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Abstract

Current research in music scholarship appears to be trending towards the “embodied” yet from the vantage point of the performer this progression seems to be lacking a key component of such an embodied discourse: their voice. In this thesis I argue that the oversight of the performing body and its importance to the field of musicology is a result of conceptual dualities that attempt to conceal the body in its role within thought, culture, and meaning. Illustrating this oversight with the gaps in the current academic discourse, I show how many in the field either consider the body only in a metaphorical sense, or see the performer as an object of study. An examination of the contributions of three performer-scholars to this field demonstrates ways in which the gap can be filled, and lack addressed. Their approaches are then combined in an embodied analysis of Messiaen’s “Abîme des Oiseaux” from Quatour pour la Fin du Temps which reveals the potentialities of depth and breadth that can be considered when the performer’s body is permitted to be a site from which a musical analysis might originate. This thesis concludes that the performing body must be reintroduced into musicological discourse with a new understanding of its value, and that this can best be accomplished by addressing the “embodied” within the academic music curriculum, alongside traditional tonal and formal analyses.
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Introduction

“I wonder if I should interfere with the process by analyzing the music?”1 –Linda Kaastra

As a student I was always interested in understanding the differences in learning experiences I would have between my private studio teachers and my classes in music theory. We could be working on the same repertoire, but the approach was so markedly different: in one I would learn how to create elements of musical style on my instrument, with my body, while in the other I would learn how to spot these elements in the score. I assumed “these disparate approaches must somehow combine to form a well rounded musician,” and so I worked away at both, exclusive of each other. However, I started realizing that undertaking a traditional analysis of the music I was playing was not actually helping me play it better. In fact, such an analysis gave me a false confidence that I truly understood the piece, a fallacy that would be revealed in master class situations where such a disembodied understanding was unable to convey the meaning demanded by the music. This experience brought to the surface an awareness that I was not only unable to subjugate my body to my thoughts, but also, and more importantly, that my body had its own understanding of the music, an understanding that I was failing to nurture. At this time in my education I was introduced to the Alexander Technique, a method that addresses the body and its thought processes simultaneously and as a unified-whole. This technique revealed important gaps in my understanding of not just performance, but myself. At the same time I was being made aware of the importance of my body in music-making via the Technique, I was learning about how this same body

was actually being subjugated by the institutions in which I was currently studying. This awareness of the importance of the body, and at the same time its invisibility in the places I was devoting all my energies to, was, to say the least, disheartening. As a result I became interested in what traditions and beliefs had led this to be the case, as well as in finding a way out, or at least ways that I could interrupt the often unconscious dissemination of these tenets.

This interest has led to this thesis, during the research of which I have come to understand its importance. As a teacher of private music lessons, I found myself with a student who was not performing the correct style of a particular étude, an allemande. Recalling the tradition of my training, I informed my student of the history of the dance, its characteristics, and we even pulled up YouTube to listen to a recorded example. All of this was in vain, of course, as after several attempts, my student, though keen and improving, continued to have an artificial, almost robotic sense of stress on the beats. That was when I decided to try something different. Having been working on this thesis, and the ideas of embodied knowledge rattling around in my thoughts, I recalled the work by Diane Urista, a scholar who examines embodiment in relation to music education.\(^2\) I hopped on the piano and played a little allemande while I had my student at first walk, then dance around the room to the figure. We did this for less than a minute. However, when we returned to the clarinet, it was obvious that he knew what an allemande meant. His playing demonstrated that his understanding of it had changed by being able to embody what was previously only conceptual. This was an affirmation to me of the

importance of engaging bodily with the music one studies, even though it would soon become apparent that articulating this kind of experience of musical performance, was, to say the least, difficult.

Whether it is explicit or not, the body has always been a domain that creates friction between practice and theory, in music or otherwise. While performers explicitly discuss what the body needs to do in order to make music, be it anatomically, metaphorically, through character or imagery, analysts often write what amounts to disembodied analyses of pieces—disembodied in the sense that the analyst may not have an embodied experience of what it feels like to perform a piece. This is not to say that such analyses are not without elements of embodiment. One need not look past the concept of tension to see how performer and theorist engage with the subject in a way which may seem different on the surface but has roots that indicate something deeper.

When singer Renée Fleming answers a question from a young musician on tension, she states, “Releasing tension is difficult to explain in writing… Proper breath support will make it much easier to get rid of throat tension as well.”\(^3\) For her tension is something felt kinesthetically, in part of the body, and can be overcome, or undone. But when music director Antonio Pappano describes Verdi as the “master of musical tension” he means that it is “the use of silence that creates the tension… that creates the sense of expectation.”\(^4\) Here, we see something of the analyst’s view of tension: something


\(^4\) The Royal Opera, “Antonio Pappano on Verdi as ‘a Master of Musical Tension’ in Simon Boccanegra,” YouTube video 2:31 (October 2013), accessed October 6, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x9zIT85b54A.
created from a lack of stimuli, a lack that gives music forward momentum. However, as an experienced musician familiar with Verdi operas, when I consider the tension Pappano describes, I do not just know it, but can imagine and even feel its sensations—as my jaw slightly tightens, my eyebrows raise, and my body draws forward in anticipation; or perhaps my senses heighten because I am awaiting a cue from the conductor. This reveals that the knowledge I have of tension in Verdi is not the metaphoric one expressed by Pappano but rather a kinesthetic understanding of what it means to play Verdi. Hence, Fleming’s and Pappano’s tensions may appear on the surface to be different concepts, but they find meaning in the same processes of bodily interaction with the environment. Pappano’s language simply seems more ethereal through processes of abstraction which I will explore in Chapter One. I would guess that if we were to ask Pappano to further describe this tension he would join Fleming and admit that “tension is difficult to explain in writing.” As I began to understand the expression of tension by Fleming as literal, and Pappano’s as an abstraction, I returned to the instruction I had received as a young musician. If analysis, such as Pappano’s, was not as real as Fleming’s idea of air support allowing tension to undo, why would it help me get closer to a more meaningful performance, or a more complete understanding of the music I was playing?

I know now that my teachers had been trained by the same educational institutions as I had, ones which did not see the performer’s body as a source of knowledge but something that needed to be educated. This realization helped lead me towards my current research and what I want to understand: what are the differences between how performers and theorists understand music? And is there a way to bridge this gap? To answer these questions, in this thesis I will show that the performer’s body is
a necessary tool for analysis for both scholars and performers as a way to derive meaning from music, even if it has been an undervalued part of the musicologist’s repertoire. I will demonstrate this first by showing that the body is necessary for meaning-making. Then I will illustrate how attempts to make use of it in musicology have for the most part fallen short. I will then focus on three scholars who make effective use of the body in musical analysis; then apply their approaches to a study of Messiaen’s “Abîme des Oiseaux.” I will conclude with the implications for future research derived from putting the performers body centre-stage in the discourse.

A body-centered discourse is not new to the field of music, “the theories of Dalcroze have long stressed the importance of bodily experience to musical perception.” Despite his developments more than a century ago, Jacques Dalcroze’s ideas seem unable to gain a wide audience outside the realm of music pedagogy. Thus the notion I propose is then actually a re-introduction of the body into musicology. Approaching the musicological discourse in this body-focused fashion might be moot were it not for the following three factors: (1) music academia often makes music an object of study, an approach borrowed from the sciences, and therefore in an attempt to be less subjective places value on the higher senses (which often means disregarding the lived experience of the whole body); (2) at the same time musicology is trying to incorporate the ideals of an embodied discourse into its field of study; and finally, (3) the hierarchy assigned to the differences in types of knowing, as signaled through how one speaks on music, is maintained by a long-held system which acts to suppress the emergence of the seemingly

---

desired, truly embodied discourse. I will now discuss each of the factors and show how they signify the need to further investigate this gap between the embodied and the objectified.

(1) The goals of musicology have branched exponentially over the course of the discipline. There has been a significant shift away from formalistic musical analyses towards those that borrow nuance from other disciplines, the scope of study going far beyond the piece or composer. However until recently, save ethnomusicology, there has been a trend towards putting a “scientific lens” on a piece, composer, or even the performer. This scientific approach heralded “objectivity” (namely, those approaches which could verify their approach visually), and as a result omitted fundamental aspects of the discourse including the body beyond the eyes, as well as the performer. This silencing of the body/performer can be seen in North American music institutions today through the cultural differences of how music is spoken about in a theory or history class as opposed to a studio class. This legacy is beginning to be eroded in some institutions with upper-level academic courses that offer an investigation into the performer’s experience, rather than traditional classes in performance practice. Nicholas Cook also addresses issues including the validity of embodied knowledge within the current discourse by bringing issues of performance practice to the fore. Even though the trend towards the body explicit has been in the zeitgeist for decades now, it is not undoing the years of silencing done on the body and performer. Furthermore, as will be addressed

---

6 See Davidson for research on gesture; McClary for how music is symbolic of patriarchy; or Kaastra’s application of cognitive science to music performance.  
7 For example: University of Ottawa’s “Voice of the Performer” with Dillon Parmer; Eastman’s “Seminar in Analysis and Performance” with Jonathan Dunsby; or UBC’s, “Analysis and Performance.”
later, attempts at this type of objectivity often do little more than to disguise the body (the “subjective”) in a discourse.

(2) As the shift away from traditions of objectivity in other fields has since filtered into musicology and allowed for a glimpse of the body and the performer, a trend towards “embodiment” in academic discourse has resulted in new approaches and areas of research. As will be seen in Chapter Two, although the “body” has been given a pulpit within the musicology discipline, the discourse that has emerged often ignores the performing body—the primal body needed in the creation of music, especially live music. When the performer’s body is discussed, it has often been treated as a “laboratory rat” for objective, scientific study. Here, objectivity is achieved through distance, and the performer is stripped of authority in their field. The combination these two concepts in musicology—to include the “body” in the discourse, yet remain “objective”—has created a conflict within the field. Dillon Parmer has identified this conflict and acknowledges “the subject position of the performer, although already latent within musicology, is held back from becoming a legitimate source of knowledge about music on par with current academic discourse.” The result, a mostly faux-embodied discourse in musicology (save for a few researchers) places its focus on the embodied experience of the listener/analyst or the empirical data mined from the performer.

---

(3) Finally, the *Oxford* entry on *Body* suggests it has been “a longstanding if somewhat romanticized notion that anti-Cartesian philosophy and holistic views of performance upset traditional orders of knowledge in politically constructive ways.”¹⁰ This notion that the performer’s knowledge is not on par with that of the academic can be seen within our institutions: the *habitus* (as understood by anthropologists), or bodily divisions in the culture between musicologists and performers, shows itself through how each class speaks about music, and furthermore, how that understanding is valued, classified and rewarded. This can be seen in the differences between where an étude book would be located in a library as opposed to a theory textbook; how some institutions differentiate their funding for a PhD student opposed to a DMA; or each student’s respective salaries for employment at the same institution upon graduation. Though there are some organizations changing this landscape, these are the antiquated markers of an institutional hierarchy that privileges the knowers and disparages the doers. Even within performance, there is an appearance of greater mastery in studio classes if one can justify performance choices through a theoretical analysis of the piece. This shows that an acceptance of embodied knowledge as valid has yet to be demonstrated on a large scale, or even within performers’ culture. With this in mind, one can see the need for continued investigation into this area of research.

With this rationale at hand, and having introduced the topic and key concerns, in the following thesis I will highlight the disconnect between music academics and performers as a way to move towards an embodied musicological discourse that is

---

performance-based. To do this I will first answer the question “why look to the body?” by showing how the body is a central vehicle for our ability to process abstract concepts, and furthermore makes a worthwhile and valuable paradigm for analyzing music and its phenomena. **Chapter One: Understanding the Embodied** will demonstrate this by illustrating the body as the site where meaning is made, through Thomas Csordas’ “embodied paradigm” which argues that the “body is a productive starting point for analyzing culture and self;”\(^{11}\) and Mark Johnson’s work in embodied meaning which draws on cognitive science and linguistics to point to the human body as the maker of meaning and meaningfulness. I will conclude the chapter with a definition of embodiment to take forward and use in Chapter Two as a premise to discuss the embodied discourses of musicology. In **Chapter Two: Embodied Discourses in Music** I will conduct a literature review of the current state of embodiment within music academia. I will begin with how the *New Musicology* of the 1990’s allowed for a look at the body in music through approaches of identity and how these ideas diverged into different streams, all involving the body in different ways. In **Chapter Three: Performer-Scholars** I will highlight those in the field who are successfully conducting embodied analyses and articulating meanings extracted from performance and the performer’s body in the academic discourse. In **Chapter Four: Embodied Analysis** I show how thinking in terms of embodiment has influenced my own research on performance through a look at a single movement for solo clarinet in Messiaen’s *Quatour pour la Fin du Temps*, the “Abîme des Oiseaux.” Finally, in **Chapter Five: Music Performance as a Process for Understanding** I return to a general discussion on the

implications of an embodied approach to musical analysis and what a contribution to the literature might look like.
Chapter One: Understanding the Embodied

“We have changed an art that exists only when, so to speak, the Word is made Flesh, into an art which is only the Word. Metaphorically, we have denied the very thing that makes music music, the thing which gives it such enormous symbolic and sensual power” – Suzanne Cusick

This thesis examines the disparity between academic discourse and performance-based embodied discourse. One of the perceived differences between these two discourses is the role of the body. As I will demonstrate, this difference is merely an illusion. The goal of the present chapter is to contextualize the role of the body in the process of meaning-making. This will lend perspective to the following chapters of what a truly embodied discourse looks like, and provide definitions for some key terms to be used in this thesis. Before I can do this however, I must answer two important questions: “Why the body?” (1.1) and “Why the performer?” (1.2) To answer this first question, I will present models of embodiment that show that the intention of musical analysis indubitably leads us to the body. This includes considerations of music analysis that focus on what makes music thoughtful, cultural, and meaningful. To answer this chapter’s second question will require drawing on qualities of meaning, and how these, in regards to the Western Art Music (WAM) paradigm of composer-performer-audience, are the most abundant in the performer’s body. Finally I will consider a definition, or at least parameters, of embodiment (1.3). Exploring these questions will not only provide an essential context for the role of the embodied in music, it will also set up the discussion for Chapter Two where I will examine what is being left out of the embodied musicological discourse.

1.1 Why the Body?

In this section I will use concepts of embodiment as explored in two disparate fields to unite behind the reasoning of the body’s importance for musical analysis. The first field I will draw upon is the theory of embodied cognition as championed by philosopher Mark Johnson as well as cognitive linguist George Lakoff. This work has been applied to the field of music frequently, which I will briefly touch on here. I will then look to anthropologist Thomas Csordas’ “embodied paradigm” for further reasoning of the importance of the body in analysis. Finally I return to Mark Johnson’s work, specifically his applications of embodied meaning.

Before I begin to demonstrate how the use of the body is an integral part of the analytic process in music, I must first ask: “Why should the body be considered in music analysis?” To answer this I must look at the concept of music analysis. Drawing on the entry on “analysis” in *Grove Music Online*, one finds

> The phrase ‘musical analysis’, taken in a general sense, embraces a large number of diverse activities. Some of these are mutually exclusive: they represent fundamentally different views of the nature of music, music’s role in human life, and the role of the human intellect with regard to music. These differences of view render the field of analysis difficult to define within its own boundaries… Underlying all aspects of analysis as an activity is the fundamental point of contact between mind and musical sound, namely musical perception.\(^\text{13}\)

Though the act of analysis can be diverse, as indicated by the beginning of this definition, this last sentence is revealing, not only in how it seems to discount the body from the process of analysis, but also the performer. However, the article continues with a slightly

---

different perspective, “Analysis is the means of answering directly the question ‘How does it work?’”\textsuperscript{14} The reason this is important to include is that it shows the diversity of approaches that can be, and are, taken to answer this question. These approaches themselves can be seen as an art, as expressed in the 	extit{Oxford Companion to Music}, “Analysis is interpretation—even a kind of performance, in the sense that analysts explore the materials and meanings of compositions and attempt to communicate their findings, through speaking or writing.”\textsuperscript{15} Reducing these two paradigms to their essence, and given that music is a cultural act, I would like to suggest that the fundamental idea of music analysis, is an “articulation of what we think about culture and its meanings.” This of course is an oversimplification, but having the bare bones of this idea, despite the many varied applications of it, allows us to consider three things: how the body relates to the idea of thinking, how the body relates to culture, and how the body relates to the process of meaning. As I will show now, the body is imperative to each of these concepts.

\textbf{1.1.1 Embodied Cognition and Metaphor}

In this section I will show how the body is a central vehicle for our ability to process abstract concepts, therefore underscoring that an acknowledgment of the act of thinking cannot occur without acknowledgement of the body. Here I will draw on second-generation cognitive scientists George Lakoff and Mark Johnson and their “generalized approach to metaphor” to provide evidence of this. I will then show how

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
their work has been used to recognize traditional music analysis actually is rooted in bodily experience through the work of Lawrence Zbikowski.

Lakoff and Johnson’s *Metaphors We Live By* suggests that our thoughts, and the language we use to express them, is completely based upon bodily experiences. Johnson asserts that the “grounding assumption of embodied cognition theory is that mind, meaning, thought and value all arise from the ongoing interactions of a bodily organism with its environment (which are physical, interpersonal, and cultural).”¹⁶ This implies that only an organism built like a human, that operates in human environments, could develop concepts and languages like ours. The concept of metaphor in Johnson and Lakoff’s work is not as a literary device but rather as a way of “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing or experience in terms of another.”¹⁷ Their work gives evidence to this theory by working backward from every-day speech to find hidden metaphors which point to the body. Such an example of this might be “warmth equals affection,” a nearly universal metaphor across the globe. In most languages a warm person is considered a friendly and caring person. Johnson and Lakoff argue the scaffolding of this metaphor begins as infants when the physically warm embrace of a parent (the repeated interaction with the environment) occurs at the same time they are being cared for.¹⁸ This physical experience filters into thought and gives structure to language (as I will examine below), allowing the thought of a “warm person” as one not equated with temperature, but rather

---

the characteristics of friendly and caring. Emphasizing the role the environment plays in creating these connections, Lakoff does note that while some metaphors seem to be universal across human languages, others reflect differences in experience of human bodies in dissimilar environments. For instance Tamil (a language spoken in equatorial India) does not equate the linguistic idea of a “warm person” with affection, and instead the phrase would more accurately translate to “an annoying person.”19 Lakoff argues that because of the extreme heat in the regions this language developed, warmth is uncomfortable and thus equals annoyance, therefore providing a different metaphor scaffolding. The reason awareness of these scaffoldings are important is so that we can see how abstract thinking requires the body and environment to create these seemingly disembodied thoughts. This idea then that performers and theorists are thinking at different levels thus becomes moot. I will now examine the process with which Lakoff and Johnson use explain how these connections occur.

Nearly a decade after Metaphors we Live By, Mark Johnson published The Body in the Mind where he describes how the human body and bodily experience determine the organism’s cognitive structure. He also clarifies how language categorization occurs on a level that is in relation to the human being. As implied by the theory on metaphor, to understand any concept we must undergo a process that involves relating the unfamiliar to the familiar. According to Johnson, this begins with developing an image schemata, which is essentially a realization of a “repeated pattern of bodily experience.”20 Image schemata are the building blocks of metaphor; for instance the observation that one’s

19 Ibid.
knee is above one’s foot can be an image schemata which will form the basis for concepts related to vertical space. This source experience can then be used as a basis onto which other like experiences and ideas can be applied. If image schemata are the grounding of metaphors, *cross-domain mapping* is the “process through which we structure our understanding of one domain (which is typically unfamiliar or abstract) in terms of another (which is most often familiar and concrete)”\(^21\) The idea was developed as an application of Johnson and Lakoff’s work in the domain of music in Lawrence Zbikowski’s *Conceptualizing Music: Cognitive Structure, Theory, and Analysis*.\(^22\) Zbikowski identifies text painting as a common musical phenomenon that exemplifies cross-domain mapping. He asserts, “With respect to music, the “high” and “low” used to describe pitches reflect the conceptual metaphor *PITCH RELATIONSHIPS ARE RELATIONSHIPS IN VERTICAL SPACE*. This metaphor maps spatial orientation such as up-down onto the pitch continuum.”\(^23\) He then shows how this is used in composition, “As each of the voices in Palestrina’s six-part texture takes up the word “descendit,” it begins to “descend” through musical space.”\(^24\) The conceptualizing of vertical space afforded to humans by the experiences of their bodies is thus what makes Palestrina’s technique meaningful. Zbikowski also lists two important roles cross-domain mapping plays in music,

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 13.
\(^{22}\) In this volume Zbikowski works from the “the assumption that musical understanding relies not on specialized capacities unique to the processing of patterned sound but on the specialized use of general capacities that humans use to structure their understanding of the everyday world.” (pg vii) Though not explicitly identified here, these ‘general capacities’ are located in bodily experience.
\(^{23}\) Ibid., 66.
\(^{24}\) Ibid., 73.
first, it provides a way to connect musical concepts with concepts from other domains, including those associated with language; second, it provides a way to ground our description of elusive musical phenomena in concepts derived from everyday experience.\(^\text{25}\)

These roles will prove important for, as I have mentioned, the discourse around embodiment in music can seem hardly embodied at times. However, by applying the lens of embodied cognition to the discourse, Zbikowski has shown where to look for the marks of the body in the analysis of music.

Showing this correlation between body and music theory, or the composition itself however, does not give a full account of the body in music, especially that of the performer’s. Zbikowski states that his goals in analyzing the combination of cognitive processes and culture is to prove that neither of these are “given by nature”\(^\text{26}\) and furthermore, the study the cognitive processes “help us understand better the ways culture, society, and history reshape musical practice.”\(^\text{27}\) As Clayton and Leante argue regarding embodied cognition, “The challenge for music studies is that on the one hand we wish to emulate this approach—since verbalized music theories are as richly endowed with embodied metaphors as any other discursive domain—but on the other we need to go beyond it.”\(^\text{28}\) Musical discourse stands to gain insight about itself by embracing an embodied discourse because of the foundational level of concept making (metaphor building) it is involved in, but this idea that there is more to an embodied discourse than just embodied cognition lends itself well to the other concept we need to address when

\(^{25}\) Ibid., 64.
\(^{26}\) Ibid., x.
\(^{27}\) Ibid., xi.
discussing analysis, music and the body: culture. The idea of cognitive embodiment is useful for tugging at concepts of thought and language and seeing how they unravel to reveal the body; however, we must also consider that this body is part of a larger culture which is producing the music in question. Therefore, we must find a constructive way to consider how an analysis of music as a cultural act serves an embodied analysis. For this I consider the anthropological approach of an embodied paradigm as suggested by Thomas Csordas.

1.1.2 A Paradigm of Embodiment

In this section I will show how the body must be considered as the starting place for an analysis of a cultural practice. The bodies that engage with music are both tools for the creation of culture and at the same time resultant of it. Therefore, the analysis of cultural acts must include bodies, not just as objects, but as experienced. To illustrate this I will examine anthropologist Thomas Csordas’ use of embodiment to show “that the body is not an object to be studied in relation to culture, but is to be considered as the subject of culture, or in other words as the existential ground of culture.” Furthermore, I will show how Csordas attempts to find a “consistent methodological perspective… for the study of culture and the self.” The requirements Csordas establishes for his approach however create complexity in the methodology. This process foreshadows what we see develop in musicology, specifically with performer-scholars in Chapter Three. Csordas also draws on phenomenology, and thus Merleau-Ponty as well as Bordieu, two

---

30 Ibid.
intellectuals (philosopher/linguist and sociologist/anthropologist respectively) whose oeuvre lies heavily in the meaning of the body.

Anthropological methods that examine the body have been used often within musicology, especially ethnomusicology; however they have also made an impact on the field of Performance Studies. Hence borrowing a research paradigm from this field for analysis of culture is a natural extension. In “Embodiment as a Paradigm for Anthropology,” Thomas Csordas shows how Bourdieu and Merleau-Ponty both include the body in their theoretical approaches. Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenological approach “wants our starting point to be the experience of perceiving,” thus his idea of the preobjective unites the experiential realm of the body with its environment. On the other hand Bourdieu’s concept of habitus “holds promise because it focuses on the psychologically internalized content of the behavioral environment.” In other words, his “socially informed body” and all its senses generate practices. However, Csordas finds both these philosophers’ approaches fall short of recognizing a “principal characteristic” of embodiment, which he notes lies in “the collapse of dualities between mind and body, subject and object.” He states Bourdieu focuses on the collapse of the mind-body duality, and Merleau-Ponty the latter; but because neither considers the unification of the other duality, an embodiment paradigm becomes “superordinate” to both their approaches.

From this Csordas suggests a paradigm of embodiment involves “an analysis of
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perception (the preobjective) and practice (the habitus) grounded in the body [which] leads to collapse between subject and object.” Csordas argues further that “This collapse allows us to investigate how cultural objects (including selves) are constituted or objectified.” This ability to acknowledge the objectification of culture is an important part of the embodied paradigm as applied to music, as this is an element that has held weight in the musicological discourse for some time (text versus process).

Csordas uses his embodied paradigm to research ritual healing, specifically demonic possession. He notes “The importance for our discussion is between demons as cultural objects, and their experiential manifestations as concrete self-objectifications in religious participants.” The identification in this passage of self-objectifications does not deny the *experience* of the “object” in fact here, the experience of the demon, is the only way in which this cultural object exists. What Csordas is interested in his study of possession is “not the cultural object, the evil spirit… [but] the surpassing of a tolerance threshold defined by intensity, generalization, duration, or frequency of distress.” In short, Csordas realizes that to study culture the experiences of the body are the important considerations, much less so than the “objects” which are used to label such experiences. This runs parallel to an underused discourse in music which emphasizes experience of music over its objects. Nicholas Cook suggests “To understand music as performance means to see it as an irreducibly social phenomenon, even when only a single individual
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is involved.”  

He continues, and offers an apt allegory in this situation, “there is a comparison with religious ritual, which involves the reproduction of socially agreed forms of expression even when conducted in private.”

However, even with theories on practice, there is a difference between theory and practice. Csordas’ emphasis on the need for an embodied paradigm that is clear in its methodology is brought up in a second article, written alongside, but published later than “Embodiment as a Paradigm for Anthropology” called “Somatic Modes of Attention.” Here Csordas elaborates on the “how” of an embodied paradigm in his analysis of religious revelatory phenomena. He notes struggles within our current framework, and that the goal of a paradigm of embodiment is, “a phenomenology that will lead to conclusions both about the cultural patterning of bodily experience, and also about the inter-subjective constitution of meaning through that experience.” In this work Csordas continues with the idea that for an embodied perspective one needs to collapse “dualities between subject and object, mind and body, self and other.” What is further developed is the idea of attending to one’s bodily sensations as a way to gain insight into the meaning of an experience. Csordas defines somatic modes of attention as “culturally elaborated ways of attending to and with one’s body in surroundings that include the
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embodied presence of others.” Csordas gives examples of these “modes” as including, but not limited to, “intuition, imagination, perception, and sensation.” However, in his research Csordas also realizes that as a result of this collapse a “principle of indeterminacy” emerges.

The idea of indeterminacy, or possible infinite possibilities, is one of the problems often encountered by approaches to analysis that study experience. Csordas shows how both philosophers he draws on are forced to confront it in their work. He shows that in Merleau-Ponty’s view, embodiment “asserts more things than it grasps,” and, for Bourdieu, it “always outruns his conscious intentions.” Csordas notes that indeterminacy is not a concept that should be tried to be “made determinate” in order to facilitate or legitimize embodied analysis, but rather accepted “as an inevitable background condition of our analyses.” This idea of indeterminacy will be acknowledged in different ways by the performer-scholars examined in Chapter Three. It is sometimes made as the reason why a subjective, or embodied, analysis is less valid than an objective one. Therefore, it is imperative to keep in mind that the meaning derived from the cultural body, while full of possibility, is still limited by its body-ness.

In this section, I have shown why the analysis of the cultural requires a consideration of the body. The work of Csordas also offers a paradigm and approach for such analysis in anthropology, and as we will see has much overlap with the performer-scholars discussed in Chapter Three. Having demonstrated that both thought processes
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and cultural acts are rooted in bodily understanding, I now must show a final way in which the body factors in to musical analysis, through meaning-making. For this I note that Csordas argues that “The argument I am developing about the body as existential ground of culture is to be distinguished from that of Johnson (1987), who analyzes the body as cognitive ground of culture.” Though both scholars cover why the body is important in examining culture, Csordas’ focus is pointing out that the body is where culture needs to be analyzed from (and finding a methodology to do so). As we saw Johnson’s early work focused on how thought and language showed the marks of the body. However, more recently Johnson has applied this approach to the philosophy of aesthetics and as a result lends insight into the role the body plays in the process of meaning and meaningfulness.

1.1.3 Embodied Theory of Meaning

To begin this section I must submit some definitions to allow for clarity. The first concept of which is body, unsurprisingly defined as what John Dewey and others of his time referred to as the “body-mind.” This hyphenation, in addition to being what is implied by this thesis when only the term “body” is used, reminds us that even though language may take on dualities, we must be keen to collapse them in order to maintain an embodied understanding. The idea of “body-mind” might also need to be made explicit that it incorporates both the physical self with thought processes, but also those logical thought processes with the emotional. This prevents an understanding that would privilege mental capacities over somatic ones, when they are really one and the same.
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Secondly, a definition of meaning is in order as a difference is often understood between meaning and meaningfulness. If we are to remain congruent with the idea of mind/body and logic/emotion unifications, then we must realize that meaning and meaningfulness are also the same. This is the view offered by Mark Johnson in one of his more recent publications where he attests,

One popular strategy for acknowledging that there is non-propositional meaning while still privileging the propositional is to claim a rigid dichotomy between two fundamentally different kinds of meaning: (1) descriptive (cognitive) meaning, and (2) emotive (noncognitive) meaning.\(^{51}\)

What then is meaning/meaningfulness? This is where we find the important aspect of mind-body, as Johnson’s argues, “meaning is not what is consciously entertained in acts of feeling and thought; instead, meaning reaches deep down into our corporeal encounter with our environment.”\(^{52}\) Johnson’s “Embodied Theory of Meaning” as a result has “Means emerge ‘from the bottom up’ through increasingly complex levels of organic activity.”\(^{53}\) This idea then that meaning too, like thought and culture, is rooted in the body proves beyond a shadow of doubt that the body must be an integral part of analysis in music.

Worth further consideration then is why certain “types” of meaning are harder to express than others. This relates to this discussion of music where certain types of analysis receive more validity for their ability to discern qualities. The concept of qualities and thought are central to Johnson’s examination of meaning. He points out that “The problem with qualities is that they are about how something shows itself to us, about how something feels to us, and they seem to involve more than can be structurally
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discriminated by concepts.”\textsuperscript{54} The danger with this Johnson notes is that “We mistakenly regard something that is only a conceptual limitation (i.e. our ability to adequately conceptualize qualities) as though it were actually a limitation on our experience of meaning itself.”\textsuperscript{55} This is an important consideration for the validity of embodied analysis, as it demonstrates that meaning derived from experiences in music are equally as real whether they are quantifiable, or conceptually limited. The privileging of the “objective” is really just a partiality towards concepts that appear more clearly defined because they lack biases caused by certain types of sensation. Johnson demonstrates this fallacy by acknowledging the differences in the treatment of concepts (abstract thought) and precepts (sensation) in an objectivist paradigm. “It treats concepts... as discrete mental entities... as something different in kind from sensations, perceptions, and feelings,” and thus “parallels the alleged separation between body and mind.”\textsuperscript{56} However Johnson notes, “what we call thinking, or reasoning, or logical inference, could not even exist without the felt qualities of situations.”\textsuperscript{57} This notion of conceptual limitation when faced with certain “qualities” of experience also offers reasoning for the difficulties encountered when performing embodied analyses. With this clear establishment of the importance of the body to meaning, and thus musical analysis, I will now situate why that of the performer’s is of necessity to be considered.

1.2 Why the Performer?

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 70.
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As I have demonstrated, the body (body-mind), with all its sensations and experiences of qualities, is where meaning, thinking and culture occur. In this section I will offer reasoning of why the body of the performer offers potentially deeper insights into these areas. My main point draws upon the idea of three matrixes interacting with music (in the WAM tradition), the composer, performer, and audience. I will then draw upon the performer-scholars I explore later in this thesis, and discuss their reasons for the inclusion of their performing bodies in their analysis.

If we are to consider the activity of performance in WAM, we often encounter three categories of interface with the music: composing, listening, and performing. Though these spheres can overlap, thus I will consider each activity separately in regards to who is engaged: the composer, the audience, or the performer. In traditional musicology and music theory, an analysis occurs with reference to primarily to the audience and composer. Meaning is sought on why the listener hears the music a certain way, or finds it particularly moving; or thoughts about relationship of the music to the composer, or to the composer’s other works, or other composers’ works is explored.

Though both these elements of the performance matrix are important for music, the acknowledgement of the voices in the discourse of this trifecta are lopsided. What is more is, if what has been proposed thus far in this thesis holds true – that the body is a well of meaning, thinking and culture – the body with the most meaning to offer in this equation would be the performer’s. I hesitate to say that the performer is “physically engaging” more with the music than the other two elements of this scenario, as it

emphasizes a mind-body duality, but also the composer and listener do engage physically with the music at different times and levels. However, the volume (both in degree and quantity) of interaction between performer and music is usually significantly greater than the other two members of this ensemble. I am in no way trying to reverse hierarchies, but what I believe needs to be considered is that there is potentially more meaning within the performer’s body, and thus it should be explored as such, rather than shunned. I will explore this idea more in Chapter Three.

The work of performer-scholars, which I will fully cover later in this thesis, offers some perspective, both explicit and implied, on the importance that performance has played in their research. Firstly, Linda Kaastra acknowledges how her work as a musician gives her a specialized insight into the process of music. This allows her to focus her research in cognitive science on elements that would not be considered by many in the field. She also recognizes how being a musician influences what she values in her research.

My experiences as a bassoonist cause me to value depth of insight and observational power over objectivist findings about music performance. As a performer, I am drawn to observe and listen for the physical aspects of presentation and the subtle realms of interaction. Where [others use their] observations of music performance to shed light on cultural identity and personal growth, my observations remain in the realm of embodied musical expertise. I listen, with a physically trained ear, for insight into the process of performing, the experience of music-making, and the dynamics of interaction between musicians. I listen within the music for insight into my own music making.59

Kaastra’s understanding of the importance of the performer in music analysis appears full of self-insight. Similarly, but with a different motivation, Dillon Parmer asserts his voice

as a performer in relation to the gross oversights he sees in the field of musicology. As a fight against those who “suppress performing (how-to-knowledge),” he demonstrates how musical analyses often do not make sense when put in practice. From such a perspective one could interpret that the performer can offer, if not a richer, than a “more authentic” analysis. This is in contrast to Elisabeth Le Guin, whose answer to “why the body?” might be “Because the performer’s relationship to the work of art must have an extensively explored bodily element…which by its nature contains an extremely fine grain of detail.” This level of detail would be something lost on a scholar only engaging music with their eyes and ears, hence the performer is integral for understanding. With this multiplicity of reasons for engaging the performer’s body in analysis, I will now take a generalist position and find components of theories of embodiment to use in a discussion of the musicological repertoire.

1.3: Embodiment

“There are no faculties of memory, conscious perception, or music appreciation that float in the mental ether, separate from the bodily functions.” This is the uniting feature we find across disciplines in their use of embodiment. Where embodied cognition sets the presumption that higher-level human thought (and therefore meaning) can only result from having a human body engaged in our human environments, an embodied
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paradigm suggests that cultural meaning emanates from embodied experiences. Both
Johnson’s and Csordas’ models are necessary for comprehending a thorough analysis of
the differences in understanding encountered by performers and theorists in music. The
difficulty arises when trying to create a way to blend such models, as suggested by
Martin Clayton and Laura Leante as part of the EMMP project (Experience and Meaning
in Music Performance),

It is one thing, indeed, to recognise that verbalised, formal music ‘theory’ is
expressed in metaphors that suggest an embodied origin, and quite another to
value untheorised, nonverbal musical behaviour itself as meaningful action…
we suggest that the challenge in understanding music performance is to do
both of these things.  

This is a difficult task indeed as the concept of embodiment in general discourse is still
fairly diffuse. This term can take on many connotations across various disciplines, or
within one. For instance in social epidemiology Nancy Kreiger gives “three critical
claims” of embodiment which could be surmised as, “bodies tell stories.”

She goes on
to say, “embodiment in other words is literal” and then “embodiment is a verb-like noun
that expresses an abstract idea, a process, and concrete reality.” These are the
ambiguities Csordas was keen to avoid in his look at an embodied paradigm.

Let us then turn to Csordas for his definition where “embodiment can be
understood as an indeterminate methodological field defined by perpetual experience and
the mode of presence and engagement in the world.” 66 This specificity is matched by Johnson, who recognizes there “remains considerable debate as to what exactly the term embodiment might mean,” so to answer it he turns to question the body, “Is the “body” merely a physical, causally determined entity? Is it a set of organic processes? Is it a felt experience of sensations and movement? Or is it a socially constructed artifact?” 67 His answer, of course, is that the body is each of these. Then if we are to proceed we must take up a superordinate position and identify the crucial components of embodiment on which to base our work. For this definition I turn again to Clayton and Leante who point out a key difference in the application of embodiment on paper as opposed to in the field, case study makes the point that different aspects of embodiment are less easy to tease apart in practice than they are in theory… [the] most powerful benefit of a case studies approach: that it forces us to acknowledge that different aspects of embodied cognition come bundled together, and that acknowledging this may help us to understand better how, for instance, metaphors are linked to emotional states. 68 Therefore, for the purpose of this paper I will make the distinction that a truly embodied discourse is one that is grounded in practice. I will not let this paradigm preclude me from talking about what is usually considered “embodied” within the discourse, but I will use it as a method for framing ways to approach embodiment. This bundling together of ideas is what I will use as a base for defining embodiment from the literature thus far surveyed. An embodied approach must therefore (1) begin with the body; (2) consider the mind and body as a unified whole; (3) acknowledge the body as a part of (and having a

reciprocal relationship with) the environment in which it operates; (4) de-objectify the body (i.e. remove the culturally enmeshed hierarchy of senses for valuing information and understanding meaning, as well as recognize the body experiencing these senses as the prime knower); and (5) recognize “the researcher’s body… as being deeply entangled in the process of study.”

Conclusion

In this chapter I outlined the reasons for why an embodied approach to music analysis is essential. I showed this by revealing that the body is contained within all aspects of musical analysis. Using three paradigms to reveal this, embodied cognition, an embodied paradigm, and embodied meaning, I showed how all three focused on collapsing dualities, appreciation of and applications for research, and making the body the central place for investigation. Having explained the potentiality for richer analyses in examination of the performer’s body, I then sought out a scaffolding for ideals of embodiment that can reflect the boundaries of truly embodied analyses. I will now apply these parameters through a review of the musicological literature that is traditionally labeled “embodied.”
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Chapter Two: Literature Review

“The relationship between embodiment and music research has not always been a comfortable one. Musicology has frequently striven to keep the body out of view, or at most to allow bodily movement a place in discourse only as (apparently disembodied) metaphor; at other times, it has broken through these constraints to temporarily assume a central importance, before fading from view once again. The rise of the theories of embodied cognition in recent decades presents music researchers with new opportunities.”

—Martin Clayton

Embodiment has become a central concept in many discourses, especially those that influence musicology. An embodied approach acknowledges that a sense-limited approach to perceiving culture or the body is at best misguided, at worst artificial.

Embodiment researcher and psychologist Joshua Davis notes the explosion in research pertaining to this topic: “A lot of the ideas of embodiment have been around for a few decades, they’ve hit a critical mass… whereas sensory inputs and motor outputs were secondary, we now see them as integral to cognitive processes.” He sees “embodiment as a new paradigm that we are shifting towards.” This metaphorical shift Davis refers to indicates that the research field around embodiment is going through a process of instability as it moves away from its previously held, static position. Within the academic discourse in this instance, what is being shifted away from is not necessarily outright Cartesian dualism (as that has been more easily accepted with suggestive research) but a more insidious version which instead privileges types knowledge that are seen as more
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distanced from the body—logic over emotion. In music this shift might be seen as moving away from the abstractness of Schenker, and towards the ideals embodied by ethnomusicology. These ideals do away with a mind body dualism which Mark Johnson summarizes as, “there’s no disembodied understanding, no disembodied reasoning.”

Understanding requires a body, even the most abstract thoughts. At the same time Johnson realizes “dualism is never going to go away. It gets reinforced, it’s built into our language at a profound level.” He demonstrates this by speaking of the body as separate from its environment, recognizing how language forces him to take this dualistic approach. The fact that dualism is built into our language makes analysis of our discourse more difficult, but the conversation is a necessary one to have.

In this chapter I will examine at the concept of embodiment as used in musicology, and the different ways scholars have used the body to derive meaning. In Chapter One we examined how the body is essential for deriving meaning (both culturally and cognitively) and for meaningfulness (through understanding and enacting), yet in musicology the locus of meaning has often looked past the performer’s body as a source of that meaning. Therefore, it is important to explore how the body has made its way into music academia, and yet how the discourse still keeps it at bay. In doing this I will shed light on truths in academia, and point to places where change is necessary. The sub-disciplines I will talk about are important in the history and development of concepts about the body in musicology. However, the use of the term “embodiment” takes on many meanings within different facets of the discipline and as I will show, these
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interpretations usually leave something to be desired. By focusing on what elements are missing in these discourses I can show how musicology needs to push harder for true embodiment within the discipline. I will begin by examining a paradigm required for a truly embodied discourse in music which draws on the work of theorist Patricia Carpenter, and the concept of “music as process” (2.1). This will set the stage for where the discourse was at mid-century and what problems were coming to the fore in the discipline. By placing her work alongside that of Nicholas Cook, I will also show how musicology itself shifted in realizing the importance of the body in the discourse. Secondly I will discuss how different branches distinctively employ the term “embodiment” through a survey of three areas of musicological research that consider their work embodied. Each field offers a unique viewpoint and a specific place for entering the discourse for the consideration of the performer’s body, thus I have separated these sub-disciplines in regards to how they intersect with the idea of music as a process as outlined by Carpenter and Cook. These categories are: identity studies (2.2); objectivist musicology (2.3); and performance studies (2.4). In exploring these disparate disciplines, my goal will not be to summarize all the issues present with the embodied paradigm taken, but rather establish patterns that show which elements are missing in the discourse. I will also refer back to the ideas of cognitive embodiment and an embodied paradigm from Chapter One for criterion in what a meaningful and embodied discourse must blend.

2.1 Music as Process

To best demonstrate what is lacking in the musicological discourse I must first unearth a paradigm in WAM that makes the body invisible, and thus difficult to discuss
within the field. It is around these parameters that I can categorically show how certain sub-disciplines continue to operate without fully engaging the body. But before we wade into the idea of “what is embodiment in music?” we must first touch on the philosophy of “what is music?” This is important as it will be a recurring theme in how discourses differentiate themselves, as well as acknowledge change over time. Furthermore, as we will see, the role of the body in the discourse has been determined by how the musicologist views music. Nicholas Cook shows this with early music scholarship’s borrowing of tenants from literary studies. In this parallel the act of performance is ancillary to the text itself, for example the performance of poetry. Most 20th century WAM theorists continued to think along these lines until the “new musicology” of the 1990’s shifted the idea of the “reified work” towards one of “musicians and audiences as jointly ‘performing’ music’s autonomy… in the same sense that the royal chapels and courts of the seventeenth century ‘performed’ monarchy.” This kind of performance made music a cultural act, and lessened a perceived “cultural hegemony” from ethnomusicologists that as a musical object, WAM was more valuable than “jazz, rock or remix culture” where the idea of a musical object would seem absurd. Cook further brings up a second tension that we will see repeatedly throughout this chapter—the idea of knowledge hierarchies that exist between performers and scholars. Cook quotes Taruskin in regards to performance practice, “Performers are essentially corrupters—
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deviants, in fact”79 and though this may sound outlandish on first glance, it is a view embedded into how much of music scholarship operates. Cook further elaborates that this view about performers is emphasized by “the relationship between theory and practice.”80 This view he suggests is a result of a capitalism which values product over process, and sees the performer as no more the a “‘middleman’… who puts a markup on the product without contributing anything to it.”81 Cook takes issue with these disparaging views of the performer, which he suggests take their basis in academe, and have no relevance to the listener, or culture at large. However Cook comes to the conclusion that what he is talking about has been done before, he cites “[Christopher] Small’s terminology not music but musicking, in Taruskin’s not things but acts, in short, not product but process.”82 In this chapter I will add to this list with Parmer’s music-as-done, Elisabeth Le Guin’s carnal musicology, and Linda Kaastra’s application of Joint Activity. These ideas all build on a premise which in my research was begun with Patricia Carpenter’s philosophical look at The Musical Object.

One of the first to question the role of body in modern musicology was Patricia Carpenter. In her search for the meaning of a “work” she draws on as example Edgar Varese’s Ionization, in contrast to John Cage’s Variations. “Varese speaks of the spatiality of sound and molds it as if it were a very solid, palpable matter. Cage, on the contrary, exploits the most fundamental properties of the mode of hearing. He
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deliberately breaks down any sense of corporality or external spatiality.”

This dualistic tone used by Carpenter, that Varese’s music is bodily and Cage’s – what she hesitates to call music – lacks one, sets her up to examine music not in a mind-body antagonism, but rather an object-process one. A musical object, she argues, is one where you can relate the parts to the whole (has form), as well as take a role of spectatorship; whereas a process has “diffuse” construction, and the subject stands at the center of the work, rather than to the side.

In referencing the ricercar of Adriano Willaert she refers to the “listener, as performer” for, as Carpenter argues, this piece was written “primarily for performance” and is “most satisfactorily grasped at the level of moment-to-moment unfolding of an activity” as opposed to a Bach fugue, whose performer “presents a musical object intended for contemplation by someone who is removed and who grasps more far-reaching relations of structure in his confrontation of the piece as a whole.”

This categorization could be argued as arbitrary, or skewed by canonical tradition, but what is key is Carpenter’s acknowledgement that the spectator’s proximity to the work decides whether or not it is objectified. Identifying that proximity determines objectivity may seem to reveal little, especially when one considers the fundamentals of research. However in thinking of music not as an object but as a process instead, one with many moving parts, allows for a further and more complete study of it to occur.

Carpenter also finds it worth noting how this objectification may be symptomatic of “Standard Average European” languages. This group which has obviously affected
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Westernized thought processes seems to have the ability to objectify non-corporeal subjects, such as time or “a piece of music.” Carpenter cites linguist Benjamin Whorf, in that how we speak sets up “our notion of the world as a combination of form and substance (a notion, incidentally, which much of 20th-century thought has been engaged in refuting).”88 Thus in 1967 Carpenter not only set up the notion of the importance of the performing body, she also acknowledged how language objectifies music, and that academia is trying to deny the embodied. This objectification process is common, as we saw in Chapter One with cognitive embodiment, and Carpenter (over a decade before Lakoff and Johnson’s theory) points to metaphor as a way in which we have come to objectify the process of music:

a mechanic will talk of fixing the timing on a car in much the same terms that he uses in speaking of fixing the tire, even though the timing is simply a relation of events, whereas the tire is a thing. Perhaps this is simply a metaphorical manner of speaking, but the metaphor proceeds via the conception of a stable physical object. A piece of music is like the timing on a car; it has been objectified.89

What is the drawback to objectifying music? Carpenter considers the inherent problem as one that lays out fundamental truths of objects, the most important of which is, “an other; not I.”90 As we saw in Chapter One, a truly embodied discourse collapses a subject-object duality. So to objectify music is to automatically discount it from an embodied discourse.

A further point Carpenter brings up is the idea of a hierarchy of senses in our culture, determined by how well the sense can differentiate between subject and object.91 She cites that “vision distances, whereas hearing interconnects,”92 and that hearing
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“mediates between inner and outer world.”

Carpenter makes a case of how the sense of hearing collapses the body-environment duality which sight keenly emphasizes. She also acknowledges hearing as a temporal medium and how that is reflected in the concepts of the arts: “On this view, painting has been taken to exemplify being, and music, the process of becoming.” This temporality she notes, is a characteristic shared by the senses of hearing and touch. On her spectrum of ability to objectify, touch falls alongside hearing; however, if we were to extrapolate where she might rank kinesthetic sensation on this continuum, the sense needed by performers of all levels, one could imagine it sinking below the possibilities of being ranked. It is pure subjectivity. And it is this subjectivity which is often overlooked in music theory. Carpenter notes that “Objectivity in our music, too, has been achieved by heightening the traditional distinction between doing and knowing and, thereby, between the knower and the known.” It is with this we can expose the gaps in the knowledge of the “knowers”.

To return to the question of “what is the drawback to objectifying music?” Nicholas Cook continues to builds on Carpenter’s premise in “Between Process and Product: Music and/as Performance” where he points out what scholars in performance studies are keen to show: there is a lessening of the performer, and performer’s knowledge, when a view of music as an object is taken. One way Cook shows this is by demonstrating how (especially in WAM) our language is built to subjugate the performer’s status, in that you cannot “just perform” you must “give a performance “of”

93 Ibid., 70.
94 Ibid., 73.
95 Ibid., 66-67.
something." How language determines our conception though, is not Cook’s main point. Through a survey of authors arguing that performance and text are equal, or at least on “a continuum between experiencing music as process and as product," Cook shows that these types of arguments actually result in a commodification of performance. Cook suggests places where we see this objectification of performance in music occurring include watching a performance of Madonna (where the song’s composer is likely unknown to most in the audience); or the virtuoso tradition in WAM (Liszt, Chopin, Rubenstein, and other forgotten composer-pianists) which ran along side that of the “opus” tradition. Furthermore Cook exposes Kivy’s “gap between ‘text’ and performance” as something that can also be commodified. Interpretation is what he purports is “for sale” when we look at the difference between two recordings/orchestras/conductors playing the same work. Cook concludes from these observations “there is a striking mismatch between the largely performance-oriented manner in which such music is experienced and the almost exclusively composer- or composition-oriented manner in which it is represented in historical and critical writing.” And thus in arguing for performance to be included into this discourse, it is important to guard against making performance itself a commodity or object. What Cook, and we, should be looking for is the music as performance, in short, the process.
The following survey of the embodied literature in musicology has at its core that it treats music performance as a process. However, each camp has been grouped into one of three broad categories which reflect how the faction views and interacts with the process. The first, identity studies, treats music as a cultural process which affects and is effected by its culture. Secondly, the camp of empirical musicology treats music as a process that can be studied by breaking it down and observing its component parts. And finally I discuss performance studies, which includes those disciplines that seek to understand the process of music by engaging in and with it.

2.2 Embodiment in Music and Identity Studies

The role identity studies in musicology played in bringing the body to the center of the discourse was paramount to legitimizing that which is embodied. However, the use of the body in this discourse is heavily steeped in metaphor and as a result lacks actual bodies. One feminist musicology scholar, Susan Cusick, recognized and articulated this, however was unable to follow through with an actual embodied analysis. I will now show how her discipline developed to allow for her to raise this question.

Though the body has always been a necessary part of the study of music (perhaps felt most in pedagogy), in the 20th century, music analysis took a turn towards the abstract. At the same time, most notably in France, philosophy and anthropology were beginning to notice the body (or the lack thereof) in their discourse. Phenomenologist Maurice Merleau-Ponty and sociologist Marcel Mauss lead developments in their fields
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of cultural study to become sensitive to the importance of the body within it. While this incorporation of the body was happening in philosophy and anthropology, Schenkerian analysis, a fairly disembodied methodology, was becoming fashionable in musical discourse. The privileging of the mind in this analytical style was not lost on all, including musicologist Paul Henry Lang. Lang wrote of Schenker and his disciples’ style, “In reality music serves only to furnish grist for the mill of their insatiable theoretical mind, not for their heart or imagination.”¹⁰³ This call for more body and emotion in music analysis was an unpopular opinion at the time, thus the abstractionist theory popularized by Schenker led to a musicological discourse that ignored bodily analysis. I will begin my analysis of where the body (re)enters the modern musicological discourse with the identity studies birthed from a turn to “new musicology,” specifically feminist musicology.

The feminist approach in music has changed over time, beginning with an attempt to challenge the male-dominated cannon through uncovering female-composers and addressing the patriarchal lens of music history. Over time this has branched out into a method which looked for signifiers of the body within music, showing music’s reflection of the society in which it was formed; and how the physical bodies in this society were represented by the metaphorical ones in the music. In the 1980s there was a legitimatizing of social analysis in music that sought to unmask privilege and redirect focus within musicological discourse.¹⁰⁴ It was at this time a feminist voice in musicology emerged and as a result made the body an explicit component of the
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discourse. The publication of McClary’s *Feminine Endings* in 1991 cemented feminist musicology as a sub-discipline. In opening up questions concerning meaning in music, McClary found that “music… frequently betrays fear – fear of women, fear of the body.” The title concept of the book addressed the idea of how the female body’s subversion in the patriarchal culture at large was depicted through cadential structure used in classical music. Thus, she was offering a look not just into (Western Art) music, but also the analysis and discourse that surrounded it.

McClary acknowledges that she and her peers may come to their analysis from different perspectives, agendas, and varieties of feminist theory. However, at her outset she proposed five questions to specifically guide her in applying feminist theory to musicology. Though each of the points centers on issues of gender, two of the ideas explicitly bring the body into the discourse: “gender and sexuality in musical narrative” and “musical constructions of gender and sexuality.” Furthermore, McClary’s look at “music as a gendered discourse” offers some problematizing that can offer insights into a performer-centric approach to musicology.

When McClary looks at “gender and sexuality in musical narrative” she is examining how we map our concepts of bodily understanding onto music as it unfolds. Citing the antiquated practice of theorists “gendering” themes as masculine or feminine, or how Western tonality is set up to conquer “the other,” McClary shows ways that the body and its differences through gender are seen in music analysis. Furthermore she points out that theorists of all stripes endlessly employ the metaphor of sexual activity as

---
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a stand-in for musical motion. She realizes the “heavily gendered legacy of these paradigms”\textsuperscript{107} is not an intentional part on the composer, but as such are “the most powerful aspects of musical discourses, for they operate below the level of deliberate signification and are thus usually reproduced and transmitted without conscious intervention.”\textsuperscript{108} This argument reflects an approach of Lakoff and Johnson’s embodied cognition theory, in that what we are understanding as an abstract concept – music analysis – is actually rooted in the body (in this case sex). McClary is finding meaning in music analysis through its embodiment of gender-identified bodies by showing that music is metaphorically reproducing cultural values.

Looking at “musical constructions of gender and sexuality” McClary examines the “musical semiotics of gender” and how these codes were established by attitudes prevailing from the beginning of 17\textsuperscript{th} century opera.\textsuperscript{109} She suggests these representations remain today, not because of a “universal language of music,” but rather that social codes regarding gender are “strikingly resilient”.\textsuperscript{110} Their resiliency lies in part that as an act of culture, music not only reflects the attitudes of the society in which it is composed, but informs it as well.\textsuperscript{111} Thus McClary is bringing into the discourse how the gendered body is represented as well as how it is being taught to be. Again this argument reflects an approach of Lakoff and Johnson’s embodied cognition, although, the stand in for language in this case becomes musical tropes. These metaphor mappings for her are what allow the music to “make sense,” and to completely understand WAM one needs to have

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 16.
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experienced a gendered body in Western society. For this thesis though, what is important to note is that even though McClary has brought the body into the discourse she is still only discussing it in terms of the listener and composer, and has almost completely neglected the performer, the body producing the culture, as well as one affected by it.\textsuperscript{112} Her recognition of metaphor is significant, as it uses music to comment on a state of cultural identity which has profound political implications, inside and outside of musical discourse. However merely bringing a metaphorical body into the discourse is not enough to qualify it as truly embodied. In recognizing that the spectator’s body is the one McClary conjures when analyzing the music, we can see how she is leaving out the body and processes through which that culture is being produced: the performer’s.

It is also worth considering McClary’s examination of “music as a gendered discourse” for the questions it might pose towards a view of embodiment. Suggesting music is a fine art that emphasizes effeminate characteristics of humanity, McClary observes how male musicians have tried to erase some of the femininity from music by exalting its rationality, objectivity, and universality.\textsuperscript{113} This resembles how the body has been subjugated in much of contemporary musicological discourse in two ways. First, as brought up in Chapter One, rationality has been given value over that which is physical. Second, McClary addresses taboos in the discourse when she states, “if the whole enterprise is fraught with gender-related anxieties, then feminist critique provides a most fruitful way of approaching some of the anomalies that characterize musical

\textsuperscript{112} It is important to note McClary’s approach to this subject changed over her career, but in this monumental work very little was said of the performer.
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institutions.” These “gender-related anxieties” scale back to her earlier pronouncement that there is a “fear of the body” in musicological discourse, and thus might actually be more persuasive an argument that musicology is fraught with performance-related anxiety, realizing how embedded listener-spectatorship is into the field of musicology. Using gender discourse to reflect the dualities seen in embodiment may appear to be an argument that merely replaces “female” with “body,” and “male” with “mind;” however, what is more important is to demonstrate that there is a physical body, not metaphorical one involved in the process of music making. This was first and most keenly acknowledged by another feminist musicology scholar, Susan Cusick.

After the release of *Feminine Endings*, “Questions were asked about whether music could sustain the kind of analysis McClary was proposing and… would [it] make music somehow less of a “music thing” and more of a “culture thing.” This line of thinking is in itself steeped in the duality that Mark Johnson showed was unavoidable in our ways of speaking. It indicates a stigma implied by acknowledging the body in academic discourse, especially in the search for meaning. To answer this question one needs only to look at the wealth of analysis that followed in this style. Approaches similar to McClary’s emerged in music analysis in queer and racial theory, looking for similar hermeneutic structures that indicated power relationships and the body. Though the idea of an “objectified” music had been around since the late 1960’s in music aesthetics, it was not until the 1990’s that this discourse became mainstream and attempt was made at “subjectifying” music.
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This discourse takes a further turn with Suzanne Cusick’s “Feminist Theory, Music Theory, and the Mind/Body Problem.” Here Cusick, in examining a Fanny Mendelssohn trio, realizes there is a meaningfulness in the texture and interplay of roles between the piano and strings. She decides she has two choices for an analysis: (1) a metaphorical account of how the piano part (also Fanny’s instrument) represents the role of a woman in the time and culture of the composition; or (2) to analyze the piece through her body, skipping the metaphor and using bodily perception (beyond ears and eyes) as a starting point for her analysis. She acknowledges the second option as the correct choice, but realizing it is fraught with difficulty and that she cannot do it justice, argues that she must save it for another time in her career. Having decided that this type of analysis is more legitimate than a metaphoric one, Cusick calls out her fellow feminist music scholars and makes pointed attacks on those who talk about the body yet ignore the performer’s.

In her attempt at analyzing the Fanny Mendelssohn-Hensel trio Cusick questions, “might not elements of all bodily performances be read as metaphors of gender.”\(^1\) (An equally powerful sentence without the final two words). This idea leads her to a second realization of looking at her “subject as a set of scripts for bodily performances.”\(^2\) The idea of scripts leads her to an analysis where she needs to “think about bodies, performer’s bodies,”\(^3\) though her first attempt she slips back in to a habit (and habitus) of talking about texture as a metaphor for social roles. When she again remembers she

\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Ibid., 15.
“ought to have been thinking about actual bodies”¹¹⁹ she decides to postpone her analysis, but speculates on Hensel’s approach to the piece,

I suspect that Hensel wrote so much of this story into the relationship among physically enacted parts (as opposed to writing it into the relationship among notes or themes) because she understood the tension surrounding her role as a woman composer to be as much metaphorical as it was real.¹²⁰

Cusick’s article was the first to legitimize the performer’s body in musicological discourse. McClary, perhaps heeding Cusick’s message, followed suit shortly after with “Music, the Pythagoreans, and the Body” in a multi-art compilation Choreographing History which incorporated the performer’s body into the discourse. These publications built legitimacy and momentum into the field, and others started following suit. What identity studies in music does well is question where the body exists in music, and addresses the subject-object duality through a lens of listener-spectatorship. However it fails to collapse the mind-body duality: by not bringing an actual body into the discourse, it continues the privileging of the knower. We will now examine how an “embodied” approach that includes actual bodies can be equally as disembodied.

2.3 Empirical Musicology

In an empirical musicology where the body is involved, the “research is fascinating and instructive, but it can seem all too remote from the reality of performance and the perceptions of the performer, who is often treated more as a laboratory rat than a sentient being.”¹²¹ This is often seen in work where the goal is improved performance or anatomical understanding of music. What then differentiates empirical musicology from

¹¹⁹ Ibid.
¹²⁰ Ibid.
performance studies if both include real bodies, and in many cases, those of performers? For the answer to this I turn to Steinar Kvale’s *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing* which draws a distinction between two types of data collection. The first takes a positivist stance, and Kvale draws on the metaphor of a miner who pulls “nuggets of data or meanings out of a subject’s pure experience.” On the other end of the continuum, “the traveler… asks questions that lead the subjects to tell their own stories of their lived world, and converses with them in the original Latin meaning of conversation as ‘wandering together with.’” The reason I draw this distinction is because I wish to make clear that an embodied discourse is not a dataless discourse. Rather the distinction between what I have categorized as “empirical musicology” and “performance studies” reflects differences in how the academic interacts with the subject.

Though some research in this area does take up an approach that emphasizes a mind-body duality, one of the largest problems with empirical musicology is that when held up against the light of the paradigm presented by Csordas, it fails to provide a truly embodied approach because it fails to collapse the subject-object duality. In fact, it re-emphasizes it. This objectivity is contested by Eric Clarke and Nicholas Cook in *Empirical Musicology: Aims, Methods, Prospects* where in 2004, they argue “there is no
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useful distinction to be drawn between empirical and non-empirical musicology.”\textsuperscript{124} They are firm to define that empirical musicology’s goal is not objectivity but rather “a principled awareness of both the potential to engage with large bodies of relevant data, and the appropriate methods for achieving this.”\textsuperscript{125} Clarke and Cook insist that some of the problems in the methodologies of the field are actually reflective of data-poorness, especially in older genres of music. They highlight the fact that it causes them grief when these same methodologies from data-poor fields are used in those where there could be a wealth of data to be mined.\textsuperscript{126} A decade later however, Cook seems to modify his stance, when he notes “empirical approaches are also open to some quite powerful objections. Perhaps the most fundamental is that… [texts] are taken out of context and analyzed as self-sufficient objects rather than as the traces of human actions.”\textsuperscript{127} With regard to my research, I will demonstrate ways the performers body has been empirically studied and despite claims to the contrary, objectified, in empirical musicology. This failure to engage the performer in research not only limits their voice in the discourse, it also (again) privileges those who know over those who do.

The field of empirical musicology is beginning to swell with data as new technology and methodologies allow for answers to questions previously thought un-researchable. Such questions can include “what is happening in the brain of the performer
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when hearing or watching another musician perform?” But beyond researching biological, psychological and cognitive structures involved in music making, this field is looking at how to address the meaning that emanates from music. This is not as far a stretch for the field as one might at first think. For example, one lab points out “Gestures and action-perception couplings are now acknowledged to be an important part of the musical meaning formation process.”\(^{128}\) I will now briefly explore sub-disciplines of this genre of musicology that bring physical bodies into their discourses, but conclude each section with a description of what is lacking in terms of a truly embodied discourse.

### 2.3.1 Psychology and Cognitive Embodiment

The cognitive sciences are a diverse area unto themselves, but psychology is especially influential in modern thought on embodied cognition. Raymond Gibbs Jr. has examined embodiment and its implications, especially in language and behavior, by using image schemata and studies as ways to understand the many expressions of embodiment. Speaking to studies conducted in music, especially those on rhythm,\(^{129}\) he shows that “listening to rhythmic music involves the same basic processes that generate bodily motion.”\(^{130}\) The work by John Sloboda was some of the earliest in music psychology to


focus on the performer, as his early works focus on skill acquisition.\textsuperscript{131} As his work developed, he began making qualitative assessments of the musicians being tested: for example there were “good readers” and “master readers” in his study on sight-reading.\textsuperscript{132} This development would become important for later studies that would shed the simple separation of “musicians” from “non-musicians” and instead begin to assess the various levels of skill. The difference of these skill sets becomes important when discussing quality of movement as well as awareness of it, as is done in studies on gesture in music. Though the discussion of differentiation of quality of movement may be useful to the performer, much of Sloboda’s work (and that in music psychology) could be read in a way which devalues the performer’s knowledge of their craft. Though this approach can be beneficial for performers, as well as shifts the focus of the research from listeners to performers, it continues to reinforce the duality between the knowers and the doers. It could be argued that this is a new form of prescriptive musicology.

2.3.2 Gesture

Fisher and Lochhead describe gesture as “the specific site where physical action and musical significance merge.”\textsuperscript{133} In Jane Davidson’s research, which is derived from the social psychology of performance, the study of gesture in music is a key theme of analysis. She has collaborated with other musicologists in the areas of musical cognition including John Sloboda and Eric Clarke. One of Davidson’s early studies showed the
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importance of visual elements to comprehension of expression by an audience.\textsuperscript{134} Her work has evolved across the decades to include more qualitative accounts of musicians (i.e. through interview), and showed that in rehearsal performers grounded meaning through physical metaphor.\textsuperscript{135} Davidson’s research is often analytical in nature, in contrast to performing musicians who often relate to a more subjective examination of the phenomenology of performance. Her founding work in this field has allowed gestural analysis to become a popular approach to performance studies\textsuperscript{136} as well as find specific niches for exploration including in ethnomusicology,\textsuperscript{137} entrainment study\textsuperscript{138} and in application to specific instruments.\textsuperscript{139} As widespread as this research has become, it
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would be erroneous to suggest it contributes to an embodied discourse in musicology. Researchers in this field look for meaning in the movement of the performer’s body, often relating it back to the text as a way to decipher the expressiveness of the gesture. As a result this excludes many elements of the process of performance as possible contributors to meaning, leaving us with an analysis that is one-dimensional and falls flat of truly being embodied.

2.4 Performance Studies

As mentioned earlier, when the body became of interest in philosophy, sociology, and anthropology, music scholarship followed suit. The study of music performance became a way to examine the physical body within musical discourse, especially in studies on performance practice, gender, and nationality. Feminist musicology shifted the focus from “why is this music meaningful?” to “what makes this music meaningful for the society in which it is performed?” and has led to approaches in musicology that imbue the somatic with musical meaning. Though study of embodied meaning in music is growing, it is still a small part of the discipline, especially in the sense that I argue we have yet in this literature review to encounter a truly embodied approach in music scholarship. As noted by Alejandro Madrid,

do… how these musics can help us understand these processes as opposed to how do these processes help us understand music.\textsuperscript{141}

This emphasis on the process, as incited by Carpenter, allows for opening the discourse in academia to ask for whom the performer works, what aspects of culture are they performing, and how is their knowledge demonstrated in their bodies. This reflects the paradigm levied by Csordas as explored in Chapter One, where an “approach to embodiment begins from the methodological postulate that the body is not an object to be studied in relation to culture, but is to be considered as the subject of culture, or in other words as the existential ground of culture.”\textsuperscript{142} Extrapolating from Csordas, we can look at the performer’s body as the existential ground of music.

In this section I will examine performance studies in four separate camps: Performance Studies Advocates (2.4.1), Ethnomusicology (2.4.2), Pedagogy (2.4.3) and a brief introduction to Performer-Scholars (2.4.4). The first, which I call “performance study advocates,” is perhaps the most controversial. This group is comprised of many renowned music scholars who offer deep insight and theorizing on the musical body and its role in music. With no intention to lessen their contributions to this field (which are many) I will draw a line between them and “performer-scholars” who in addition to theorizing in this field, actually put their bodies where their mouths are and engage in embodied analyses. In Chapter Three, I will center my work on three performer-scholars, each of whom takes a different focus as they engage their research. However, in the
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present chapter I will speak in general of their approach to their subject. In this section I have also found it important to include embodied research done in the areas of ethnomusicology and pedagogy. These fields are important to note here for their contribution to the concepts and legitimation of the role of the body, especially the performer’s, in musicological discourse. Further more, both these fields take a relationship akin to that of Kvale’s “data traveler.”

2.4.1 Advocates of Performance Studies

Mainstream musicology has examined concepts of performance often under the guise of authenticity and historically informed performance practice. As the field evolved, non-authentic performance practices began to present themselves, morphing the discussion about music from “the work” to the idea of the non-objectified work. Two writings on this topic are Richard Taruskin’s *Text and Act* (1995), and Christopher Small’s “Musicking” (1998). “Musicking” inspired a conversation in musicology about the performer, and two notable authors on this were Nicholas Cook and Phillip Auslander. Cook’s “Between Process and Product: Music and/as Performance” (as indulged earlier in this chapter) attempts to strike a balance between the performer and the work, a process that requires a renaming of musical texts to “scripts” in an effort to emphasize their fluidity. Auslander’s “Musical Personae” is a reaction to this and advocates that nothing needs renaming, but rather, as in theater terminologies, an acknowledgement of the “persona” of the musician is necessary. This “persona,” and not
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the music, he suggests, is what the performer is actually performing. This debate over language and ideas has a place in the philosophy of performance studies, but what both scholars fail to do (even in Cook’s follow-up tome *Music as Performance*) is to present a true embodied analysis into the oeuvre.

In *The State of Play in Performance Studies* (2004) John Rink speculates if “performance studies” is legitimate enough to be called a sub-discipline of musicology. He notes the numerous objections to it within the field and the reasons for these objections. He then conducts an analysis of the current state of affairs within the discipline, of which he sees “three overlapping domains: historical performance practice, the psychology of performance, and analysis and performance.” He then proceeds to present an analysis through the lens of performance studies which blends these three disciplines. I bring this up here because I am not including John Rink as a performer-scholar. Along with Cook and Auslander, I suggest instead that these are advocates of performance studies. For in Rink’s attempted analysis the blending of what he sees as the three components of performance studies falls flat for what we established in the first chapter as a necessary part of an embodied approach. Furthermore his role is of a data miner rather than traveler. This is seen in how he barely engages himself in his analysis (and when he does he offers just opinions, with very little reasoning), his reliance on recordings of performances (with frequent references to the score), and his concluding visual representation of the work that seems more mysterious than useful or insightful in how it might impact performers or their discourse. I do not mean to disparage Rink’s
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approach. However, I will argue that it is not an embodied approach to the musicological discourse. Rink’s concern with epistemology hierarchy, however, shows his keen awareness of the problems between the discipline and performers, and for that alone his work is valuable.

A common problem among advocates of performance studies is their uncanny ability to be vague, or quote countless contradictory sources (an easy misstep in this field). For instance, if we are to revisit Cook’s “Music and/as Process” we see him flip-flop on his suggestions of ways in which one can study music as performance. One of the most obvious options he notes is to look to recordings. He eventually points out numerous problems with this, the most important being that it reinforces the idea of the work as a product. Cook comes to the conclusion, “And yet, in the end, the distinction between product and process does not really hold up …Process and product, then, are not so much alternative options as complementary strands of the twisted braid we call performance.” This sentence comes at the end of a paragraph suggesting that the difference between music performance and a musical work could be emphasis, ends of a continuum, or that both exist within each other; in the end one must wonder if it is it just semantics to him. This unclarity is not helpful to this field which suffers so much from “ineffability.” Cook however is able to offer some clarity and that is in a methodology to study performance:

The issue of omniscience, of the availability or otherwise of a central point of intelligibility, also has a direct effect upon the relationship between the
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performance analyst and the phenomena that analyst is investigating, and it is the component of the contemporary performance studies synthesis that… makes this clearest: ethnomusicology.\(^{148}\)

Cook’s acknowledgement of ethnomusicology’s contribution to understanding in performance studies is important for an investigation of the approach of performance-scholars.

### 2.4.2 Ethnomusicology

As mentioned, Cook takes note that ethnomusicology is a discipline well poised to give us insight into performance, “To understand music as performance, then, means to see it as an irreducibly social phenomenon, even when only a single individual is involved.”\(^{149}\) He goes on to compare performance with religious ritual, harking back to Csordas’ embodied paradigm. As a daughter of anthropology, this discipline is important for its role in explicitly acknowledging the use of the observer’s body within a musicological discourse. Though its aims are different than that of traditional musicology, the work of ethnomusicologists has legitimatized this approach to studying music, and strengthened the discipline as a result. I will show this through two shifts that occurred in the discipline, shifts which are paralleled in the trajectory of performance studies. The first centers on the concept of fieldwork, and the role of the ethnomusicologist. The second, occurring now, involves areas of research in ethnomusicology that are actually incorporating methods from empirical musicology into their study. I will show why both these shifts are significant to performance research in

\(^{148}\) Ibid., 8.

musicology. I will furthermore explore the relation of writing style between
ethnomusicologists and performer-scholars.

The concept of the role of fieldwork in the practice of ethnomusicology has
changed over time. Janet Topp Fargion maintains this paradigm shift is one of focus. She
notes “methodology has shifted from armchair analysis to participant observation, and the
research endeavor has moved from comparative musicology to the study of music in
context.”¹⁵⁰ She argues that this shift is resultant of the change in relationship between
ethnomusicologists and recordings. This change she suggests was solidified in 1964 with
Alan Merriam's seminal book, *The Anthropology of Music* which re-characterized
ethnomusicology from a discipline that curated recordings to one concerned with the
influence of culture on all aspects musical. It is interesting to see that a shift in
ethnomusicology away from recordings signaled a shift towards the performative;
however as Topp Fargion notes, the opposite was true in musicology,

while most musicologists today seem to recognize that an understanding of
performance is necessary for a fuller understanding of music, those working
within traditional musicology suggest that recordings provide the route to
performance. Ethnomusicologists, on the other hand, might argue that along
with the actual moment of expression, study of ‘the processes of creation,
aesthetics, and the training and acculturation of performers and audience’
provides the route to performance.¹⁵¹

Jeff Todd Titan agrees that the operative stance in the discipline has changed and
elaborates more on what it has become: “Fieldwork is no longer viewed principally as
observing and collecting (although it surely involves that) but as experiencing and

---

¹⁵⁰ Janet Topp Fargion, “‘For my Own Research Purposes’?: Examining
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understanding music… The new fieldwork leads us to ask what it is like for a person (ourselves included) to make and to know music as lived experience.”

This ability to “subjectify” oneself in the culture is what I argue makes for the most authentic submissions to the literature thus far in the discipline. As we will see in the next chapter it is the approach taken by each performer-scholar, though it is done in varying ways.

However what comes to the fore in each of the performer-scholars in the next chapter is the break from their discipline in how they write. In music ethnography research the voice one reads is significantly different from most scholarly literature in the field. It seems like the performer-scholars have tapped into the same well of tone and style as ethnomusicologists. I would argue this is resultant from physically engaging in one’s work, and being somatically aware of the processes occurring. This break from the norm in scholarly writing is something Cook noticed and commented on. He realized

field work

stresses personal participation in the performative generation of meaning that is music, and … it gives rise to a literary practice that is as close to travel writing or even autobiography as to the traditional literature of ethnomusicology, and which is also acutely conscious of its performative nature as writing.\(^{153}\)

This analysis by Cook is not too far off, for as Janet Topp Fargion notes, “We might describe the beginnings of ethnomusicology as springing from the work of early travel


Borrowing from Geertz the idea of ethnomusicologists as “authors” rather than “reporters” removes the mandate of objectivity, created through distance, for studying meaning, a useful tool in the field.

The lines between musicology and ethnomusicology continue to blur, and the “performative turn” of the former discipline have been a contributing factor. For instance, technological elements used in the study of musicology now find themselves being drawn upon in the study of musics across cultures. This reciprocity in methods is a second way in which ethnography in music is connected with performance studies. As both are trying to learn about processes of performance, the techniques they are interested in developing have much overlap. One such example of this can be seen with Martin Clayton’s *Experience and Meaning in Music Performance* (EMMP) project. He states his research goals as addressing the question, “how can empirical study of non-verbal behaviour in musical performance be integrated into a programme of ethnographic research?” His research thus draws heavily on gesture analysis and work in embodied cognition. Clayton finds his answers from his research lead him to a second question, “what can we learn about processes of performance, reception and meaning construction by studying non-
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verbal behaviour as well as verbalised reports?"\(^\text{157}\) In answering these questions Clayton draws on the verbal accounts of Indian musicians which are full of embodied metaphors, and accompanied by physical gestures, revealing that the “experience of the performance of [a specific] raga is very much a physical one.”\(^\text{158}\) Later Clayton draws upon a lesson given by a singer on another raga, which “highlights the role of musical embodiment in the transmission process.”\(^\text{159}\) The researchers note than in speaking of a specific musical gesture, it is accompanied by a corresponding hand gesture. Clayton argues, “these are two complementary aspects of a single act of performance and transmission of musical knowledge.”\(^\text{160}\) The reason I wish to draw attention to this is two-fold, firstly the analysis of musical teaching presents itself as a ripe area from which to glean understanding of how musicians are derive meaning, both linguistically and through gesture. Secondly, it raises a question about what information constitutes data worthy for analysis. EMMP is drawing on empirical methods in their analyses, yet often what is being used as data (qualitative or quantitative) is music performance, or verbal descriptors of it. Returning to the idea of recordings, Norma McLeod and Marcia Herndon argue, “The only ‘hard data’ the ethnomusicologist has to work with is the moment in which music is performed (and recorded)”\(^\text{161}\) Topp Farigon corroborates this, “recording becomes an integral part of the
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data. The moment becomes data through experience and recording.”¹⁶² This is significant, because it argues that performance itself, in recording or more importantly for this thesis through experience, can be data. I believe it is this fact that causes some to look disparagingly at the sub-discipline of performance studies and see it as lesser than. But good research requires good data, and surprisingly, there is not much of this type of embodied data actually seen in the field of musicology.

This returns us to McClary’s idea that there is a “fear of the body in musicology.” Suppression of an embodied type of data would make sense if musicology was afraid of the body, even more so, performance. There is one area however in music study where the role of the body has been acknowledged openly from the beginning, and that is in music pedagogy. The “backwards” thought processes (in comparison to the disciplines so far explored) in knowledge acquisition found meaningful in music pedagogy research¹⁶³ could be summed up by ethnomusicologist Mantle Hood, “The training of ears, eyes, hands and voice and fluency gained in these skills assure a real comprehension of theoretical studies, which in turn prepares the way for the professional activities of the performer, the composer, the musicologist and the music educator.”¹⁶⁴

2.4.3 Music Pedagogy

As mentioned in the previous section, the approach to embodiment in music pedagogy is a key area of research as many interested in cognitive embodiment find that

music pedagogy can give significant insight into performance cognition. For example, performer-scholar Linda Kaastra gives as her reasoning for studying videos of high level performers teaching master classes: “Grounding theory in the realities of performance is best done through third-person analysis of high quality instructional material. This is a more systematic gleaning of professional level knowledge than first-person accounts or interviews.”

This demonstrates that there is significant overlap in research domains between music pedagogy, and meaning in performance despite the fact that these disciplines have different focuses: “how do we learn music meaningfully?” as opposed to “how do we perform music meaningfully?” The overlap in these questions, how do we learn to do what is necessary to perform music meaningfully demonstrates a large area of reciprocity between these disciplines. However, in this section I would like to draw attention to a specific way in which research in music pedagogy heavily intersects with that of performance studies. Through a focus on the act of performance, the relation between the body and meaning is made clear. I will show this through a look at Dalcroze’s approach to music education which highlights the involvement of the body and how, when taught through this style of pedagogy, students have a potentially richer learning experience.

The open discussion of the body that has been occurring in the field of music pedagogy may seem obvious due to the fact that the body has always been a necessary part of performance learning. The length of time for which the body has been openly
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talked about in this discipline, compared with what has only reached mainstream
musicology in the last two decades, is surprising. For instance, in 1898 Emile Jacques-
Dalcroze wrote,

I am beginning to think of a musical education in which the body would play
the role of intermediary between sound and thought, so becoming an
expressive instrument. Bodily movement is an experience felt by a sixth
sense, the muscular sense. This consists of the relationship between the
dynamics of movement and the position of the body in space, between the
duration of movement and its extent, between the preparation of a movement
and its performance. This muscular sense must be capable of being grasped
by the intellect, and since it demands the collaboration of all the muscles,
voluntary and involuntary, its rhythmic education needs movement of the
whole body.\footnote{Claire-Lise Dutoit, \emph{Music, Movement, Therapy} (Surrey, England: Dalcroze Society, 1971), 10.}

Though this was written before Dalcroze had fully developed his method, the approach
he will take in regards to the whole of the body is evident in this passage. The application
of this bodily explicitness can be seen in Diane Urista’s teachings on the concept of
different types of cadences. Rather than the traditional lecture on what they look and
sound like, Urista has students move around a classroom with dowels in hand while she
plays various cadences on the piano. She notices in her students
different physical gestures emerge that reflect the subtle qualities of the
various cadences. For some types of cadences, the movers touch dowels
gently and lightly above their heads; for other cadences they touch dowels
swiftly and precisely near the waist. They also begin to exhibit facial
expressions that mimic the cadences’ bold or tranquil character.\footnote{Diane Urista, “Beyond Words: The Moving Body as a Tool for Musical Understanding,” \emph{Music Theory Online: The Online Journal of the Society for Music Theory} 9, no. 3 (August 2003): 2, accessed October 6, 2017, http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.03.9.3/mto.03.9.3.urista.pdf.}
The importance of this way of learning is that “What takes place is a spontaneous, living
analysis of phrase and cadence. Rather than passively talking about the idea of cadence…
a personal response [is] derived from the musical event itself that engages the kinesthetic
The meaningfulness Urista’s students embody of the cadences has more depth than what they could have taken away from a traditional theory lesson. And it is this richness which performer-scholars are drawing on. They are trying to bypass visual, score-based metaphors in getting to the meaning of music. For as even Lakoff and Johnson note, “In actuality we feel that no metaphor can ever be comprehended or even adequately represented independently of its experiential basis.”

This premise is at the heart of an embodied music education, and thus we return to the main difference between music pedagogues and performer-scholars: their goals. For instance the goal of music pedagogy can be seen when Magnus Andersson suggests “Movement studies can make [musicians’] playing more precise and can engender a far better musical understanding of how to shape or listen to the time in between notes.”

The extra step of learning as the framing of the research is a fine line that delineates the fields of performance study and pedagogy. As a result the importance of the research done in music pedagogy in understanding the role of the performer’s body in comprehending meaning cannot be over-looked. I mentioned at the top of this section how one performer-scholar used pedagogy in her research. I will conclude this section with how another calls for a shift in how we educate music students in universities, by discussing the performer’s body in traditionally “academic” classes.

What the students come to learn from performing it, and to a lesser extent from watching performances, is not how to imagine some idealized abstraction, the work, in the context of its compositional conception or some
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other cultural backdrop. What they come to learn is how the process of performing itself determines what the work is, how the work works, and what that work means in the context of that working.\textsuperscript{171}

2.4.4 Performer-Scholars

The work of performancer-scholars is the voice that is missing from the discourse in this chapter. The three I include in the following chapter are among the handful of musicians contributing the analyses, and bodies, to the field. This group epitomizes the ideals of embodiment, and while they can advocate on behalf of the field, they also get in the trenches and engage in embodied analysis. As mentioned in Chapter One, the process of embodied analysis is not an easy undertaking, as it often confronts experience with limitations of conceptualization. However, each performer-scholar develops their own unique methodology from which to approach their analyses. As described by Linda Kaastra,

As many researchers have already pointed out, “the field of performance inquiry” does not yet exist. There are many reasons why this is the case, all of which have been covered… In order for the field to develop fully, it is my belief that we must begin to study music cognition from a broader perspective, one that is phenomenologically resonant with the day to day realities of instrumental practice. Rather than adopting critical and theoretical lenses developed in existing fields of music scholarship, it may now be time for us to turn inward and develop a scholarly discourse around performance knowledge, taking all of its forms into account.\textsuperscript{172}

Conclusion


\textsuperscript{172} Linda Kaastra, “Systematic Approaches to the Study of Cognition in Western Art Music Performance” (PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 2008), 141-142.
As I have shown in this chapter, the discourse of musicology that considers itself embodied is often either lacking a real body, or objectifying it. These discourses may see music as a process, but their focus is either on understanding how that process intersects with culture, or how it can be disassembled into its component pieces, separated from the whole. As we will see in the next chapter, it is key for the work of performer-scholars not only to engage in the music they wish to analyze, but also acknowledge its many parts and variables. The importance of music as a process to be engaged with is seen in performance studies’ sister fields of ethnomusicology and pedagogy. Like these fields, performer-scholars “tend to take the “lived body” as a methodological starting point rather than consider the body as an object of study.”

Chapter Three: Performance-Scholars

“I believe the time has come for us, as performer-scholars, to move beyond an exclusive focus on the musical work and the demands it makes on us. We need a more inclusive model of the cognitive strategies underlying expert performance, a model in which the role of the musical work is kept in perspective. I believe the time has come for a new branch of scholarly inquiry that paints a more complete picture of what we do as musicians – and, by extension, of who we are.”—Linda Kaastra

In this chapter I examine the work of three performer-scholars,175 Dillon Parmer (3.1), Elisabeth Le Guin (3.2), and Linda Kaastra (3.3), and show how each one conducts an embodied analysis, something that I argued was missing from the discourse in the last chapter. Furthermore, the reason the work of these three is so important is, as I explained in Chapter One, that the body is the primary tool of culture and the origin of all meaning making, therefore imperative to be used in music analysis. Though the overlap between these three academics is considerable, the style of each of their embodied analyses is quite different. Dillon Parmer takes on a “generative” approach to embodied analysis, and focuses on opera and the singer’s character; Elisabeth Le Guin considers herself a historian and cellist, and as such her analysis, while deeply steeped in researched history, biography and context, exposes the kinesthetic mode as a means of analysis. Finally Linda Kaastra, a bassoonist and cognitive science researcher, looks at empirical evidence in her work, but is keen to identify herself within it.

These performer-scholars not only advocate for the inclusion of the body or the performer in the discourse, they submit embodied analyses into the literature. Instead of just saying it should be done, they use the body as the starting point for their analysis.

175 A term I borrow from Linda Kaastra.
Whether knowingly or not, their work builds on that of Susan Cusick. Cusick realized a thorough analysis needed to include “bodies, performers bodies… actual bodies,” also a must-have for this group of scholarly musicians. However in “Feminist Theory, Music Theory and the Mind/Body Problem,” Cusick does not proceed with a full embodied analysis and decides to,

withhold that part of my argument until I can do it well. When I write an essay on Hensel’s Trio, I will want to argue that Hensel’s script for the metaphorical social actions that resolve imbalances in her sonata-form movement is only readable if one acknowledges the inextricable presence of the body in music – a presence both musicology’s and music theory’s focus on the intentions and the texts of composers scrupulously denies.

This decision by Cusick not to complete her analysis may be a hint at how difficult an embodied analysis is actually to do. For instance an early publication by Parmer leaves the reader,

hard-pressed to find in the present essay a concrete description of what performance- as opposed to listener-based knowledge looks like, however, particularly in relation to specific musical compositions; that articulation must of necessity occupy future essays… I will be more occupied here with opening up a space for such knowledge to become articulate within musicology rather than with articulating it per se.

This excerpt is revealing for as I have shown many music scholars are keen to include the performer’s body within their work, but few actually do it in an embodied way. It is important to note that if Parmer had left his intentions here in future work, I would have classified him along with the performer advocates.
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3.1 Dillon Parmer

Dillon Parmer is an operatic tenor and musicologist. His work in musicology on the subject of performance is the most ideal to examine first as he is the most explicit in what and how he approaches his analyses. His work focuses on two elements: the first is an overhaul of the musicology discipline, one that would level the epistemological playing field between performers and academics; the second is that he advocates for and enters into musical analysis from a performance perspective. I will show how these analyses provide a richer interpretation of the music and its processes than traditional music theory. This first keystone of Parmer’s work is a demand for a paradigm shift in the field of musicology, which he identifies as being in a “state of crisis,” to one that “opens up at the centre of musicology a space for a discourse grounded in the embodied experience of performing music.” For this change to occur Parmer realizes that “shifting from understanding music as text to understanding it as performance does little to alter how much it is still the listener-spectator who dominates music discourse.” He argues that to make a true shift we must instead draw a distinction between the modes of what he calls “music-as-read” and “music-as-done.” The difference between the two for Parmer is where the “meanings and values” are found. In “music-as-read” they can be found in
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the “studied object” where as in “music-as-done” they “arise from the act of performing within the context of the socially negotiated process of artistic production.”\(^{183}\) Parmer’s identification of a conflict in the locale of meaning presents an ethical dilemma in musicology because it challenges the norms of who is able to decipher such meaning.

In addition to the suggested overhaul of the discipline, Parmer’s work in musicology tries to shine a light on who is being excluded from the discourse, “What needs to be talked about more is the cultural work that music scholarship itself enacts, about how it constructs identities and about how it inscribes hierarchies that marginalize and oppress.”\(^{184}\) His proposed solution to this problem is clear: the focus needs to be on the inclusion of process. His suggestions for how this can happen are two-fold. First he advocates for the need for musicians to “speak at conferences and colloquiums, and that they are going to have to… publish.”\(^{185}\) However, to get to a world where this is possible Parmer acknowledges change will need to happen to allow for these voices to come to the fore, and that is why his second place of advocacy is for bringing “musical understanding into direct contact with musicological thought by making room in the classroom… for musicians, both student and professional, to speak from the vantage of their own field experience as performers.”\(^{186}\) Parmer does not hesitate in making this change in his own classroom and speaks on how he has implemented such methods and their surprising results (this approach further emphasizes the reasons for music pedagogy to be considered alongside performance studies). He has found ways to incorporate

\(^{183}\) Ibid.


\(^{185}\) Ibid., 82.

\(^{186}\) Ibid.
performance in his musicology teaching which allows students “bring to the process
elements from outside the score, elements that are not incidental or supplemental but
definitive for what the work is and means”\(^{187}\) into the class; or write essays that “required
them to articulate as much of the whole process as they could… and to engage…
scholarship from the basis of what they learned from undertaking that process.”\(^{188}\) What
Parmer is calling for is a paradigm restructuring of post-secondary music institutions’
curriculum methods. This view seems natural after what we have seen in music education
studies, and the time is long past due.

Parmer however is more than a musicologist and a pedagogue, as his work goes
beyond advocacy and enactment in education. As a musician, and Kvale’s “data
traveler,” Parmer presents a theory that allows for an embodied analysis of music.
Making explicit an analysis of music from the perspective of embodied performance is
quite uncommon in the literature, explaining the process of doing it is even more rare.
Parmer’s approach concerns a “generative” model of musical meaning.\(^{189}\) In this process
he looks for a “third line” or “infrastructural urtext” which he defines as a “creative act
[that] interpolates a supplemental text non-identical but coextensive with music, word,
and gesture… [that is] driving the performance of musical works even though performers
create it after the fact of what composers… have written down.”\(^{190}\) Parmer uses this
“infra-text” to demonstrate what a performance-based analysis can be, and how it clashes
with traditional methods. To first explain what this “infra-text” is, Parmer uses an
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\(^{187}\) Ibid.

\(^{188}\) Ibid., 83.

\(^{189}\) Dillon Parmer, “Artistic Practice as Music Research: Towards a Generative Theory
of Musical Meaning,” unpublished article (Department of Music, University of Ottawa,

\(^{190}\) Ibid., 2-3.
example of an improvisatory acting game where performers mimic and contrast gestures, then sounds, then, still improvising, develop an impetus for each movement. As participants gain fluency Parmer notes, “In that process, the intentions arising in reaction to what one partner does motivates the other partner’s vocal utterance and physical gesture. It is precisely at this moment that an immaterial force takes form.”\(^{191}\) It is this “immaterial force” that is the third line, or Parmer’s infratext. It is here we see another emergent quality of the performer-scholar: the dive into what traditional music analysis often labels “ineffable.” In fact Parmer concludes his call for space in musicology for performance and performers with the realization, “Opening up such a space might be taken as a covert attempt on my part to sneak into academia a wholly subjective and presumably ineffable experience.”\(^{192}\)

Now that Parmer defined his infratext, he sets out to find it in music he has performed. He provides two key examples of this. Firstly he cites the impetus behind a fugal section in the *Terzetto* in Giacomo Rossini’s *Petite Messe Solennelle* that was interpreted by a quartet, with which he performed, as a chance for “one-upmanship” that arose spontaneously from a familial relationship between the singers.\(^{193}\) Such a thing could not be written in a score and “the music itself becomes the acoustic by-product of enacting a set of anterior intentions that, although un-notated, nevertheless generate what
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\(^{191}\) Ibid., 4.


the notation specifies.”\textsuperscript{194} For concert-goers that evening who identify the \textit{Terzetto} as particularly inspired and want to know why they found it so meaningful, it would do them no good to look at the score as the meaning they are searching for is located in the bodies of the performers.

A second example of Parmer’s generative theory involves contrasting an analysis of Tamino in the \textit{Magic Flute} between himself, who had performed the role, and Lawrence Kramer, who presumably had not. Here Parmer puts Kramer’s text-as-read interpretation that “the opera means what it says”\textsuperscript{195} against his own text-as-done where he argues you find out “what the opera means, what values it contains, aren’t reducible to what can be read in the score, even if it is the score that gives rise to your performance.”\textsuperscript{196} Parmer offers options for playing Tamino that counter Kramer’s “wimpy Tamino” who rebuffs Pamina, and concedes that he could accept Kramer’s interpretation if only it began with “this is how I performed the scene…”\textsuperscript{197} But Parmer demonstrates close readings of music-as-text often require use of a score to find meaning in metaphors, and “verbal trickery.”\textsuperscript{198} He suggests such a reading could be the idea of a “gap-fill” melodic structure as a compositional device in Tamino’s “Portrait Aria” in \textit{Die Zauberflote}.\textsuperscript{199} This links the ideas of “a melodic ‘gap’ and ‘fill’ as well as the desire for

\textsuperscript{196} Dillon Parmer, “Musicology and Indifference,” unpublished article (Department of Music, University of Ottawa, 2017): 37.
\textsuperscript{197} Ibid., 63.
\textsuperscript{198} Ibid., 62.
\textsuperscript{199} Ibid., 43.
the gap to be filled… to describe Tamino’s emotional situation.” This reading, as Parmer notes, would completely discount the performer, however Parmer is also able to show how words can also betray the music theorist. This is most notable when he points out Kramer’s acknowledgment of the importance of the infratext when he states, “Pamina can be performed compelling enough…to imbue the whole opera with a powerful element of feminine agency.”

Acknowledging the power of the infratext is one thing, and has been done by many a music critic. However what makes Parmer’s approach so unique is the way in which he shows how we can speak about it in academia. However there are some things to keep in mind in this discussion. Firstly, this infratext is what Cook was indicating was “for sale” between recordings of the same works of varying conductors, and thusly has the potential to become objectified and commodified. Thus we must notice in our discourse, as Carpenter points out, if we are speaking of the “timing belt” as an object or process. A further concern of Parmer’s (which he raises himself) is that his approach may not be universal. For although he suggests the “model can be extended to other vocal genres, perhaps even to instrumental music” he at the same time focuses it in terms of opera performance and the “scenario within which you play your character.” I would argue that he does provide enough of the model so that it can equally be applied to instrumental performance, where a performer must also decide in which character to
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perform the music.\textsuperscript{204} Parmer states "the process of music making, and of making music meaningfully, becomes not one of executing meanings found in the score"\textsuperscript{205} which is a sentiment that applies equally across performance mediums. However, his continuation of this thought shifts back to an opera focus, where he consider meaningful music making as an experience "of coordinating the character’s experience about the situation, which has to be constructed apart from the score, with what the score specifies, and executing it in such a way as to make the performance believable."\textsuperscript{206} Though Parmer’s specifying of a "character" and "what motivates them"\textsuperscript{207} may be something specific to vocal music, instrumental performance too involves decision processes on "making the performance believable" and thusly a generative approach could be taken. A more difficult application of Parmer’s approach may however be with solo instrumental music, as his applications often look at the relationship of "performer’s intentionality"\textsuperscript{208} and how they combine to generate meaning (I will show this is still possible with my analysis of a solo work in Chapter Four). However, while Parmer’s approach may not focus on the genre of solo music, it is one of the domains explored by Elisabeth Le Guin. Though Le Guin’s approach to music can take on a performative approach, she also contextualizes her work within its history. Parmer, as an advocate for the strength of the performer’s voice, sees this as a sign of deference to current epistemologies in the discourse. He acknowledges "when musicians…. Defer to this or that disciplinary paradigm, they not only betray their

\textsuperscript{204} To clarify, I am not referring to the character of Auslander’s ‘Musical personae’ but to the affective state which one may ascribe to the way in which a work is played.
\textsuperscript{205} Ibid., 49.
\textsuperscript{206} Ibid., 54.
\textsuperscript{207} Ibid., 55.
\textsuperscript{208} Ibid., 56.
allegiance to the discipline of music, they effectively become mouthpieces for other
disciplinary voices.”  

We will now explore the blended voice of Le Guin.

3.2 Elisabeth Le Guin

Of the three performance-scholars I have listed here, Elisabeth Le Guin is perhaps
the one most steeped in a traditional approach to musicology and analysis. Le Guin
focuses on the cello works and string quartet’s of Luigi Boccherini. She sees “his music
as evidence of, and meaningful engagement with, the physical processes of execution and
performance.” As Parmer mentions, she provides a rich historical context for all that
she explores, though it is not necessarily unrelated to her embodied analysis. For instance
she historicizes concepts of embodiment, and even points to the distinction between
instrumentalists and composers in Boccherini’s time, noting that he earned double what
“non-composing” musicians earned. Le Guin also does a comparison of two oil portraits
of him, one with cello and one without. In the former he is a mere cantor, one who is,
“physically engaged in the production of music… [with] little perspective on what it is
they are doing.” As compared to the portrait where Boccherini is seen with sheets of
music paper and a feather quill, where Le Guin labels him as musicus, “the expert…
aware of [music’s] theory and its effects, and thus licensed to create.” Le Guin is less
vocal than the other two performer-scholars about creating a revolution in the field. She
in fact suggests looking towards music scholars in early music fields who, during the 20th
century, “confound... disciplinary ‘nationalism’ and text-bound myopia to grapple with

\[\text{Ibid., 8.}\]
\[\text{Elisabeth Le Guin, } \text{Boccherini’s Body: An Essay in Carnal Musicology (California: University of California Press, 2005), 256.}\]
\[\text{Ibid., 134.}\]
\[\text{Ibid.}\]
the larger implications of historical performance practice.” Le Guin's work also takes on a different feel than the others in this chapter because her work focuses primarily on kinesthetic sensation as a means to analysis. In this section I will first focus on why Le Guin deems it important to consider kinesthetic elements in performance. I will then show how she uses them in analysis, and how her resulting conclusions are rich with insight into the processes of music and music making.

Le Guin labels her analysis in the performative vein as carnal musicology. Like Cusick who was searching for an answer to a question to performance, Le Guin uses her analysis to make sense of “Boccherini’s repetitiveness and his tendency to write passages devoid of the narrativity of melodic impulse.” To explore this inquiry she sees the use of kinesthesia and awareness of gesture as an important part of this analysis. The reason she deems this type of analysis important to this work is due to the cultural context of the body at the time of the composition. Le Guin puts the body in context of its evolving theories during the period Boccherini’s life, where newer and more systematic theories by the likes of Descartes were being popularized, alongside heavily contrasting approaches developed centuries earlier. She argues this made for a body that was very aware body of itself in Boccherini’s culture, hence leading him to a compositional style that emphasizes kinesthetic. Le Guin further recognizes that kinesthetic sensation may be contended with as a mode of analysis for the subjectivity it creates. Le Guin responds to

215 Ibid., 9.
216 Ibid., 182.
this notion with an example, “people react to an unexpected pinprick today exactly as they did in Boccherini’s time, by reflexively jerking away – but we must equally note that the sensation itself is not describable in any objective way.”\footnote{217} This provides an analogy that I think is key to mention about the performer’s work for those who think performance analysis is too subjective to be worthy of a place in academic discourse. It seems worthwhile to note that the performer, unlike the composer, who will die (despite Le Guin’s interactions), and the audience whose ear (acoustic palette) will change through time and culture, the performer will continue the most consistent relationship with “the work” over the course of time, through their body. The meaning of what such a “bodily sensation is, as an experience, can only be approached though what it means within the culture that introduced that body to itself in the first place.”\footnote{218} This reflection shows Csordas’ approach to studying culture in an embodied paradigm is useful, but also a difficult undertaking. Le Guin notes,

> Again and again during this project, I had found myself inventing a methodology – and sometimes disinventing one, throwing out days or weeks of labor because the results had proven untenable… Thus I had gained an intimate… sense of how difficult it is to unite performance and musicology into one discourse.\footnote{219}

One of the difficulties noted of an embodied analysis in Chapter One was the resultant confusion between conceptual limitations and limitations of experience. Here we see how Le Guin was confronted by the process, however her analysis is richer for it.

Le Guin begins with a bold statement: that the relationship between a performer and a composer is essential to musicology and “should be a primary source of knowledge

\footnote{217} Ibid., 6.  
\footnote{218} Ibid., 6.  
\footnote{219} Ibid., 13.
about the performed work of art.”⁴²²⁰ The idea of the performer’s interaction with a piece creating a “primary source” does reveal Le Guin’s deep inoculation in musicology but presents a way to “legitimatize” performance scholarship in a way that is acceptable under the current disciplinary paradigm. Le Guin does go further afield though, suggesting she has a reciprocal relationship with the composer through performance, I would have been inclined to take Le Guin’s “relationship” as less than literal were it not for the fact it leads Le Guin to the following conclusion:

It is a commonplace in any kind of physical education that intensive involvement with certain bodily configurations will change one’s habits, change one’s choices, change the very way one feels. Here as I educate myself physically about the highly characterized work of this composer, these changes occur in the image, or rather the feel, of someone else.⁴²²¹ This reciprocity is Le Guin’s embodying of Boccherini, and acknowledges the importance of body position in relation to emotions. This makes further pertinent the role of the body in musical analysis, and it is worth investigation to understand how the physicality of a piece might support, or reject, such a reading through the performer’s body. Le Guin does just this in her analysis which focuses on two elements. The first is the kinesthetic sensation created by Boccherini’s Sonata for Cello, and how it finds meaning in feelings of comfort and discomfort in the cellist’s body; the second is a view of how the physical gestures, resultant of playing, might be analyzed for meaning.

To begin, Le Guin submits a musical analysis to the literature than looks to kinesthetic feelings in performance of comfort and discomfort as the guiding factor in finding musical meaning. Her analysis language, explicit in her role as a performer,

⁴²²⁰ Ibid., 14.
⁴²²¹ Ibid., 25.
heavily embodied, and a far stray from tradition, can be seen in this passage where she describes a phrase with mounting tension, but not the metaphoric kind,

> the thumb has been planted across the Bb-F fifth ever since bar 18. Such familiarity is in danger of breeding contempt, or at least hand-strain: maintaining a fixed-thumb position for extended periods is not particularly comfortable, and by this point not only attention but considerable desire is likely to be focused on getting somewhere else.²²²

This passage leads Le Guin to the difference in “desires motivating” the listener and performer. Boccherini’s choice to return to the main theme in its original key for Le Guin’s listener, “may constitute a disappointment: this is scarcely new! Or it may be a puzzlement: is this some sort of premature recapitulation?²²³ However for her, the performer, “it is both relief and pleasure in that relief: how thoughtful of the composer to continue the phrase in a known place, in a known manner, giving a few seconds of additional time for the muscles of the left hand and arm to recover themselves!”²²⁴ This kinesthetic description is able to account for compositional choices in the structure of the piece that traditional analysis would have been unable to recognize.

A second example of Le Guin’s application of “carnal musicology” is in a linking of the kinesthetic sensation of performance to emotion through gesture. This is in stark contrast to the gesture analyses we have explored in Chapter Two, as it does not relate the performer’s movement to structures in the text, and the gestures are created for music, not because of it (in a conscious sense). The passage in question is highly chromatic and for Le Guin “in order to play this descending line… the left hand must move, however minutely, towards the heart. Kinesthetically, this is a motion towards the center of

²²² Ibid., 27.
²²³ Ibid., 30.
²²⁴ Ibid.
balance; and gesturally it references that motion associated in classical oratory with heartfelt sincerity.” That the performer’s gesture could embody meaning in a work, independent of the score, is a relationship that could not have been uncovered through means of tradition analysis. Again we see a meaning that could never have been uncovered by reading the text.

The question these examples brings us to is: Do Le Guin’s analyses have richer conclusions than those of traditional analysis? Unlike Parmer, whose analyses shed light on how the performer’s body generates meaning, Le Guin looked at how meaning was put in the performer’s body via the music. Also within Le Guin’s kinesthetic accounts were elements of traditional approaches to analysis, and she proposes

performance and analysis as two faces of interpretation, an act which is both art and science. If we accept this… the whole simplistic and ultimately rather boring notion of an authoritative reading simply auto-digests, leaving us with its compost: that complex layering of interpretations that builds up around any work of art.  

This compost is the richness that traditional analysis fails to provide. Le Guin’s analysis suggests though, that to have plausibility for performance analysis we must place the composer in his culture and examine what the body meant to that culture. This might limit the scope of performance analysis. However, it does explicitly account for the cultural body within such an analysis. Such explicitness I believe is unnecessary, for in the body, Csordas’ “tool of culture,” even Le Guin recognizes the only way to deliver information about common responses to kinesthetic stimuli is through “analogies, images, associations, all of them historically and culturally bound.”
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historicizing of her analysis attempts to legitimize performance studies within the traditions of the discipline of musicology. This contrasts the next performer-scholar, Linda Kaastra who calls for a move in a completely new direction.

3.3 Linda Kaastra

Linda Kaastra is a bassoonist and researcher in the cognitive sciences. Like Parmer and Le Guin her focus is on bringing what theorists often describe as “ineffable” to the fore; and she reckons this can be done by studying the performer, performing, and performance, as a performer and armed with effective research paradigms from cognitive science. She describes her PhD dissertation as an “attempt to construct models of music cognition that are resonant with an insider’s lived experience through performer-directed research on the cultivation and exchange of musical knowledge in practice,”228 and she emphasizes that she does this “not as a gender or music theorist... cultural theorist or semiotician… [but as a] performing instrumentalist.”229 Because of her use of traditional “data,” Kaastra may on the surface seem to be taking a different approach than the previous two authors. However we will see there remains significant overlap—especially in the focus on the embodied experience of the performance of music. One of the endeavors of her work has been to find a methodology that can approach music in a way that, as labeled by Cook, lies between process and product. She does this through the application of an ontology used for examining language (to be explored later in this chapter) which looks at music as neither process nor product but as activity. She states,
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We have shifted from studying the products of music to studying the process of music making. We now examine **musical activity** because we realize that through detailed, **theoretically rich, descriptive accounts of musical activity**, we come to a much deeper understanding of creative music practice than we would by simply analyzing musical products. We will then arrive at questions worth asking, hypotheses worth testing, and some idea of how to structure data collection around those questions and hypotheses.\(^{230}\)

An approach that emphasizes the study of the activity of music as a way to gain a richer understanding of it puts Kaastra along side the likes of Le Guin and Parmer. Though Kaastra does not engage in typical music analysis, her approaches are still saturated in embodied analysis. This interdisciplinary perspective Kaastra offers as a performer and an academic also provides ways to look at the discipline of performance with new eyes, allowing her to find and research questions that are meaningful to performers, as well as discover approaches to answer them.

It might be questioned if Kaastra fully qualifies as a performance-scholar or if her work might better constitute her as an empirical musicologist. It is not difficult to defend Kaastra’s inclusion in this chapter for the fact alone that Kaastra would not be able to do her research if she herself was not a performer. Furthermore, this expertise is a detail she is constantly identifying in her work. Within her research in embodied cognition she often begins, “From my perspective as a bassoonist in the orchestra…”\(^{231}\)

---


experience as a musician is used to her advantage in her approach to studying performance,

Specifying precisely what musicians have in mind when thinking about an aspect can seem elusive from an outsider’s perspective. Because I am a highly trained bassoonist, I have an insider view of the contents of my processes of attention and awareness.232

A specific example of her using this awareness can be seen in how she takes issue with traditional gesture analysis. This type of research often has as a goal observing how the performer moves in relation to the score to express meaning. She notes, “Studies on gesture in music-making have not to date been interested in the performer’s imagination of herself in the process of music-making; indeed, her imagistic, impulsive, and idiosyncratic processes are often viewed with skepticism and are derogatorily labeled ‘irrational’ or ‘intuitive.”233 This insight could not have been gleaned from a researcher who was not a highly trained musician that had actively engaged in the activity of music. This acknowledgement of herself and her experience sets Kaastra apart from empirical researchers in the music field, but also contributes to Kaastra’s unique relationship with empirical data. She explicitly describes how her performing body comes in contact with her work in the cognitive sciences, as she

engages in reflexivity in her research design: she allows her experiential knowledge of performance to shine through her structured observations of performers; she tests her observations with her performance experience; she shifts her understanding of performance to accommodate her observations.234
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This reciprocity between research and performance is something we have seen in each of our performer scholars thus far: between Le Guin and Boccherini, Parmer and his ensemble, and now Kaastra and her data. This link solidifies Kaastra’s place within this cohort.

Now that I have established Kaastra place as a performer-scholar, I will proceed to show how she finds an ideal paradigm for which to study performance. This is important to acknowledge as it the base from which she operates in her research and can provide foundations for future explorations within this field. Kaastra identifies two core values which must be addressed by any ontology wishing to explore performance studies: pragmatism and generalism.\(^\text{235}\) Firstly, Kaastra insists that to study performance one must as a pragmatist design “research based on the nature of the problem. Pragmatic inquiry recognizes knowledge as contextual. Knowledge… arises as a result of interactions between actors in a situation.”\(^\text{236}\) Kaastra demonstrates that this approach to knowledge actually parallels how musicians approach problems in their work. This pragmatic approach also harkens back to Csordas’ collapse of the subject-object duality. The second “core value” Kaastra argues is necessary for a research paradigm in performance studies is generalism, “the common ground between disparate ways of thinking.”\(^\text{237}\) She notes, “The generalist is interested in discovering systems of thought and communication without getting caught in the trap of trying to assess which paradigm has more truth than the others.”\(^\text{238}\) Kaastra touts this idea of generalism (which is equivalent to transdisciplinarianism) as superior to interdisciplinarianism because, as she quotes
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Weinberg, this view is “one taken from a much higher vantage point, one from which the paradigms of the different disciplines are seen to be very much alike, though often obscured by special language…” 239 Again she explores how the performing musician often works from a generalist stance,

the performer's understanding of a work must come from a vantage point that is simultaneously higher and more personal than any single paradigm of musical thought. She must "know" the context of the composer and a performance history of the work [this performance history can be formal… or informal through observing and discussing performance with colleagues]. She must have some theoretical/analytical knowledge about the musical materials [this knowledge in many cases cultivated in formal settings and applied informally in practice] and be able to encounter any social or critical references contained in the music. More importantly, she must know the music through an imagistic practice of sounding and self-positioning, both within the music and within the ensemble. 240

These requirements lead Kaastra to dismiss objectivist and relativist ontologies and instead lead her to “experiential realism” as applied by Mark Johnson, a method that embraces these parameters. 241 Experiential realism “outlines a middle ground between traditional objectivism and relativism. [It] is grounded in the idea that bodily sensation, imagination, and understanding are interconnected.” 242 Satisfying both boundaries of pragmatism and generalism, Kaastra points out it allows us to “view human understanding as arising from structures of bodily experience,” which in turn allows us to “respond to our need for common ground and human imagination in cognitive theory on music making.” 243 Using this paradigm, Kaastra takes the time to redefine creativity and
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virtuosity as cognitive skills\textsuperscript{244} thus removing some of their “ineffable-ness” and making them more concrete. She in essence, uses experiential realism to embody the abstract.

With this viewpoint as a guidepost, I will now discuss the work Kaastra submits to the embodied analysis literature. The first is a study on Toru Takemitsu’s \textit{Masques} for Two Flutes. Kaastra submits two analyses of this work, each focused on different aspects of the activity of performance. The first, which I will focus on presently, looks at elements of gesture, the other elements of coordination. The process Kaastra went about in analyzing this work was to document (through video/audio, transcripts, motion capture, and note-taking/journaling) the entire process of the ensemble from the first sight-reading session through to performance. She then used Grounded Theory (to be discussed later in this section) to lead her to a method for analyzing the data. Kaastra states her conclusions from this work clearly,

the volume of expressive and ensemble gestures changes based on the amount of time spent learning the music, external distractions to performance, and general well-being or intent of the performers. More importantly, once the music is learned, gestural roles can shift between performers, and all physical gestures can be removed without threatening the sense of ensemble. This finding points to the need to further understand the implications of context and process on physical gesture in performance.\textsuperscript{245}

In a presentation on her research, Kaastra notes the significance of these findings, “This kind of turns a lot of that [research on gesture in music] on its head because it’s saying, ‘…when I play and move as a performer it’s not just because I’m interpreting something
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musically, it’s because I’m responding to a whole world of performance issues." This contrast between Kaastra’s work and the traditional approach to music and gesture reflects Parmer’s duality of looking at music-as-read as opposed to music-as-done. Kaastra admits this conclusion “was about as far as I could go as a bassoonist.” It is here she switches the emphasis, but not totality, in her role from musician to cognitive scientist.

Kaastra notes, “Once I had worked through my initial findings I was ready to seek out a suitable theoretical framework for making further sense of the data.” It is here Kaastra presents the “Joint Activity” approach to language of Herbert H. Clark which considers language an “emergent product” of human activity. However instead of studying the product, this approach looks at the activity that generates language.

Kaastra illustrates Joint Activity in music as emphasizing, the variety of actions involved in cultivating musical understanding, and constrains those actions and activities within the layers of personal, public, and shared goals for the interaction. This perspective differs from the traditional simplified view of music-making as a single coordinated act that is derived from a score.

Kaastra highlights that by looking at music as more than process or product, but as activity, we can consider factors that are superordinate to all the disciplines involved. “By adopting this “joint action” approach, I am side-stepping the problems of the structuralist
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legacy and opening up a new avenue for social and cognitive inquiry in music.”

Kaastra sees two ways to use Joint Activity as a “basis for performance inquiry… One type of inquiry is performance inquiry for the purposes of developing cognitive theory on music performance… The other type of inquiry can be undertaken in rehearsals to further systemize experimentation on and through music making.”

It is through the developing of a cognitive theory that we will see a richer type of performance analysis. However Kaastra also sees Joint Activity as providing function to practicing musicians as the ideas it contains often reflect concepts explored in music rehearsals in WAM.

In application of joint theory to music making Kaastra first draws attention to Clark’s “dimensions of variation.” Dimensions of variation are continuums on which an activity can occur. One example Kaastra gives is the idea of a spectrum between scripted and improvised music, which could be indefinite. Even in the most historically recreated of performances are factors of indeterminacy,

the reality is that even scripted music is shaped by the dimension of variation of the activity. There have been no studies “proving” this for WAM; however, personal experience tells us that playing a concerto for an orchestral audition is very different than performing the same concerto with the orchestra.

One set of variations she notes as important to WAM is that of formality, for the reason that WAM tends not to acknowledge much of this continuum. Seeing as how music performance as an activity can range from a professional concert to a living room jam-session, “presentational music making” to “communal music making,” it would seem one-sided that “music performance in the WAM tradition is discussed only in the
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dimension of formal presentation, either recorded or live.”\textsuperscript{255} The ideas of formalism and scriptedness intersect in Kaastra’s analysis of Takemitsu’s \textit{Masques}, where she notes that the flutes, formally playing from a score, actually had a goal of sounding “conversational” in their presentation of the music, thus “unscripted.”\textsuperscript{256} Dimensions of variation thus give us a unique parameter from which to analyze and discuss musical activity, a parameter which is unaccounted for in traditional score analyses. As Kaastra puts it, “We simply have not studied the way dimensions of variation shape the emerging music.”\textsuperscript{257}

One of the advantages of Joint Activity is that from its transdisciplinary vantage point, it is well-positioned to simultaneously consider score along side the practice of music-making. To find meaning in the musical activity Kaastra suggests we “begin with an attempt to identify the activities and events from which music emerges.”\textsuperscript{258} With Joint Activity these events occur on macro- and micro-levels, which allow for activities to embed within others, and as a result speech, body motion and instrumental playing are all regarded equally as musical acts. The importance of this is it enables us to include factors as “musical acts” that are often left out of tradition analyses, such as speech.\textsuperscript{259} What then becomes a key component to our analysis are what Clark labels “coordination devices.” Coordination devices are formed from common ground between people and assist in the negotiation of meaning when solving problems of coordination.\textsuperscript{260} In language they can
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refer to inflection, eye contact, gesture, etc. Though they can be “almost any device”

participants deem to be most relevant. Kaastra gives examples of some,

Conventional devices [in music] include the materials of music (keys, chords, notes, ornaments), the rules for using and combining these materials, their conventions of use in composition, and the conventions of perspective that musicians take upon those materials. Conventional procedures for musical negotiation can also include… the interactive network (the roles of the performers), the interactive system (the musical materials used), the interactive sound structure (the constraints and concepts surrounding the way the musical sounds are put together), and the interactive motivation (why people are induced to participate). Speaking the same language, playing the same piece of music, and following the same procedural goals are also conventional procedures for negotiating music.\(^\text{261}\)

These devices include, but also go beyond, what traditional analysis tends to look to for when they search for meaning. Kaastra points out however, “coordination devices facilitate the negotiation of musical meaning but do not in themselves contain that meaning.”\(^\text{262}\) Within her research with the flute duo, Kaastra looks at coordination devices including the work, pencil annotations in the score, gestures, and sense of ensemble. There are also unconventional coordination devices, which in music could be demonstrated by the indeterminability of interpretation of a work, phrase shapes in relation to others within a work, the common ground between performers in an ensemble or between performers and audience, mimicry of style, or a concert that becomes a recording (layering of activity). That these “devices offer a process through which musical meaning can be negotiated,”\(^\text{263}\) allows Kaastra to show how she could make one piece “mean” different things simply by playing it in different styles and contexts.
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I have embedded within this section a sense of how looking at music through Kaastra’s application of Joint Activity leads to richer analyses of music, but I would like to further consider what the theory makes room for in the analysis: data and context. Kaastra notes, “Clark’s conceptualizations for language use allow a researcher to analyze and interpret music-making with greater observational power.” For example we see how “dimensions of variation” give the researcher access to more types of performative data, or type of activity to consider as part of music making; some which may be more easily studied. Secondly, it maintains the context of the music activity as something deeply complex. This is an important distinction to keep in mind, for as seen earlier with “embodied” elements, such as gesture, narrow focuses are taken which “are often measured in order to reveal the performer’s interpretation of a work.” The contextualizing of the activity however reveals that “while some of that information may be contained in a gesture, the separation of a motion from its context can result in unfortunate oversimplifications of musical activity.” Richness in this theory’s application then may not lay in its ability to focus on a certain aspect of performance, but rather as “a way to expand the range and depth of such performance experiments so that performers can deepen their understanding of their performance manners, experiences, and situations.”

I must note one of the processes which Kaastra used to find her methodology for her research as it further illustrates the ability for data to provide richness in the field of performance studies as well as echoes some processes of other performer-scholars.
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Kaastra uses “grounded theory” as a way to make sense of the data she recorded from the Takemitsu rehearsals. Kaastra notes, “Grounded Theory doesn’t let us use existing theory, rather Grounded Theory asks us to develop theory by systematically examining relevant data from real rehearsals.”

Grounded theory, Kaastra notes, has much in common with qualitative research, one of the principles of which she notes is that it “is interpretive; researchers reflect, through introspective analysis of their biases, values, and interests, on the way their identity shapes the inquiry.”

This again aligns Kaastra as a “data traveler”. The reason behind the development of Grounded Theory was “to learn how to theorize a situation without the imposition of existing theoretical constructs,” and its use is often found in “fields which are heavily theory driven, fields in which the social participants have all but lost their voice.”

Kaastra notes that Ground Theory, though accused of a positivist slant, still has many qualitative researchers who “recognize that social reality is variable, multi-faceted, contradictory, and often fragmented.”

This appears to be Kaastra’s approach which is seen in how she notes the goals of Grounded Theory as, “a deeper understanding of an event or issue grounded in the set of experiences and attitudes of those involved.”

The difficulty and complexity of this approach are not lost on her as she is forced to explore and acknowledge in her data, Competing agendas, differing perspectives, and contextual interference are normal. The process for studying the social reality of people requires an
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ability to deal with ambiguity, contradiction, complexity, change, and multiplicity. Data collection and analysis take place in the context of the researcher’s understanding of an issue, which is then shaped by the process of inquiry. Personal experience and knowledge are considered not only relevant for the purposes of preventing bias, they are relevant because of the way a researcher’s understanding is shaped by the process of inquiry itself.\textsuperscript{273}

Here we can see a reason Kaastra’s use of Grounded Theory was so striking to me. Many characteristics of the theory, and its reasons for employment, paralleled the work I see with Parmer’s generative theory and Le Guin’s carnal musicology. These are not the same processes to be sure, (differences in formality and systemization are quite significant) but it seems significant that all three of these performer-scholars felt their data wasn’t aligning with what they were finding in the “heavily theory driven” field of music, where as performers they had “all but lost their voice.”

What Kaastra then is arguing is missing is a voice from the discourse. She describes the power of this voice as the “Missing Piece: First Person Experiential Inquiry:”

When a musician works for hours with her instrument, she pays attention to her sound, her resonance, and the relationship her sound has with her embodied experience of making music. Experiential inquiry is widely used in the cultivation of expertise in music performance, though the discourse surrounding this form of inquiry takes place in lessons, master classes, and rehearsals – rarely in written form. Even pedagogical treatises rarely go into detail on qualitative/experiential matters. Yet, all of my teachers taught from experience. All had cultivated elaborate first-person accounts of shaping musical sound.\textsuperscript{274}

Kaastra then taps into this inquiry in the first person by providing an analysis that is unconventional, but performance based, using this method she has deemed “phenomenologically resonant with instrumental practice and offers much explanatory
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power for studies of cognition in music performance.”

Drawing on Johnson’s ideas of embodiment, and the reasoning that “we make sense of music through metaphors derived from our general bodily experience of the world as well as through our specific bodily experiences of engaging with music,” Kastra proceeds to take excerpts from her practice journal and analyzes the experiential categories and metaphors behind what she has written. The ideas she analyzes include resonance, the torso as a container, and anchoring. Kastra does not apply this metaphor analysis to a specific piece, making it untraditional in yet another way. However, it provides insight into the practice of music-making, and refocuses the question of “what should performance analysis do?” especially through the lens of embodiment and embodied cognition.

The parallel between the work done by performers and that in cognitive science is also obvious for Kastra, who notes they both are keen to address the qualities many in musicology or music theory have deemed inexpressible.

If you press most music scholars, they will say that there are ineffable, inexplicable aspects of musical activity at the highest level, and even musical products at the highest level, that can only be generated or even appreciated in some holistic, imaginative way. Reconciling this aesthetical perspective on performance with the cognitive empirical approach requires that the mechanisms that underlie the former be made sufficiently explicit so as to generate predictions that could be validated through observation of performance. The reliance on “the mysterious” as an explanation for cognitive processing in music performance would seem to leave [cognitive scientists] unsatisfied.

Likewise, though many instrumentalists have been trained to speak from the same aesthetic perspective as that mentioned above, teaching performance at the highest level requires that that, or any other aesthetic
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perspective, be realized in specific instructional techniques. For example, the teachings of Stephen Maxym seem to contradict the “performance mystique” invoked therein. Maxym once told me, “My dear, when I am through with you, you will be able to play anything the conductor ever asks of you.” His confidence in his ability to impart all of the necessary skills for performing suggests that for him performing music at the highest level was not some ineffable, inexplicable achievement. Indeed, there was no mystery in learning to play the bassoon at all. Every minute detail of experience was accounted for and practiced until the musical activity that took place “online” was a highly skilled communicative interaction.  

Both cognitive science and performance demand that we make clear that which seems abstract to most. This equivalency in focus and candor in addressing the “inexpressible” in music puts Kaastra’s approach to analysis through a cognitive science on level ground with Le Guin’s carnal musicology and Parmer’s infratext. Like Parmer’s call to performers to publish, Kaastra also has a call to arms, hers though is for the development of methodologies, for as she notes, “we do not have the conceptual tools for investigating how theoretical and practical knowledge are combined in the mind of a performer.”  

She implores,

As John Rink (2004) and Nicholas Cook (2001) point out, the field of performance analysis is still searching for a methodology that will capture the voices and concerns of musicians from more than one cultural background (and on more than one instrument). We need an approach – or rather, a range of approaches – that have greatest chance of revealing performance knowledge without imposing prior assumptions about musical behavior onto the experience of the musicians or trying to improve performance before understanding its domain. A suitable methodology should be open-ended enough to allow us to examine music-making while treating a variety of social and cultural settings equally and revealing meaningful patterns of musical interaction at the level that is most relevant to performance. Additionally, this methodology should work for all types of instruments, not just piano (the instrument that has figured most prominently in the literature of performance studies thus far).
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In conclusion, as mentioned, the title of this chapter is derived from Kaastra’s work as a true performer-scholar, as she not only advocates for, but also contributes to the research in the discipline, both with cognitive science and her “first-person experiential inquiry on music performance.” Kaastra’s contributions to this field through the lens of cognitive science has shown how the performer’s body is essential for analysis, and how such an analysis is richer than those seen in traditional music analyses. Kaastra’s work is strongly focused on methodologies within the cognitive sciences, and as a result her research gives us interesting insights into what the activity of performance might include, and how the meaning of these activities are coordinated. The richness of her analyses are in the depth created by the parameters of her musical events, how the body and its environment interact to create meaning, and how her study of music as activity leads to understandings of meaning, much more so than a look at the relationship between notes on a page, between the body and notes, or by studying the biological processes happening during performance. Kaastra delineates herself as disinterested in traditional positivist views of research usually seen in the sciences when she notes her participation as a researcher within her work, “These observations are from the perspective of a performer. They do not explore the personal or cultural identities of the flutists… My presence in the above text could be characterized as that of a ‘traveling instrumentalist.’” However, she goes on to note “I do not limit myself to that perspective… Instead, I have chosen a sampling of analytical tools that seem to me to extend quite naturally from practice into a more formal research domain.”
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Conclusion

What we can see from Parmer’s “generative theory,” Le Guin’s kinesthetic approach of “carnal musicology,” and Kaastra’s relationship with cognitive science, is that there is a wide array of approaches to embodied analysis that are being left out of the discourse of musicology. Furthermore, all of which provide deeply meaningful and complex analyses to their research in music through their engagement of the body, the performer, and themselves. What we can glean from where the research in this chapter overlaps is that the conceptualization of music as an act allows for musical analyses which can consider a wider array of activities than traditionally studied. This inclusion of modes for analysis, such as the performer’s concepts of performance, sensory awareness while playing, and score annotation through time, all reveal sources of knowledge and meaning in the body of the performer. I will now proceed to apply these techniques demonstrated in Chapter Three with my own embodied analysis in the chapter to follow.
Chapter Four: Embodied Analysis of Messiaen’s “Abime des Oiseaux”

“To put the performer always first, front and center, inverts an established order of musicological thinking; and that order was established for some good reasons. Taking the performative point of view profoundly complicates the whole enterprise of talking coherently about music.”283 Elisabeth Le Guin

In this chapter I undertake an embodied analysis of a movement from Messiaen’s *Quatour pour la Fin du Temps*, the “Abime des Oiseaux” for solo clarinet. The reason I chose this movement is that it presents the performer with several issues that I believe effectively reflect the different approaches brought forth by each of the performer-scholars in Chapter Three. Furthermore as a solo piece, I am able to eliminate the consideration of variables related to other ensemble members in my analysis. After a brief introduction of the movement (4.1), I will present my embodied analysis of the music, and its relation to the concepts of infratext, carnal musicology and joint activity (4.2). Throughout this latter section I will frequently hold my analysis in contrast to traditional analyses of the piece, showing the differences of what each is able to consider, and how an embodied analysis is potentially a richer, more revealing, and more practical style of analysis.

To begin, however, I return to the idea from the introduction of this thesis, an idea that is often lobbed on music students: analyzing music according to the precepts of conventional music analysis and theory will make you better able to perform it, or express its meaning. I bring this point up here for two reasons: firstly, as a university student performing this work, I undertook such analyses, to a level of detail that verged on obsessive. I searched for relationships in pitch and rhythm, and tried to derive

meaning from them and assumed it would result in a clearer performance of the work. The result, need I say, was not a performance that sounded grounded in context or understanding, but rather one which created a confusing experience for all involved. I had believed this effort in analysis was where the power in creative performance lay and would lead me to where I needed to go. What I found was the contrary. Conversely, I have discovered that the process of doing the present embodied analysis has given me more ability to choose meaning and expressions in the performance of the work than a conventional score analysis was ever able to, and an ability to understand the music that is beyond paper, beyond metaphor, but located within my body.

4.1 The Movement

To contextualize the analysis that follows, I will begin this chapter with a brief discussion of “Abîme des Oiseaux,” which Messiaen himself inscribes “The abyss is Time, with its weariness and gloom. The birds are the opposite of Time; they represent our longing for light, for stars, for rainbows, and for jubilant song!” The third movement (of eight) in the quartet, the form of “Abîme” may be generalized as ternary with a coda (ABA’-coda). The A sections are extremely slow, Messiaen indicates them to be “Lent, expressif et triste” (eighth note = 44 bpm), where the contrasting B section, marked “Presque vif, gai, capricieux” (quarter note = 126 bpm) is filled with bird-song. Near the end of the B section is a place marked Modéré, which provides material for the coda. The first Modéré presents us on the page with an “arching figure” constructed of extremely wide leaps (see fig.1) at ff, which is then echoed note-for-note in the measure.
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following at \textit{pp}. In the coda this arch shape is inverted, but still echoed one measure later. Anthony Pople insinuates this shape might be “a pictoralism influenced by the image of the birds flight.”\textsuperscript{285}

Fig. 1 “Abîme des Oiseaux” mm. 25-26
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There is much written on the quartet, and over the years a legend has emerged about the circumstances of its composition and premiere, much of it professed by the composer himself. These stories have been contextualized by Rebecca Rischin in \textit{For the End of Time: The Story of the Messiaen Quartet}. This work dispels some of the myths around the extraordinary circumstances of the work’s origins. The reason I bring it up here, in addition to the wealth of material it provides, is for fact that it has been touted as a source that does not “treat the work's history as preface to theoretical analysis, [and rather] takes other scholars to task not only for privileging analysis over compositional and performance history, but for relying too heavily on Messiaen as sole witness to that history.”\textsuperscript{286} Though her work is steeped in historical analysis (like Le Guin), and follows up on many of the general questions surrounding the compositional process and premiere performance (such as audience size and instrument quality), it fails to consider aspects


that might be questioned by musicians performing the work. This is surprising given Rischin is in fact a clarinetist. However I will take up the oversight and explore some of these questions in the analysis to follow.

Before I begin my embodied analysis, I will further draw on Rischin to gently frame my argument. If I am to provide an analysis which acknowledges the style of each performer-scholar, I must contextualize the body in the culture at the time of the work’s composition to parallel the way that Le Guin validates her carnal approach (arguably detrimentally so\textsuperscript{287}). Though I do not have as much space as Le Guin to do so, and am weary of using a device which falls back on epistemologies of knowledge that raise traditional analytical approaches while discounting the performer, there are some obvious points worth mentioning that would indicate an embodied analysis of this movement is appropriate. I do not have to search far to find many ways that the cultural awareness of, and meaning ascribed to the body in WW II Europe was at a crest; this was especially peaked in the POW camp of the quartet’s composition and premiere, Stalag VIII A. A strong example of this awareness is the recounting of Messiaen’s departure from the POW camp. Henri Akoka, the quartet’s clarinetist, was supposed to be on the same convoy as Messiaen. Unfortunately,

At the moment of boarding, a German officer told Henri to get off. When Henri asked him why, he responded, “Jude” [Jew]… Henri said, “No,” and gestured to pull down his pants, because his circumcision had not been well done and he thought that he could pass for a gentile.\textsuperscript{288}

\textsuperscript{287} As argued in Dillon Parmar, “Musicology and Indifference” (unpublished article, Department of Music, University of Ottawa, 2017): 7.

\textsuperscript{288} Rebecca Richin, \textit{For the End of Time: The Story of the Messiaen Quartet} (New York: Cornell University Press, 2003), 74.
At another time during his imprisonment, Akoka heard that the Geneva convention was requiring that the Germans give soldiers from France’s African colonies special considerations, Akoka was able to capitalize on his darker complexion in this instance to get transferred to a less harsh climate.\textsuperscript{289} It is worth noting Akoka was the only Jewish member of the quartet, and a few weeks after its premiere 1,523 Eastern European Jews were “deported from Stalag VIII A to Lublin en route to their eventual ‘unknown destination.’”\textsuperscript{290} As Akoka was a member of the French military (which he joined prior to the enacting of anti-Semitic measure which barred Jews from service) and thus considered a Westerner, he was spared him from the same fate of the Eastern European Jews at Stalag VIII A.\textsuperscript{291} It is also worth noting that the fact Akoka was Jewish was something “the composer himself was aware of.”\textsuperscript{292}

One might argue that these descriptions depict the “nationalized” body, and thus a cultural rather than performative analysis may be more apt. However Messiaen, not only the work’s composer, but frequent pianist, is quoted throughout time emphasizing aspects of performance that I believe make a case for such an inquiry. Firstly we see in the inscription in the score by Messiaen a section labeled, “Advice to the Performers.” Here Messiaen suggests to the musicians, “In the nonmetered movements… you can, to help yourselves, mentally count the sixteenth notes, but only at the beginning of your work: this process may encumber the public performance.”\textsuperscript{293} This acknowledgement of the process of performance requiring an evolving embodied understanding of the music is

\textsuperscript{289} Ibid., 76-77.  
\textsuperscript{290} Ibid., 30-31.  
\textsuperscript{291} Ibid., 30.  
\textsuperscript{292} Ibid., 31.  
\textsuperscript{293} Ibid., 134.
something that I believe reflects Messiaen’s experience as a pianist. This knowledge of change in the process of playing it is also reflected in Etienne Pasquier’s (the cellist who premiered the work) account of Akoka’s fist playing of “Abîme,” “[Akoka] would grumble from time to time, as he found the composer gave him difficult things to do. “I’ll never be able to play it,” he would say. “Yes, yes, you will, you’ll see,” Messiaen would answer.”[^1] With these reasons in mind, I will now perform an analysis of the movement that is embodied in the ways I have set forth in this thesis.

4.2 Embodied Analysis

Before even starting to work with “Abîme,” a clarinet player has some decisions to make. The first is deciding the context in which the movement will be played. Playing it within the whole of *Quatour pour la Fin du Temps* requires a different approach than playing it as an isolated solo piece, as is common for recitals or exams. Already here we come up against how a WAM tradition might not consider such an isolation as a valid “performance,” yet in practice it is quite common. The isolation of this particular movement of the piece may also be seen as valid in performance for the reason that, contrary to Messiaen’s telling of the story, it was the first movement composed of the quartet, before the whole ensemble had met, or even been sent to Stalag VIII A. The differences in how a performer may render the movement within, as opposed to extracted from, the work are numerous. One surprisingly logistical but important difference is that the context determines whether or not the clarinetist will sit or stand to

[^1]: Ibid., 12.
[^2]: Ibid., 12.
[^3]: Aside from personal experience, a quick internet search will reveal programs from clarinet recitals at most major universities often include this work.
play it. Playing with the full quartet traditionally compels all instruments to be seated, but in a solo performance, the clarinetist usually chooses to stand. That may seem unimportant, but since the clarinet is an instrument of balance, the relationship of the instrument to the body changes between standing and sitting. Establishing equilibrium during practice is, therefore, an important part of the process of practice. The effect of this consideration would be most notable in the B section where large, quick leaps can rock the instrument dramatically in the hands. Another reason the consideration of performance context is important, is that even though this is a solo movement, how I play it within an ensemble working towards the goal of a unified rendition of the work will affect elements of my interpretation. The space the violin or cello might take during their solo movements may affect how I treat the many eighth-note rests within the third movement—rhythmically literal, or as a chance for breath and slightly more time. I will now consider how these two elements are taken into consideration in Kaastra’s work.

In her application of Joint Activity, Kaastra offered the concept of “dimensions of variation” as a way to allow for an expanded breadth and relationship between activities that take place in the process of music making. I draw on this as a way to show how a consideration of these dimensions affect analysis in ways unimaginable by traditional means. In this case, they allow for an account of meaning that could never be contained within a score, or most considerations of music. When we allow these elements to be included in an analysis, we get a greater possibility of meaning. For instance, taking into consideration the continuum of formality in music performance we see that a solo recital
might in fact be a less formal than a chamber presentation of the work. This formality determines the musician’s physical stance in their performance, affecting their interaction with the instrument, not just in concert, but often throughout the process of preparation. As we saw with Le Guin, this physical interaction between performer and kinesthetic sensation is a well of meaning, and thus considering the dimension of formality can affect the types of meaning one might draw from performing this work in different contexts. This was also shown above in regards to performing the work solo, or with the ensemble as a movement. A continuum that Kaastra labels “cooperativeness” would encompass this idea, showing that the range between ensemble playing and solo performance would also create differences of meaning in performance. These examples show how concepts of performance and the meaning ascribed to them can be altered before a note has even sounded, but the whole of the performance is in mind.

Fig. 2 “Abîme des Oiseaux” m. 1-5

A second aspect of an embodied analysis in this piece that asserts my attention as a performer is the breath markings in the movement. The first line of the piece (see fig. 2, mm. 1-5) requires the clarinetist to make a decision about how to breathe. At the extremely slow tempo of eighth note = 44 bpm, it is difficult for the player to make it to
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the end of the phrase without a breath. Then, at the recapitulation the same breath
markings are indicated, but in this iteration there are the added hurdles of the repeating of
the theme in a lower octave (where even more air is required), and also the detriment of
the player’s stamina (from the physically demanding B section just prior). This makes
following the indicated breaths next to impossible. The clarinetist’s choice in this
predicament is three-fold. First and most commonly, the musician will discreetly take a
little sip of air where the phrase breaks (m. 3), careful not to distort the time, or leave too
much of a gap, so that the phrases within the larger phrase maintain their line. This breath
is so common players have actually forgotten that it was not indicated by Messiaen. A
search of recordings and videos, or a viewing of the “Clarinet BBoard” shows how
ubiquitous this breath is—some players indicate there is nothing difficult in regards to the
breathing in this movement. A second option for this passage is that one could use
circular breathing. This is the practice where wind players can abstain from taking
breaths in phrases by exhaling air into their cheeks to use while inhaling through their
noses. It produces a continuous tone with only minute variations of timbre as the player
switches air production methods, which are less noticeable in players with increased skill
and experience with this technique. However, it is sometimes expressed that this method
of breathing constitutes as “cheating” when used in music prior to the time when the
technique became mainstream. Furthermore, it is suggested that its use takes away

299 An online forum for clarinet players. The following link is to a thread on the issues
in discussion in this paragraph.
http://test.woodwind.org/oboe/BBoard/read.html?f=1&i=273817&t=273380
300 That is if they have the technical ability to do so – not all clarinetists have been
trained, or are able, to circular breathe.
301 In regards to “cheating” I can only offer anecdotal accounts, or comments again by
clarinet players in online forums. As far as the date of which this technique becomes
vocal qualities from music, as a singer must take in breath. In the end both these options allow for the musician to confidently execute the phrase without having to worry about sacrificing its accuracy. However the affect of each style on the audience and performer are very different. A breath in the middle of the phrase gives comfort, even normalcy to this somber and “gloomy” opening. However, if one circular breathes so as to play the phrase without the breath, the performer, while modestly comfortable, can cause discomfort in the astute listener as they wait for the “breath.”

There is a third option for performance of this phrase, however I have never seen or heard anyone undertake it, but it is worthwhile for discussion as it draws on the analysis style of Le Guin. This last option is to take Messiaen’s breath marks literally and not breathe for the entirety of the first phrase. This is possible, but barely. It causes extreme discomfort (I would even say pain) for the clarinetist, who risks not being able to play the phrase correctly (let alone musically) through to the last note. I attempted this phrasing for the first time while researching this chapter. The immediate effect it had on how I phrased was felt from the first note, which was decreased in volume, as I tried to ration my air. As I passed the possible spot for an “escape breath” I became conscious of maintaining composure so as not to allow undue tension to eat into the reserves of air intended for making sound. It was here that I briefly considered the desolé marking as an apology from the composer. As I miraculously made it to the last note of the phrase I held on, through an experience of what I can only describe as a “fear of lungs imploding.” This raises interesting ideas on the meaning of performing such an interpretation of the phrasing. Would it seem foolish of a clarinetist to perform as such, possibly not historically acceptable, there are no determinate specifications, but it is often attested that this defense is used by those who choose not to, or cannot, perform it.
maintaining the phrase until its completion, and putting them self in pain, just so that the audience and performer might together glimpse for a second the unimaginable holding of breath of Second-World War Europe? Would such an act exclude a musician from the WAM tradition, and place them more towards actor or entertainer as they offer their body less for music-making and more for exploitation of sensation?

The fact that I have never seen nor heard the piece performed in this way I believe demonstrates a hierarchy in performance tradition in regards to the performers body. In WAM one could assume expression through the performer’s bodily experience is only a worthy secondary vehicle of communication after that which must be primarily be communicated—the text—is honoured. Thus, we encounter a culturally imposed limit on how far the performer can deviate from the score, even with the aim of creating a more compelling artistic affect. This would have been an important question for Rischin to have considered in her historicizing of the quartet. Furthermore, Le Guin’s carnal approach does take into consideration the physical discomfort and pleasure of playing, in opposition to the aural desires of where we might want the music to go. However, in this passage I, like Le Guin, am forced to consider if the audience will “hear” my kinesthetic sensation in the execution of this piece, and also if that is a desirable trait in its performance. As we can see however, the consideration of breath gives us ways into an analysis to something that, while indicated in the score, has a depth that cannot be explored outside of practice. Of the analyses surveyed for the study of this movement, not one considered breath as an aspect worthy of mention. I will now turn to such an analysis as an example of a contrasting approach to these first five measures, and how it regards meaning without the context of performance.
A prime example of “traditional analysis” is David Morris’ “A Semiotic Investigation of Messiaen’s ‘Abîme des Oiseaux.’” Though this analysis is somewhat dated (1989) and, I must acknowledge, the fashion of analysis has changed since publication, it provides a clear foil to my argument. Here Morris uses Messiaen’s own writings to find the meaning in this composition. Much of the work is dedicated to finding division among the phrases. For instance,

A glance at the opening five bars will reveal that a division may be made roughly in the middle, and that the second half is a varied repeat of the first. The exact point of balance is not so obvious; symmetries and pivots cloud the issue. Segmentation can proceed along various paths.  

I’ve included an excerpt of Morris’ analysis (see fig. 3) which he uses to clarify the confounding nature of his description; unfortunately it has the opposite outcome, especially for the performer. The reason for the futility of this analysis is that how he proposes note groupings in almost all every case makes little sense in practice. Aside from the fact that the most of the units are too small for a practicing musician to imbue with musical significance, the divisions themselves verge on arbitrary, though the goal according to Morris is an association “of intervals, modes, rhythms and favorite motives… [so as] to corroborate a neutrally conducted semiotic investigation with the composer’s own view.”  

This poietic approach, while affording Morris the task of pushing notes around on pages, serves not as the intended revealing tight gaze of a microscope but rather an unfocused blur that loses meaning alongside clarity. This approach also fails to take into account non-pitch and non-rhythm markings in the score. The idea of breath as a determiner of phrase or unit is foreign to this analyst. Here we
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also see that an interaction with the score can indicate a privileging of knowledge. Symbols more related to the “logic” of music (notes and rhythm) are given more significant value than those related to affect (dynamics, breath, phrase and emotive markings).

Fig. 3 Excerpt from “A Semiotic Investigation of Messiaen’s ‘Abîme des Oiseaux’”

Another such place where breath creates affect, and this time causes discomfort from its overuse, is in m. 24, where the performer encounters a *Pressez* with a crescendo.

---

(see fig. 4). Here the effect sounds to be increasing chaos. This increase in chaos is paralleled by the clarinetist’s destabilizing grip of the instrument as this passage continues. With each subsequent iteration of the rhythmic figure the first note of the motif has less and less fingers for which the clarinetist can “anchor on” to. The breath marks here also become annoyingly close, approaching hyper-ventilation in the player, certainly an undesirable outcome. Thus the *ff rallentendo* indicated at the end of the passage becomes imperative to play with extreme as a way to exhale all the (stale) air now built up in the performer’s lungs. As seen in Morris’ analysis, the idea of breath, so important in the performance of this work, is completely ignored by music theory. Thus, I would like to take this analysis further off the page, and offer an excerpt again pulling on Le Guin’s kinesthetic approach, this time as applied to the extreme leaps and dynamic contrast (as seen in fig. 1) of the *Modéré*.

Fig. 4 “Abîme des Oiseaux” m. 24

The leaps that occur in the section marked *Modéré* (eighth note = 92 bpm) are worthwhile to investigate for the kinesthetic experience of the clarinet player. The size of
the leaps mean that the clarinetist will be switching registers (see fig. 5) for all but the highest note, making the passage precarious for the player. There are two factors commonly illustrated about this passage. The first is that the pitches used in this figure are transpositions of the opening theme widely displaced over more than three octaves.\(^\text{305}\) The focus then often becomes the relation of this figure to the opening melody; however for the performer, that knowledge, which may be stumbled upon during rehearsal, is secondary to the shape of the phrase, which is unlike anything yet heard, or felt in the piece. Another point commonly illustrated about this passage is that it is echoed note-for-note in the following measure. The idea of an echo at this point in the score seems obvious if one considers it visually, or even played on a piano where a lighter touch on the same keys is all that is needed to produce such an effect. However, considering these two measures from the clarinetist’s perspective allows for an understanding that a kinesthetic feeling of “backing away” is not the case. Playing the pp iteration in m. 26 is something that requires more air, or at least air pressure, from the clarinetist to execute at the dynamic indicated. The kinesthetic feeling of this then becomes more effort to produce the echo. This might make the phrase seem like less of a shout that is sounded back by physical structure, and more of a shriek that is followed by a pleading. This could be further illustrated by the fact the highest note would be played with different keys in each measure. A ff “high G” fingering\(^\text{306}\) would sound too sharp, or be too unreliable at a piano dynamic, and thus an alternate would be used in this passage. This kinesthetic reading of difference of “notes” at the height of the phrase would seem to run


\(^{306}\) A clarinet ‘fingering’ is the combination of fingers and keys that need to be depressed to create a desired pitch. Certain notes have multiple options of fingerings.
contrary to the idea of the \textit{(echo)}, something thought of as a returning of an original sound. Therefore, from this kinesthetic reading, I would argue that the echo is a semantic one. The clarinetist echoes their sentiments, but changes their tone the second time when they don’t receive a response.

Fig. 5 Registers of the Clarinet

Before I proceed, I must include a point towards an analysis that incorporates an application of Parmer’s infratext. As I studied Parmer’s work, I began to wonder if it was only related to opera singers, or those who need to create “characters” (i.e. Harlekin by Stockhausen, a work where the clarinetist dances to her own music). However as it is obvious that the idea of a “third line” is something all good performers create, I came to the realization that an infratext is something which is difficult to express outside the confines of personal motivation, as seen in Parmer’s work. Thus as a clarinetist, I found I was able to express an infratext by means of considering the musical atmosphere as a
character. For this part of the analysis I will focus on the A sections, and the differences in their expression. The opening material of this movement occurs in what is called the throat register on the clarinet (see fig. 5). This is the place where the instrument is the shortest, and has a wispy, if not pathetic tone. It is here I would like to draw attention to how the acknowledgement of clarinet register has been incorporated into Morris’ analysis and what can be gleaned from it,

It must be remembered that this piece is for Bb clarinet, and that certain registers on this instrument exhibit different timbral qualities. The opening section lies more or less in the so-called ‘throat’ register. This is often described as a pale area, and obviously suits the désolé nature of the opening… The range gradually opens out during the remainder of Part 1, though no great heights or depths are reached. The recurring semibreve Es are in mid-clarino register. This is characteristically bright, and best capable of producing the ppp-ffff crescendo demanded… A gradual descent through the ranges to the lowest chaleameau leads to the repeat of the opening (Part 3). The chalemeau is usually considered a darker tone colour than the throat register, but Messiaen retains the same expression marks as the opening.³⁰⁷

Though I acknowledge Morris’ goal is different from my own, his ability is limited in being able to derive meaning from the clarinet’s timbre. It is a constant goal of clarinetist to work on making this “throat register” sound as rich as the others. The fragility of tone colour, coupled with the fact that few fingers are actually holding the instrument on these notes, makes the register quite unstable. The fact that the movement opens on the F# in this throat register indicates to me as a clarinetist, that whilst this note is free-blowing, I will have to work harder to make it not sound wimpy, to evoke a more somber mood. That I even consider this opening note as an F# could be viewed somewhat controversially by the established norms of analysis. Most theorists (including those whose work I have mentioned) use a score notated in concert pitch to produce their

analysis. This is for the reason that they are looking for relation of notes between instruments and movements. However, each note on the clarinet (and other transposing instruments) can take on specific connotations of timbre, and those meanings are reflected in what I have to do to perform that note to either hide or bring out those qualities. An example of this understanding a musician has of where things sit on her instrument is well demonstrated by Kaastra when she describes,

I know middle C as a left hand responsibility. My personal goal is to play middle C with a full sound. Middle C requires twice as much breath pressure as the C an octave below. As a result, my embouchure must compensate for the increased pressure by opening up, not biting. I know middle C is in tune when my body is energized, but not tense, and I feel the resonance in my mouth, chest, and hands. If I am tense, the pitch will be high. If I am slack, it will be flat. If I am playing middle C in an orchestra, say, on the last note of a C major symphony that ends on the tonic in root position, I am probably playing first bassoon, not second. I anchor my pitch inside the tones of those who are playing an octave or two below me. It is their job to set the pitch for the rest of the ensemble. I listen downward; my C is a shade of color added to that of the basses, cellos, and second bassoon. My C should not draw attention to itself. I feel and perform its function in relation to what goes on around me.⁵⁰⁸

For a clarinetist, the difference between starting on an F#, as opposed to an E (as indicated in the concert pitch score) is significant in differences of color, approach, stability, available atmospheres of creation, and meaning. F# can be stuffy and thin sounding (something that can be overcome with alternate fingerings, however that option is denied to us in this instance due to the fingering required for the following note), thus a focusing of embouchure and air can give it a roundness that gives it a more solemn character.
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Why though should I want a somber mood, if the clarinet pushes towards “paleness”? For this we must return to the form of the work, and consider our infratext. As any theorist would note, our return to the A material at the end of the movement occurs an octave down from the original theme. Metaphorically this might be linked to ideas of profoundness that take off from the “depth” of the notes, or tone in that register. However, as a clarinetist this return has a different meaning. The return (A’) is in the chalmeau register, the darkest and richest register of the clarinet, not to mention the most comfortable and stable. The lowest of these notes are rich even for an inexperienced player, and the balance of the instrument is secured as all fingers are holding on. This contrast in “tone defaults” of each A section suggests that a reconciliation needs to be created, if we are to consider this somber section a gloomy character for our analysis. Thus I am given a choice for how I could perform—I could exploit the feeling of walking on eggshells in the opening of the piece while in the depths of low end of the clarinet, or I could consider establishing a richness in the opening which I will capitalize on in the recapitulation. This is now where as a performer considering the full embodied paradigm, I must take into consideration elements of culture in performance.

The culture surrounding clarinet tone is complex. In the simplest terms, in WAM the spectrum of clarinet tone ranges from “dark” on one side of the continuum, often associated with German players, and at the other end, a bright tone, traditionally associated with the French school of playing. Presently these schools, while still distinct, have become more homogeneous (though the issue has more dimensions than I elaborate on here), but in North America the tone colour often preferred is towards the darker end of the spectrum. I do not think it would be helpful to this analysis to expound on the
dualities of the nationalisms of tone colour as they relate to this piece, however what might be worthwhile to note are comments from the composer regarding the performance of this piece. One recording of Messiaen performing this piece exists today, as well as some overseen by the composer. In one of the latter, Messiaen’s words to the clarinetist, Guy Deplus, stuck with the musician, as he explained in an interview,

Messiaen retained Akoka’s particular sound in his mind. And when he worked with our quartet, he was taken aback, because my sound was different. For example, in “Abyss of the Birds,” when the theme from the beginning returns in the low register of the clarinet, it’s marked piano, but Messiaen said to me: “No. With you, it needs to be louder.” Because sounds are darker now, so they project less. Even when Akoka played piano, he projected more. With me it was different. And so Messiaen asked me to play mezzo-forte here rather than piano.\(^{309}\)

This point was corroborated by another clarinetist, Michael Arrignon, who also recorded the work under Messiaen’s direction.\(^{310}\) This acknowledgement by the composer for a preference of a brighter tone in the chameleau recapitulation, is something worth considering by the performer. As mentioned earlier metaphors could easily be mapped between an abyss and darkness, which the player could decide to emphasize in their choice of tone colour. Also, choosing to play with a brighter tone colour as a North American clarinetist might be culturally shunned, especially in this piece where common practice seems to be to play with a dark sound. Does the cultural fashion then dictate to the performer how to play? Csordas would argue that the performer’s body, both a tool of culture and the result of it, must be considered within this paradigm for a true embodied analysis. I must admit, in my performance of this work, I find the A themes have a line that seems to call out to be played as dark in colour and atmosphere. The way they sit on
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\(^{310}\) Ibid., 14.
the instrument, though difficult to create in the opening, become rewarded heavily in the recapitulation. Performing with dynamics in mind, that this darker sound might need more to project, is a useful idea to keep in mind for clarinetist. However one chooses to play these sections, the recap of the movement becomes an area of pleasure for the performer. Not only is it a return to familiar material after a more technical contrasting section, thus offering respite; the return happens in a way that makes it easier than the first presentation. This return to the familiar, but along a path of more ease, might signal a meaning towards “that which is unknown gets less terrifying the more you walk through it,” perhaps a nod to Messiaen’s idea of the “banishing of the temporal.”

Fig. 6 Pople’s Rhythmic Simplification

I would be remiss if I left out of this discussion how time is considered by the performer in this piece. Anthony Pople refers to “Abime” as “a meditation on freedom and hope through an escape from ‘the equal and measured time of classical music.’”

There are two ideas I must bring forward in response to this statement. The first harkens
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back to my mistake in trying to “grasp” this piece as a student by understanding it in terms of the WAM tradition. Despite my efforts, I found it to be useless to try and find meaning in Messiaen’s rhythmic uniqueness through a comparison of the work to WAM rhythmic norms. However such an understanding is attempted by Pople (see fig. 6) where he “composes” a melody that parallels that of “Abîme” but removes the rhythmic eccentricities so that one may envision what the piece might look like if it had been composed more straightforwardly.314 This effort is futile, for in removing these rhythms, Pople removes its meaningfulness, leaving us to ask “what is the meaning of this analysis?” This misplaced consideration in regards to the temporal aspects of the movement are not unique. We can also see a second way in which the escape from “time” is “performed” in this movement, through the irregular (to WAM) use of bar lines. This missing “signal to the eye of time passing” gives a point of discussion to theorists who often refer to Messiaen’s works of prose for insight into his composition style in this matter. This can be seen in Morris’ statement where he notes Messiaen’s Technique de mon language musical “was useful in indicating that the barlines were there to indicate ‘periods.’ The exact meaning of ‘period,’ however, is not clear. It seems to stretch from one or two notes to a whole section.”315 This confusion, or need for clarity, seems absurd to the performer who can see through the unusual bar lines a type of phrase marking, or grouping of musical ideas, without giving a second thought to it. This further illustrates how viewing something in the score may lead to questions easily resolved through performance.

314 Ibid., 42.
There is however one final concern on this topic where the performer and theorist do not meet eye to eye, which is the idea of the “end of time.” Where the theorist might see the lack of measure lines as a libration from the temporal, the performer instead sees this as a shackle, for they cannot rely on their habituated unconscious competence of the meter (until well in to the rehearsal process) to carry them in the music. Pople describes in this movement a “rhythmic freedom which Messiaen instills into the unaccompanied melody.”316 This idea of rhythmic freedom seems less so to the performer who, due to the irregularity of the meter, find themselves subdividing with more concentration than they would in a classical symphony. Pople later comments “the slower music, too, frees itself from the rigours of traditional musical time.”317 The idea that especially in the A sections, the sections that represent the abyss, time would be un-rigorous only makes sense from a listeners perspective. And here I must admit that I am no longer privileged to this perspective having performed this work so many times. I am unable to hear the first note without searching for the clarinetist’s underlying pulse (or lack thereof). This freedom however also seems to be denied by the composer’s words himself in this movement “the abyss is Time.”318 For the uninitiated, the performing of this piece is quite challenging. The meaning here becomes explicit when the musician is able to embody the rhythms Messiaen writes, with the same comfort as performing a Haydn symphony. This involves process, and ironically, time. Also worth reiterating is that Messiaen was aware of this process. We can recall his words to Akoka when he “found the composer gave him

317 Ibid., 44.
difficult things to do. “I’ll never be able to play it,” he would say. “Yes, yes, you will, you’ll see,” Messiaen would answer.”

The learning of Messiaen’s style takes time for a clarinetist, but is an integral part to their development. This education cannot be understood through theoretical applications of modes, verbal descriptions of tone colour, or comparative rhythms. Instead it must be felt by the performer, who eventually comes to embody this understanding, whether consciously or not. This process is not easy, but is also where many musicians derive meaning from their playing. Embodied analysis gives us insight into this process and is something sorely lacking in the field of music scholarship.

**Conclusion**

What I have demonstrated in this chapter are ways that an analysis built from the experience of performing music, as drawn from the ideas of Parmer, Le Guin, and Kaastra, can be used to find meaning embodied within music. This meaning is often overlooked when only a score or recording is considered as part of musical analysis. The consideration of an actual body, that of myself the performer, allowed for the breadth and depth of this analysis. In this role I was prevented from objectifying the music, and instead had to consider the processes and activities that allowed for meaning to emerge. This involved not only focusing on bodily ways of knowing, but also considering cultural contexts that imbue the performance process with significance. In the next and final chapter I will explore the questions raised by such an analysis and how its offerings might affect the field of performance studies and musicology at large.
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Chapter Five: Music Performance as a Process of Understanding

“This is a different kind of call... a call for artists to identify and assume their responsibilities—not to society, but to us ourselves, as complex beings riven by flashes of diverse kinds of intelligence; not to filling up the cultural space defined by the institution and rewarded by the institution, but to stripping all that away and breaking through with serious intention, with long work deep in the process of actually doing it.”

–Tim Hodgkinson

In this thesis I argued that the importance of the performer’s body is music scholarship is overlooked, despite its necessity as a part of how both performers and music scholars derive meaning from music. I showed this by demonstrating the need for acknowledging the embodied experience in music analysis through the outlets of thought, culture, and meaning, as well as the performer’s insight; yet I was then able to illustrate how the discipline of musicology ignores work that includes these elements. Finding scholars who also acknowledge themselves as performers allowed me to combine their styles of analysis to undertake one of my own. I argued that these types of analyses have the potential to give greater insight, and depth of meaning than those traditionally undertaken in the discipline. In the present chapter I will recapitulate the crux of my argument, then consider the ramifications of not embracing a fully embodied discourse, as well as making recommendations for how the field can reconcile the still pervasive duality between mind and body, scholar and performer.

In Chapter One I set the stage for the meaning behind this thesis by addressing the key questions of why an embodied analysis is important to the field of musicology. I demonstrated that at the root of musical analysis, the idea of “thinking about the meaning of culture” actually requires the body to carry out any part of the objective. I showed this

though Mark Johnson and George Lakoff’s approach to embodied cognition; Thomas Csordas’ embodiment paradigm; and Johnson’s theory of embodied meaning. The overlap of these fields allowed for an extraction of some key ideas that formed the boundaries of the approach taken in the second chapter. Furthermore, I emphasize the role of the performer’s body in the study of music as potentially able to offer more breadth and depth to an analysis through its amplified interaction with the activity; as well as citing reasons given by performer-scholars on their own insight into the value of their bodies in their research.

The second chapter allowed for the gap in the research to be exposed. Many sub-disciplines within musicology claim to hold an embodied perspective, yet they cross the boundaries established for an embodied approach to music. The two most common ways this is seen is in through an (1) an approach to music analysis that uses a figurative body as a stand in (as demonstrated in a feminist approach to music), and (2) an objectivist approach that disregards the subjective experiences of the performer’s body. To be noted are how the fields of ethnomusicology and music pedagogy share much in common with the processes of performance studies. Also within this field is a much more notable group of “performance advocates,” philosophers who wax on how music should include the body, yet fail to produce examples of how this could be done. It is for that reason that the subjects of the following chapter deserve more attention.

In Chapter Three I delved into the work of three very different performer-scholars. This group is unique in the musicology discourse for they way they insert themselves into their analyses. The first, notable for his explicit look into the process of formulating his analysis, Dillon Parmer generates meaning from music through
performance, and shows how enacting elements in a specific way gives rise to more than what is indicated in the score. His analysis describes such moments, and takes theorists to task who submit analyses that do not work in practice. Elisabeth Le Guin has an analysis style that turns more inward, as she analyzes the physical sensations of her body as she plays. This allowed her to find meaning in the music she was unaware of before, as well as a deeper relationship with the composer. To validate her analysis Le Guin falls back on her experience as a music historian and shows how the cultural concept of “body” was heightened in awareness at the time of the work’s composition. Lastly, Linda Kaastra flips the paradigm of analysis by using embodied cognition theories to find meaning in the performance of music. She is unable to take on an “objective role” as researcher as she recognizes her abilities as a musician prevent her from approaching her study as such, however she notes the advantages of this, and executes them in her focus on research that is of interest to performers. The conclusions she reaches in her analyses are also rich with insight into how performers engage in meaningful activities in the process music-making, and what these activities can even contain. The areas of overlap between these performer-scholars—that they begin their research with the body; they consider the mind and body unified; they acknowledge the body’s relationship to the environment in which it operates; they do not objectify the body; and they recognize their role as deeply entwined in the whole process—are not only the boundaries of an embodied paradigm, but the approach I brought to my analysis in Chapter Four.

By examining Messiaen’s *Abîme des Oiseaux* in the fourth chapter I was able to “test drive” the approaches to an embodied analysis I encountered in the previous chapter. This allowed me to demonstrate how an embodied analysis by a performer can
be used to examine music and its performance, and access meaning and meaningfulness not approachable through traditional analysis methods. Considerations to breath, timbre, and performance logistics were elements I was able to include in my analysis that would be unavailable to me otherwise. Considerations of breath were heavily influenced by Le Guin’s carnal approach, timbre and the “atmosphere as character” by Parmer’s generative theory, and performance logistics by Kaastra’s Joint Activity. These analyses are something I have argued are not frequent enough in the musicological literature, as the body is either used in the traditional discourse as a metaphor, or as a test-animal. The former presents a hierarchy of abstract thought over physical sensation, the latter a privileging of objective knowledge over embodied experience. Appreciating the boundaries of embodied analysis kept me from creating these dualities.

I now must ask where can we go from here. However, before I consider this I must suggest what the detriment of maintaining the status quo would be. The continuation of a dualistic discourse might seem acceptable if you belong to the side privileged by the discourse. However I would argue that this advantage is an illusion, and is also unfavorable to the field of musicology. Those who think that a discourse that suppresses considerations of the body is an adequate one, are deluding themselves from the fact that their abstract processing arises from being embodied. Furthermore musicology as a discipline suffers if it continues to favor a process of disembodied knowledge in its institutions, as it will shut out valuable voices and insights into the processes of music. This potential loss of richness and diversity in the field is foreshadowed in the scant amount of scholars taking up a truly embodied approach currently. However there is hope, as an awareness of the body is becoming increasingly a
part of the academic zeitgeist. As we saw in the fields of ethnomusicology and music pedagogy studies, an embodied approach to the study of music has been around for a significant amount of time, thus it is time for the rest of the field to draw on the resources presented by the body, the performer, and their own embodied experience.

However, how can musicology go about doing this? As I showed in Chapter One, our language supports dualistic thinking, and getting beyond thought processes cannot be accomplished easily. As I have indicated, many music scholars are keen to include the performer’s body within their work, but few actually do it in an embodied way. The most obvious goal then is to echo Parmer, and challenge musicians to take up the task. As mentioned in Chapter Three, Parmer summons performing musicians to take a more active role in music scholarship, to “speak at conferences and colloquiums, and that they are going to have to… publish.” As a performer in this field, though I believe I have unique things to say, I have felt isolated in my scholarship. In talking with others it seems that this isolation is not due to a lack of trying to get published, but instead of where to go. As I have shown, the diversity of fields claiming an embodied approach is wide, but those who explore it in the way performer-scholars do is a mere handful. Thus finding a mouthpiece for this sub-sub discipline would be a beginning.

A second recommendation then becomes having those that the discourse privileges get in touch with the activity of making music, and letting the body be the starting point for analysis; not a metaphoric one, but their own. At the same time, hopefully they can see their “subjectivities” as not ideas to be disregarded, but as rich

experiences that can be explored for meaning. However, the question should be asked – how proficient on an instrument need one be to perform an embodied analysis? I partly wonder if this question is what the “fear of the body” in musicology centers around. As an attempt to answer this question I return to Csordas’ “Somatic Modes of Attention,” where he suggests “bringing into the foreground the notions of perception and practice.”

For a potential performer-scholar this would suggest that a level where one can bring awareness to their body while playing, beyond the confines of the instrument, would be adequate. Furthermore, this process of paying attention to oneself is not a default skill, and for the process of my research I was lucky that I have been able to capitalize on skills in this area through my studies in the Alexander Technique. Alexander Technique is a somatic modality where one learns to bring conscious attention to the body as a way to address habitual forms of movement. I bring this up here as Alexander Technique is often an ancillary part to a musician’s tuition at the secondary level, however here I suggest that it may also be of use to a scholar interested in undertaking an embodied analysis. And for the purposes of scholarly music study, this skill perhaps might be more key than playing at the highest of levels.

If the body is to be reintroduced into the musicology discourse in the forms I have explored in this thesis, the change will have to come from how music is taught. This is why I return to the work of Parmer, who uses his classroom as a place to legitimize the role of the performer’s body in academic music study. A keystone recommendation of this thesis is to expound on such a philosophy. Accepting embodiment as an approach to musical study means it must be taught along side tonal and formal analysis in the core
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curriculum, not in Master’s level seminars. This may seem like a large demand considering the current educational paradigm in music, however I argue that if the goal of a musical education is to create a competent musical citizen, how could one consider the education complete without addressing the body, the place where music is felt, expressed, and made meaningful?
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