. 2001. "Negotiating the Music-Theory/African Music Nexus: A Political Critique of Ethnomusicological Anti-Formalism and a Strategic Analysis of the Harmonic Patterning of the Shona Mbira Song Nyamaropa." *Perspectives of New Music* 39(1):5–117.
- Seeger, Anthony. [1987] 2004. *Why Suyá Sing: A Musical Anthropology of an Amazonian People*, 2nd Edition. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Small, Christopher. 1987. *Music of the Common Tongue: Survival and Celebration in African American Music*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- . 1998. *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Solis, Gabriel. 2012. "Thoughts on an Interdiscipline: Music Theory, Analysis, and Social Theory in Ethnomusicology." *Ethnomusicology* 56(3):530–54.
- Sudnow, David. 1978. *Ways of the Hand: The Organization of Improvised Conduct*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Taylor, Timothy D. 1997. *Global Pop: World Music, World Markets*. London: Routledge.
- Titon, Jeff Todd. 1997. "Knowing Fieldwork." In *Shadows in the Field: New Perspectives for Fieldwork in Ethnomusicology*, edited by Gregory Barz and Timothy Cooley, 87–100. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Titus, Barbara. 2005. "Conceptualizing Music: Friedrich Theodor Vischer and Hegelian Currents in German Music Criticism 1848–1887." D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford.
- . 2008. "Global Maskanda, Global Historiography? Some Preliminary Enquiries." *SAMUS: South African Music Studies* 28:43–54.
- Tomlinson, Gary. 1991. "Cultural Dialogics and Jazz: A White Historian Signifies." *Black Music Research Journal* 11(2):229–64.
- Witzleben, J. Lawrence. 1997. "Whose Ethnomusicology? Western Ethnomusicology and the Study of Asian Music." *Ethnomusicology* 41(2):220–42.