

IV. Methoden

Music as Performance: The Disciplinary Dilemma Revisited¹

Philip Auslander

The congress seeks to gather together this spectrum of questions and research approaches linking sound and performance and to discuss them from an interdisciplinary perspective.

At its heart is the assumption that 'sound' and performance are concepts which fundamentally draw into question the disciplinary division of 'music' and 'theatre.' [S]ound and performance are rather related to transitional phenomena than being the subject of disciplinary thinking.

– from the Conference Position Paper

I was very pleased to see the matter of studying sound and performance in relation to disciplinary formations of theatre and music raised as an issue in the conference position paper, since disciplinary questions have been at the heart of my work on music and performance for over a decade. My initial disciplinary and methodological reflections were prompted by frustration at not finding a discourse within any discipline that seemed to address musical performance in a satisfactory way. Musicology traditionally is preoccupied with a textual approach to music that relegates performance to a position of little importance. In this context, the phrase 'performance studies' refers to the technical, interpretive and research work a musician must do in order to produce a well-informed performance of a piece. It is a secondary application of musicology, which remains the privileged term.

Theater studies leaves music out of its purview because it traditionally regards musical performance as inherently non-dramatic, and performance studies has inherited this prejudice. Even opera and musical theater are neglected areas of study in these fields despite their obvious relationships to other theatrical forms. I still remember my theater history professor, the late Vera Mowry Roberts, for whom I have great respect, saying that the history of opera and the history of theater are separate narratives because, as she puts it in the textbook she wrote, "the predominant force in opera was the music rather than the words" and "the

¹ This is an expanded version of an essay of the same title published as the Afterword to *Taking It to the Bridge: Music as Performance*, ed. Nicholas Cook and Richard Pettengill, Ann Arbor 2013, pp. 349–357.

composer [...] is the focus of attention in opera.”² For Roberts, the fact that opera is driven by music rather than drama, by composers rather than playwrights, places it outside the realm of theater. Although I was studying theater history formally for the first time, this perspective struck me as a bit myopic.

Because my work in this area usually focuses on popular music, I also looked to cultural studies. Perhaps because of its roots in sociology, ethnography, and communications, however, the field of cultural studies generally emphasizes the reception of popular music much more than the performance behavior of musicians. Although scholars in communications and cultural studies often make excellent observations concerning specific genres of rock and pop music, their remarks on performance are generally impressionistic and synoptic. Most of the work in cultural studies of popular music that focuses on production examines the economic, sociological, institutional, industrial, and policy contexts in which popular music is made, and not on music as something made in and through performance. In contrast, my stance is unabashedly performer-centered: I am interested primarily in finding ways of discussing what musicians do ‘as performers’ – what it means to perform as a musician and how musicians create meaning through their performances, of which the music they perform is only a part.

I somewhat testily titled the first essay in which I first described my quest for a disciplinary context in which I could feel comfortable “Performance Analysis and Popular Music: A Manifesto”, published in 2004. It was in this essay that I introduced the term ‘musical persona,’ intended as a way of identifying a kind of performance that does not normally entail the portrayal of a fictional character, as does acting, but also cannot be simply equated with the musician’s quotidian self. Although I would bring the ideas of Erving Goffman explicitly to bear on this schema in later writings, in this essay I already described musical persona as a framed presentation of identity communicated through the deployment of “expressive equipment” and a specific “personal front,”³ though without using Goffman’s terminology. In other words, I emphasized the visual and corporeal dimensions of musical performance to counterbalance the usual emphasis on sound. Indeed, one of my later essays in this vein is called “Musical Persona: The Physical Performance of Popular Music.” I sum-

² Vera Mowry Roberts, *On Stage: A History of Theatre*, 2nd ed., New York 1974, p. 108.

³ Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, New York 1959; Erving Goffman, *Frame Analysis: An Essay in the Organization of Experience*, Cambridge 1974.

marized the disciplinary situation that led me to write my manifesto by saying,

this, then, is what I am choosing to call the disciplinary dilemma confronting the scholar who wishes to talk seriously about musicians as performers: those who take music seriously, either as art or culture, dismiss performance as irrelevant. Those who take performance seriously are reluctant to include musical forms among their objects of study.⁴

My purpose in initiating the Working Group in Music as Performance (MAP), also in 2004, first under the auspices of the Association for Theater in Higher Education, then under those of Performance Studies international, was to map out a space for a discourse that would focus on what musicians do as performers and on musical events as performances comprising a complexity of expressive means and social interactions.

More than ten years into this pursuit, I now often wonder if it is still necessary or advisable to frame this mission polemically by continuing to chastise both musicologists and theater and performance studies scholars for neglecting musical performance, as I felt was necessary at first. There is evidence – including several publications and this conference – that the kind of substantive dialogue around questions of music and performance I felt was lacking at the turn of the millennium is now underway. But I have to admit that every time I have had the opportunity to address the relationship between music and performance I have issued a fresh version of my original polemic (there have been four so far).⁵ This results, in part, from my continually encountering in the work of scholars with whom I generally sympathize an ultimate refusal to embrace the full implications of considering performance as constitutive of music. For example, Thompson, Graham and Russo, a trio of communications researchers, begin an essay titled “Seeing Music Performance” by pointing out,

most psychological research on [music] performance has ignored non-acoustic aspects of performance, considering them as extraneous and not essential to the music. Indeed, visual information related to music performance is often trivialized on the grounds that

⁴ Philip Auslander, “Performance Analysis and Popular Music: A Manifesto,” in: *Contemporary Theatre Review* 14 (2004), no. 1, pp. 1–13, here p. 3.

⁵ See Philip Auslander, “Performance Analysis and Popular Music: A Manifesto” (see nt. 4); “Music as Performance: Living in the Immaterial World,” in: *Theatre Survey* 47 (2006), no. 2, pp. 261–269; “Musical Personae,” in: *The Drama Review* 50 (2006), no. 1, pp. 100–119; and “Musical Persona: The Physical Performance of Popular Music,” in: *The Ashgate Research Companion to Popular Musicology*, ed. Derek B. Scott, Farnham 2009, pp. 303–315.

it is determined by the sound [...] in order to produce a given chord, you have to place your fingers on given frets.⁶

They enthusiastically demonstrate through experimental work that performers' physical gestures are central to the audience's understanding of its musical experience on both formal and affective levels. At the end of the article, however, the authors make a distinction between musically relevant visual information (i. e., the performers' gestures and facial expressions) and visual effects used in performance that they see as merely distracting the audience and thus failing to fulfill performance's proper role of "supporting the music."⁷ They consequently reinscribe the privileging of the musical work against which the 'performative turn' in the study of music positions itself.

A similar frustration echoes from the side of musicology in Alejandro Madrid's introduction to a 2009 special issue of *Trans: Revista Transcultural de Musica* on music and performance studies. Madrid's observations about changes in the field are similar to mine: there have been steps forward, but not enough. Speaking of the special issue, Madrid writes,

The answer to our call for papers was quite impressive, more than 40 abstracts were submitted for consideration, which in itself tells us of the increasing relevance that the idea of performance has in music studies. Nevertheless, the fact that ca. 75% of those abstracts were concerned with the old performance practice paradigm also tells us that much more still needs to be done to broaden the understanding of what performance can mean in music.⁸

It is clear that there is good will on all sides and an active desire to develop and enhance the substantive exchanges that have begun. But the need to jump-start these exchanges may not have passed just yet.

The discursive space I seek resides "at the crossroads of performance studies and musicology,"⁹ as the editor of another special journal issue on music and performance puts it, but whether it is a bridge between the two disciplines, a point at which they intersect, or a new field forged from

⁶ William Forde Thompson, Phil Graham, and Frank A. Russo, "Seeing Music Performance: Visual Influence on Perception and Experience," in: *Semiotica* 156 (2005), no. 1/4, pp. 203–227, here p. 211. The internal quotation comes from Nicholas Cook, *Analysing Musical Multimedia*, Oxford 1998, p. 263.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

⁸ Alejandro L. Madrid, "Why Music and Performance Studies? Why Now? An Introduction to the Special Issue," in: *Revista Transcultural de Música/Transcultural Music Review* 13 (2009); <http://www.sibetrans.com/trans/trans13/art01eng.html> (accessed 10 November 2009).

⁹ Todd J. Coulter, "Music as Performance – The State of the Field," in: *Contemporary Theatre Review* 21 (2011), no. 3, pp. 259–260, here p. 259.

them has been an open question. Indeed, the nature of the relationship between these two disciplines is emerging as a point of contention within this still relatively uncharted field. The nature of this contention is well expressed by Derek Miller, who argues in his essay of 2011 “On Piano Performance: Technology and Technique” that the performance studies approach to musical performance, at least as represented by my work, neglects the essence of music, which he considers to be sound. He refers specifically to my claim that musical persona is the central phenomenon of musical performance, a position that perhaps can be summarized by a few sentences from my essay “Musical Personae:”

Musical performance may be defined [...] as a person’s representation of self within a discursive domain of music. I posit that in musical performance, this representation of self is the direct object of the verb to perform. What musicians perform first and foremost is not music, but their own identities as musicians, their musical personae.¹⁰

I suggest that music is an expressive resource musicians use to perform their personae, not the other way around. For Miller, foregrounding musical persona in this way emphasizes what he describes as the secondary ‘epiphenomenal’ dimensions of performance at the expense of its bedrock of sound.¹¹

Miller also accuses performance studies of demanding that musicology “abdicate entirely its formalist attention to sound.”¹² Although I consider Miller’s specific arguments to be flawed, as I shall show, his concern that the union of performance studies with musicology may cost the latter its proper object of study is worth addressing, especially as it is a concern shared in some measure by Richard Pettengill and Nicholas Cook, the editors of *Taking It to the Bridge: Music as Performance*. They write in their introduction,

Western ‘art’ musicologists have developed sophisticated techniques of close reading and listening, but have traditionally shied away from the issues of personal, social, and cultural meaning that emerge from the act of performance. Performance theorists address the latter, but as both editors complain in their contributions to this book, the specific ways in which these meanings are condi-

¹⁰ Auslander, “Musical Personae” (see nt. 5), p. 102.

¹¹ See Derek Miller, “On Piano Performance – Technology and Technique,” in: *Contemporary Theatre Review*, Vol. 21 (2011), no. 3, pp. 261–275, here p. 262.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 275.

tioned by sounds and their representations within specific musical cultures sometimes seem to slip through the net.¹³

Madrid suggests a similar disciplinary dichotomy in his discussion of the different approaches each discipline takes to music:

While music scholarship (including performance practice) asks what music is and seeks to understand musical texts and musical performances in their own terms according to a social and cultural context, a performance studies approach to the study of music asks what music does or allows people to do; such an approach understands musics as processes within larger social and cultural practices and asks how these musics can help us understand these processes as opposed to how do these processes help us understand music.¹⁴

Cook and Pettengill, Madrid, and Miller all nominate musicology as the discipline that explicates music per se, while performance studies is the discipline that can tell us about the social meanings music generates in performance and the uses to which it can be put. Ultimately, I shall argue, a truly productive approach to music as performance must move beyond formulations that mark off disciplinary territory, even in the interest of emphasizing complementarity, in favor of an approach that sees music and its performance as inextricably imbricated with one another.

Miller, for his part, defines “musical performance as a dynamic relationship between a musician and a (sound-producing) instrument. [...] Considered in this way, musical performance is a double performance: a technological performance by an instrument and a technical performance by a musician.”¹⁵ His valorization of the instrument as the source of sound (for him the essence of music) rests on a claim that whereas the bodies of actors and dancers are themselves instruments, “the ‘body’ of the music (as a sonic phenomenon) and the body of the musician are not identical; their relationship is non-isomorphic.”¹⁶ One major gap in this argument is that Miller does not discuss vocal music. Singing surely is a form of musical performance in which the body of the music is isomorphic with that of the performer in the same sense that a dancer’s body is isomorphic with the dance. To identify musical performance solely with instrumental music in the Western art tradition is to take one tree for an entire forest.

¹³ Nicholas Cook and Richard Pettengill, “Introduction,” in: *Taking It to the Bridge* (see nt. 1), pp. 1–19, here p. 6.

¹⁴ Madrid, “Why Music and Performance Studies?” (see nt. 8).

¹⁵ Miller, “On Piano Performance” (see nt. 11), p. 265.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 262.

There are other examples in addition to traditional singing in which musicians use their own bodies as their instruments. Two that come immediately to mind are Bobby McFerrin's vocal practice and Laurie Anderson's *Drum Dance* from her 1986 concert film *Home of the Brave*.¹⁷ McFerrin is an American jazz singer who employs a range of unconventional techniques in his solo performances to produce the illusion, and sometimes the reality, of polyphonic singing (one technique he employs is that of throat singing, which enables a singer to sing two tones simultaneously). His wide vocal range allows him to oscillate very rapidly between the bottom of his range and falsetto, from head voice to chest voice and back again, thus creating the impression of two singers in dialogue. He generally weaves three such vocal lines together and supplements these with vocally produced percussive and sound effects, impressions of musical instruments, and vocal distortions and other percussive sounds made by manipulating his throat or thumping his chest. McFerrin's multiple and complex uses not only of his larynx but of the entirety of his upper body dramatize the inseparability of his body and his music. One of his songs is titled *I Am My Own Walkman*.¹⁸ More to the point, he is his own instrument.

For *Drum Dance*, Laurie Anderson wore a costume with sensors built into it at various points on her body, including her shoulders, chest, sides, and knees. These sensors triggered digital sounds of drums and other percussion instruments. As Anderson danced, she struck her hands against these areas of her body to generate a percussion solo. Because electronics mediated between Anderson's gestures and the sound, she was not her own instrument in the literal sense that McFerrin is – he was more a human digital interface. Nevertheless, the tight connections in this piece between the rhythm of her movements, the gestures she made that were both dance movements and means of producing musical sound, and the sound itself makes it impossible to dissociate the music she made from her dancing body.

To fit musical performances such as these to Miller's definition would be an exercise in extreme Cartesianism requiring one to distinguish between the performer as musician and the performer as instrument, and to anatomize these performers' bodies to distinguish the parts that serve as sound-producing technologies from those that act on them to produce sound.

For Miller, the way to correct performance studies' ostensible neglect of sound and my supposed over-emphasis of musical persona as the central phenomenon of musical performance is to focus on 'technique,'

¹⁷ See *Home of the Brave*, dir. by Laurie Anderson, Talk Normal 1986, 91 minutes.

¹⁸ Bobby McFerrin, "I Am My Own Walkman," *The Voice*, Elektra/Musician 1984.

the technical performance skills that enable musicians to generate musical sound from instruments. I have nothing but admiration for the technical skills musicians display, and there can be no principled objection to including consideration of technique when analyzing musical performances. But 'technique' is a much more slippery concept than Miller allows for. In order to cordon it off from the epiphenomenal, Miller follows Nusseck and Wanderly in distinguishing between "technical" and "ancillary" gestures in musical performance. Technical gestures are those directly involved in the production of sound, such as the pressure of a finger on a keyboard, while "ancillary gestures are a means of communicating the performer's attitude toward the music [...]"¹⁹ These have no direct relationship to sound production, and therefore no strictly musical function from Miller's point of view. "The lesson here is clear," he states, "the only elements that matter in piano performance are 'practical'."²⁰ At best, other elements constitute a secondary iteration of what the musician communicates in sound: "ancillary gestures enact visually what the pianist executes technically."²¹

There is ample empirical evidence that gestures Miller presumably would classify as ancillary in fact do contribute significantly to auditors' perception of musical sound. In a review of the literature on experimental research into music perception, Michael Schutz enumerates the ways in which both technical and ancillary gestures influence how audiences hear musical sound.²² Acknowledging that the visual aspects of musical performance contribute much to its affective experience, Schutz also summarizes the experimental evidence that perception of such formal properties of musical sound as pitch, timbre, dissonance, note duration, and the size of intervals is directly affected by gesture. The length of a tone sounded on a marimba will be heard as longer or shorter depending on the percussionist's gesture,²³ for example, and "different facial expressions can cause the same musical events to sound more or less dissonant, the same melodic interval to sound larger or smaller."²⁴

In describing his experiments with the marimba, Schutz points out, "percussionists [...] (unlike other instrumentalists), have minimal control over acoustic note duration independent of other parameters such as volume." But notes played on the instrument were perceived by the test subjects as "significantly longer when a given note was paired with a long,

¹⁹ Miller, "On Piano Performance" (see nt. 11), p. 269.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 270.

²¹ Ibid., p. 269.

²² See Michael Schutz, "Seeing Music? What Musicians Need to Know About Vision," in: *Empirical Musicology Review* 3 (2008), no. 3, pp. 83–108.

²³ See *ibid.*, p. 88.

²⁴ Thompson, Graham, and Russo, "Seeing Music" (see nt. 6), p. 220.

rather than a short gesture. [...] Therefore, although gestures cannot change the [physical] sound of a marimba note, they are capable of changing the way that note sounds within the mind of the listener.”²⁵

Schutz emphasizes the ways visual information can influence what we hear at both cognitive and purely perceptual levels.²⁶ In other words, musicians’ gestures, in some cases including so-called ancillary gestures, directly influence the audience’s perception of musical sound – which would be heard differently when executed with different gestures – and not just its understanding of “the performer’s attitude toward the music” as Miller would have it. As Schutz points out, the implication of this research is that music – especially, I would add, in the context of performance – “is less about sound per se than it is about using sound to create a particular experience within the mind of the listener. To this end, the strategic use of visual information is no less important than manipulations of breath control, bow position, striking angle, intonation, etc. [...]”²⁷ This suggests that the concept of instrumental technique needs to be extended to the musician’s non-technical gestures that nevertheless shape the listener’s perception of the musical sound.

When linked to the premise that a musician’s corporeal engagement in performance is truly ‘musical’ only when it involves actions on an instrument that directly produce sound, the distinction between technical and ancillary gestures Miller employs reinforces the prejudice against the body and the concomitant valorization of interpretation as an essentially intellectual activity that characterize Western discourse on music. Although Miller seems at first to challenge the mind/body distinction as it has traditionally played out in the discourse of Western music by saying “the knowledge of a musical work resides in the pianist’s body,” he retreats to the normative position by describing the physical process of performing as mediation “between a conceptual soundscape (the work as imagined in a pianist’s ‘inner ear’) and a physical, perceptual soundscape (sounds produced by the piano).”²⁸ In this schema, the function of performance is to communicate the musician’s ‘conceptual knowledge’ of the work to an audience – the musician’s physical actions thus serve an intellectual construct. As Jairo Moreno puts it, “the body is clearly seen [in this discourse] as the locus of ultimate exteriority and as a threat for contemplation of a purely musical aesthetic [...]”²⁹ What Madrid calls performative actions, which oblige us to acknowledge the musician’s corporeal

²⁵ Schutz, “Seeing Music?” (see nt. 21), p. 88.

²⁶ See *ibid.*, p. 91.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

²⁸ Miller, “On Piano Performance” (see nt. 11), pp. 268–269.

²⁹ Jairo Moreno, “Body’n’Soul?: Voice and Movement in Keith Jarrett’s Pianism,” in: *The Musical Quarterly* 83 (1999), no. 1, p. 75–92, here p. 83.

presence as the material basis of the production of musical sound, are rejected as repellent.³⁰

For example, the normative critical reaction to musicians such as Glenn Gould and Keith Jarrett, both of them pianists famous for such eccentricities as vocalizing along with their playing and, at least in the case of Jarrett, assuming an unusually active and intimate relationship with the instrument, is to emphasize their conventional skills as pianists and to suggest not only that their other behaviors are ancillary but also that the audience should ignore them. In the 1959 documentary film *Glenn Gould: Off the Record*,³¹ Gould is seen playing piano in his lakeside vacation home, accompanied only by his collie dog. He is wearing a bathrobe; a coffee cup sits atop the piano. He vocalizes robustly along with his own playing of Bach and occasionally plunks out a single note with a playful gesture reminiscent of Chico Marx. At one point, he abandons the keyboard midstream to get up and look out the window, still vocalizing the rhythm of the music, then returns equally abruptly to the piano. The domestic context of the documentary encourages the audience to feel it is getting a candid view of Gould, but since he is being filmed, he is in fact engaged in a public performance that showcases his eccentricity.

In the opening sequence of *Keith Jarrett: Last Solo*,³² a film of a 1984 concert in Tokyo, the camera faces Jarrett across his piano and captures his expressions. Before he begins to play, a secretive smile plays across his lips. He lowers his head down into the keyboard as he starts, shaking it vigorously, then suddenly lifts his head and torso rapidly into an erect position, his face contorted with ecstatic expression, his eyes clamped shut, his lips quivering as he seemingly mouths the music he improvises. The deeper he gets into the music the more active his body becomes: he shakes and rolls his head more and more vigorously; his facial expressions sometimes appear pained; he stands at the keyboard gyrating his torso and thrusting his pelvis in ways often perceived as sexual while simultaneously vocalizing along with his playing.

The critical line on Gould and Jarrett is that they are brilliant musicians in spite of what they do in performance, not because of it.³³ But what if these idiosyncratic performatives are integral to Gould's and

³⁰ Following Diana Taylor, Madrid endorses using the term "performatic" to describe the visual and physical enactments that constitute performance.

³¹ *Glenn Gould: Off the Record*, dir. by Roman Kroitor and Wolf Koenig, National Film Board of Canada 1959, 23 minutes. Available at http://www.nfb.ca/film/glenn_gould_off_record.

³² *Keith Jarrett: Last Solo*, Image Entertainment, 1984, 92 minutes.

³³ See Graham Carr, "Visualizing 'The Sound of Genius': Glenn Gould and the Culture of Celebrity in the 1950s," in: *Journal of Canadian Studies* 40 (2006), no. 3, pp. 5–41, here p. 34; Moreno, "Body 'n' Soul?" (see nt. 29), p. 75.

Jarrett's respective means of producing sound, as seems to be the case? (Why else would they subject themselves to predictable critical approbation for performing as they do?) If these performers need to do these things in order to produce the sounds they wring from their instruments, why should these physical actions not come under the heading of technique? Moreno, writing on Jarrett, points to the way the limitation of technique to the technical reduces the musician's physicality to that of a machine (my image, not his): the "conventional belief in the role of the performer" mandates that "the articulations and gesticulations of the body are part of the mechanics of reproduction [of the musical composition] but not, perversely enough, of the articulation of meaning."³⁴ Paul Sanden, writing on Gould, argues that listening to the musician's body as music, rather than dismissing non-technical gestures as producing "noise", is necessary to a full appreciation of music "as a physically enacted phenomenon" – as performance, in short – and to grasping "the significance of Gould's performances and not merely that of his interpretations."³⁵ From this perspective, there is no distinction between technical and ancillary gestures: all of the musician's gestures constitute the performance of music as embodied expression. Further, the musician's persona is not epiphenomenal. Jarrett's ecstatic communion with the keyboard; Gould's portrayal of a mad alchemist of Bach; McFerrin's treatment of his own body as an acoustic sounding board; and Anderson's use of her own body as a percussive interface: all of these are both the physical means by which the artists make music and embodiments of their presence as musicians, their musical personae.

I would like to consider for a moment two sequences from the films of the two pianists I have discussed. During Jarrett's encore at the end of the film, the camera isolates his technical gestures by zooming in on his hands at the keyboard, shots subsequently juxtaposed with full-body shots of him at the piano in the same frame. The initial impression is that the technical gestures are the most important, since the hands appear much larger in the frame than Jarrett's entire body at the keyboard, seen in long shot. The next sequence fragments Jarrett's body into his hands at the keyboard and his feet stomping on the floor suggesting, perhaps, that Jarrett's "ancillary" gestures are worthy of attention, before settling on his torso in medium shot. This view is immediately intercut with images of

³⁴ Moreno, "Body'n'Soul?" (see nt. 29), p. 81. For another discussion of the traditional view of the musician's role in musical performance see Philip Auslander, "Sound and Vision: The Audio-Visual Economy of Musical Performance," in: *The Oxford Handbook of New Audiovisual Aesthetics*, ed. by Claudia Gorbman, John Richardson, and Carol Vernallis, New York 2013, pp. 605–621.

³⁵ Paul Sanden, "Hearing Glenn Gould's Body: Corporeal Liveness in Recorded Music," in: *Current Musicology* 88 (2009), pp. 7–34, here p. 9, 20.

the interior of the piano in close up, as if to echo Miller's idea of piano performance as a collaboration between the musician as technical performer and the piano as the source of the sound. Aside from one further shot of Jarrett's hands, the remainder of the clip (a bit less than half of its total length) focuses on Jarrett himself, settling into a tight shot of his face to strongly suggest that, finally, he is the source of the music. By contrast, the clip of Gould never fragments him or divides his gestures into the categories of technical or ancillary. Most often, we see him from the waist up, at the piano. Although his hands are not always visible, his face always is, suggesting that he is the source of the sound. If the clip of Jarrett implies a train of thought that focuses on various aspects of his performance, weighs the relative values of his technical performance and his dramatic presence at the keyboard, and finally settles on the idea that the persona he enacts is the source of the sound, the clip of Gould suggests right from the start that the music emerges not from the piano but from Gould, not from his hands but from the whole person.

Paired analytical concepts such as technical and ancillary gestures, what music is and what it does or, to cite another set of terms Madrid proposes, the performativity and the performativity of music, have descriptive value. I emphasized performance analysis in my first manifesto, mentioned earlier, and I remain committed to the value of thick description of musical performances. But thinking in dichotomies reifies conventional understandings of music and performance by reducing musical performance into components we are comfortable labeling with one term or the other, rather than facing the challenge of understanding musical performance as something other than music plus performance. That is why I always intended MAP to stand for music as performance: I see musical performance not as an alloy that can be broken down into constituent parts, but as elemental. Switching metaphors from metallurgy to linguistics, I suggest that the relationship between music and performance parallels Roman Jakobson's description of the relationship between language and speech.

Jakobson takes issue with linguists who describe emotional expression carried by speech as "nonlinguistic," arguing that "if we analyze language from the standpoint of the information it carries, we cannot restrict the notion of information to the cognitive aspect of language" and that attributing emotional expression to "the delivery of the message and not to the message' arbitrarily reduces the informational capacity of the message."³⁶ I hear a similar reduction in some of the discourse around music as performance, in which music is figured implicitly as the message, which

³⁶ Roman Jakobson, *Language in Literature*, ed. Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy, Cambridge 1987, p. 67.

exists prior to and independently of its performance, and performance is the delivery system that brings music into the public sphere. Although music and language are not the same thing and it is always risky to compare them, they are comparable in at least one respect: music is no more independent of its expression than is language. Just as the way words are spoken determines the semantic content of the message, so the way music is performed determines its musical content. Just as speech and language are fused in the message, so music and performance are fused in musical performance. Miller argues that the specificity of music as sound, and musicologists' formalist approach to it, must be respected when looking at it from a performance studies perspective. In contrast, I argue that what must be respected is the specificity of musical performance defined not as a relationship between two autonomous practices (music and performance) or the object of a dialogue between two autonomous fields (musicology and performance studies) but as an irreducible fusion of expressive means.³⁷

Moreno, too, argues for this way of thinking when he challenges the position that "music is sound, and only sound is music" in his description of Keith Jarrett's performance:

his sounds and gestures are unquestionably part of the music, so much so that one could describe these sounds and gestures not as a translation or mechanisms in service of music, or an addition to the music, but the music itself. [...] In Jarrett's pianism, communication is aural, oral, visual, and kinetic. [...] To center music's communication in sound alone is to dehumanize it.³⁸

With this in mind, I return to Madrid's distinction between what music "is" and what it "does" to suggest that these two ideas are not as easily distinguishable as they may appear. Music is not sound disengaged from the physical being of the person who makes it. Listening to Schutz's marimbist or to Keith Jarrett or Glenn Gould or any musician, the sounds I hear result directly from all aspects of the person's physical engagement with the act of music making – all of the sounds and gestures that constitute the performance – not just the limited range of actions conventionally included under the word 'technique'. Perhaps, then, the solution to the disciplinary dilemma I identified in 2004 is to recognize that there is

³⁷ While I clearly take issue with Miller's positions I want to make it clear that I do not disagree with the entirety of his argument. Miller offers a persuasive analysis of the relationship between musician and instrument. Apart from my rejection of Miller's position that the only really relevant aspects of the musician's performance as are the technical ones, nothing I say here is inconsistent with thinking about instrumental performance as a joint performance between musician and instrument.

³⁸ Moreno, "Body 'n' Soul?" (see nt. 29), pp. 88–89.

no dilemma, no ontological or epistemological gap between music and performance that needs bridging. Music 'is' what musicians 'do'.