

melted honey: sax and sex

Dr. Simone J. Dennis
Department of Anthropology
Adelaide University
Australia

Keywords: phenomenology, corporeality, food, penetration, sensuality, musicality

abstract

This paper deals with multisensory processes of engaging and disengaging with a musical world through the body. It is based on ethnographic research with an Australian Police band. Band members make a strict distinction between rehearsal and performance. For band members, rehearsals are characterised by a multi-sensual disengagement with instrument. During rehearsals, which entail a close multi-sensory focussing in on the points at which instrument body and musician body met, the senses of touch, sight and hearing are engaged in the process of surveillance. Such surveillance is undertaken in order that the musicians can identify faulted touches to instruments that result in faulted sounds. Touch to the instrument body is 'watched', not only with the eye, but in and through touch and hearing senses. These sensual combinations serve to separate person and instrument. In contrast, performances are characterised by a multisensual embodiment of the instrument, to the point that band members understand themselves to be constructed of instruments, and that instruments are constructed of them. In performances, instruments and performers come to phenomenologically complete one another's bodies.

Band members discuss the sensually experienced distinction between rehearsal and performance by means of a distinction between fucking (which they understood as similar to rehearsal) and making love (which they understood to be similar to performance experience). Band members also drew on food/music metaphors, including the difference between constructing a musical dish from a recipe (the written music) and tasting the melted honey of performed sax sounds. They used this metaphor to describe the sensual difference between making sound in rehearsal, and the corporeally penetrative act of inviting a sax into the body in musical performance.

Using the distinction between rehearsal and performance, and the penetrative metaphors that band members used to describe it, I draw on and extend the critiques that Michel Serres made of Merleau-Pontian phenomenology to analyse rehearsal and performance moments as, respectively, multisensory processes of surveillance and anti-surveillance.???

Introduction

Rehearsal and performance moments are experienced by band members as distinctly different moments, owing to the different sensual-corporeal engagements with instruments that each entails. Essentially, rehearsals are defined by the focusing of the player's self-conscious attention on the interaction between his or her body and the surface of the instrument. Rehearsals are experienced as moments of highly directed self surveillance of the sensing body. Performances, on the other hand, are characterised by the distinct lack of self-attention paid to the points at which musician and instrument meet, to the point that musicians describe performances as experiences of becoming their instruments, or, in other words, of becoming wholly instrumentalised. During my fieldwork, rehearsal periods could, and often did, involve playing music in front of groups of people visiting the institution in which the band members work. Simply playing in front of people did not, for band members, constitute performance. Conversely,

rehearsal moments occurred from time to time during performances, when band members found themselves engaging in the particularly surveilled bodily engagement with instruments that characterises and defines rehearsal.? Band members very often used eating and sexual metaphors to describe to me their own and audience? experiences of instrument sounds, and to alert me to the difference between rehearsal and performance experiences.

I argue herein that the difference between rehearsal and performance moments pivots on the experiences that band members have of instrumental penetration, which they articulated using other kinds of penetrative metaphor.? Each experience is also multisensual.? The key to understanding the difference between rehearsal and performance moments lies in not only the penetration that instrument makes into body and that body makes into instrument, but the multisensory nature of this penetration.? It is the multisensual character of instrumental penetration that Merleau-Pontian phenomenology cannot adequately accommodate.? In order to? explore this multisensual instrumental penetration, I use the critiques that Michel Serres has

[i]

made of Merleau-Pontian phenomenology. ? Serres argues that Merleau-Pontian phenomenology is capable of looking only at one sense at a time, and does not, therefore, focus on or adequately describe the life of the body.? Rather, in Serres?s view, Merleau-Pontian phenomenology is capable of viewing and describing the language that describes the sensual life of the body.

rehearsals and performances??

Band members, who are fulltime musicians working standard 8-hour days, rehearse with what they call ?monotonous regularity?..? A morning or afternoon portion of each working day, usually some 3-4 hours, is spent in rehearsal.? Rehearsals are all about tongues, lips, fingers, hands, feet, and respiration. A great deal of the players? self conscious attentions are directed towards the manner in which these bodily parts and functions meet with instrument objects to ?buzz?, ?blow?, hit, bang, tongue, lip and breathe into, them.? If these touches administered to the instrument body sound almost erotically sensuous experiences, they are not, at least in the lived experience of the rehearsing band member; if anything, instruments are antiseptically and dispassionately regarded.?

Band members describe rehearsals as occasions when they produce exclusively ?technical music?..? Technical music, according to band members, refers to the sounds that band members make when they are engaged in playing the music ?precisely as written: pressing the appropriate keys, blowing at the level that is indicated?just playing it [the written score] precisely?..? The score provides players with a technical prescription for its precise conversion into musical sounds.? Band members describe the technical prescription or score as analogous to a recipe: as a recipe provides instruction for the precise construction of a particular dish, so too does the technical music provide instruction for the precise construction of audible musical renderings. The written recipe for the audible musical food consists of both the musical notes, and the qualities impacting on each note and collection of notes.? Making the technical music involves giving a technically correct rendition of any given musical score.? Technical correctness is judged by the conductor, who is also able to modify and/or interpret the musical score in any way he sees fit. When he does so, his interpretations and modifications are understood by players to constitute part of the technical score that they must produce in the final rehearsal instance. If the written music is a recipe, then the conductor is head chef, who directs his kitchen staff in the precise construction of the musical dish.

The production of the technically correct music is the focus of all rehearsal periods, which consist of a set sequence of events.? The conductor first asks band members to ?just play through? the score newly presented to them.? The conductor listens carefully to the playing and, upon recognising the deviance of a played note from its technical prescription in the score, he calls a halt to playing and the nature of the deviation is communicated to band members.? Identification of a mistake is made by the conductor in two ways.? As he described it, the conductor simultaneously listens to the audible productions made by the players, and visually tracks the technical prescription made for notes in the score.? The conductor both sees and hears mistakes

as they occur, as he proceeds to audibly and visually survey the notes.

Technical problems with played versions of the score are then corrected in very particular ways. When a problem is identified (which occurs extremely frequently during initial and subsequent playings of pieces newly presented to players) the conductor stops the playing, refers to the score, communicates to players the mistake compared to the score, and to what he 'should have heard', and then seeks to correct the faulted playing by drawing the faulting player's attention to the relationship between his or her body and the instrument. More specifically, he draws attention to the point of intersection between a player's body and the surface of the instrument. The conductor asks musicians to direct their attentions in the following kinds of ways:

The conductor specifically asked William to notice if his tonguing was correct [because the sounds the conductor heard emitting from William's instrument indicated that the tongue was flicking too hard against the mouthpiece, causing the passage to sound 'too harsh' at the edge of the notes]. The conductor and William then engaged in an extended discussion over the course of several minutes in which William described in exhaustive detail the position and pressure of his tongue against the mouthpiece. The conductor then issued precise instructions about how William was to change the pressure and position of his tongue as it hit the instrument surface so that it could produce a technically correct sound, [ii]

or the sound set down for the note in the score.

Both conductor and player engage here in visualising William's tongue flicking too hard on the mouthpiece, and William himself, during the next play though, spent the piece concentrating on the way in which his tongue would hit against the mouthpiece to produce 'softer' sounding notes, in accordance with the requirement marked down in the score. In his words, William spent the piece 'making sure' that his tongue 'touched' the mouthpiece in such a way that the sounds produced would be correct. Here, touch-sense is tightly surveilled, and kept well within William's self-conscious attention as he plays.

Respiration is also routinely marked out by the conductor as a focus for a player's self-conscious attention:

That note is being carried every single time, you're blowing it too long?concentrate on [iii] stopping your breath at the mouthpiece ???don't let it go through.

Here, players are required by the conductor to focus on the point that the bodily function of respirating meets instrument to breathe musical life into it. The focus of attention is not, however, focussed on the noisy musical life of the instrument, or at least it is not ostensibly here focussed, because players are concentrating on the point at which the breath and the mouthpiece come into contact.

This skin-to-skin, or breath-on-skin relationship between player and instrument is the focus of each player's attention during rehearsal because this is the point at which players manipulate their instruments to produce technically correct musical sounds. Players say that they go into rehearsals intending to focus on their fingering, tonguing, lipping, and so on. As Erin, a clarinettist, explained:

The whole [of rehearsal] time you are just trying to get the piece into your fingers and into your mouth?You have to be very focussed on what you are doing, and you can't just take it for granted. That leads to familiarising mistakes. If you watch it in rehearsal, you don't play in mistakes that you have to unlearn afterwards. So that's why we have to pay [iv] attention to the tiniest things, like how your mouth sits on the mouthpiece.

Clearly, then, the players themselves, upon entering rehearsal time and space, attempt to keep the touches they make to instrument body well within their self-conscious attentions. As these attentions slip, or as the attentions are focussed on incorrect intersections, the conductor steps in to redirect flagging self-attentions, or to correct the manipulations upon which the attentions are focussed. Directing the players to notice the points at which their bodies intersect with instrument objects is the primary activity in which the conductor engages in all rehearsals. It is the conductor who directs, or redirects, the players' attentions to the points at which their bodies intersect with those of instruments. As players come to notice the points at which they and their bodily processes end and the points at which their instruments begin, their directed self-attentions serve to place them as player subjects and their instruments objects on either side of a thick ontological divide that is maintained throughout the rehearsal period.

The process that band members go through in order to rehearse can be understood as a kind of invitation to reflection that ushers in what Langer has called the "present" body. Present bodies invite reflection and allow a person to discover their own activity in shaping the world as it is discovered through our perception. Compton describes the invitation to reflection that gives rise to the present body when he tells of his twisted ankle. Compton describes a hypothetical situation in which he casts himself as a man hurrying to a meeting for which he is rather late. Trying to get to his meeting as soon as he can, Compton is apt not to notice the details of those things around me. Instead of appearing to me clearly the things in my environment remain indistinct and undifferentiated from their background. Unreflexively engaged in this habitual, carelessly rapid walking project, Compton suddenly twists his ankle:

It now occurs to me that I cannot walk to my meeting in my habitual way as my ankle is sore and tender. I find myself moving at a slower pace, painfully aware of my injury. The cracks and unevenness of the sidewalk do not interest me in the same way as before, for, if anything, they interest me much more. I quite literally do not experience the sidewalk, or the rest of the world for that matter, in the same way.

Similarly, when band members rehearse, the terrains of their instruments interest them much more than they do during what can be described as the habitual experiences of performing.

As Compton notes, the world is shaped for us through our perception of it. According to Abram, perception is:

reciprocity, the ongoing interchange between my body and the entities that surround it [it is] an impoverished duet between my animal and the fluid, breathing landscape that it inhabits (my emphasis).

Reciprocity here refers to an exchange between bodies and objects of the world, to the point that objects and persons come to constitute one another. This occurs precisely because the boundaries between persons and objects are necessarily blurred in order for people to live, habitually, at all. As Katz, citing Polanyi, notes of this impoverished, routinely ignored, and blurry relationship between persons and things:

Each of our effective actions requires that we disattend our body as we act, focussing away from the point at which our body intersects with the world—in writing, for example, if you

watch how your pen creates the form of each letter, you soon lose your train of thought and stop writing. ^[xi]

During rehearsal periods, the points at which the body intersects with the world are thoroughly noticed. During performances, however, these intersections proceed well below the self-conscious attentions of the players or, in other words, the players inhabit habitual bodies as they play. Band members have what they call 'intense' performance experiences. These are experiences that Erol could only describe as 'the most fucking amazing feeling in the world', what Greta could only describe as 'as good as great sex', what Hamlin called 'an overwhelming sense of love', and what Erin described as 'being close to God'. These are very different descriptions of playing than are applied to rehearsal, and they describe performance musics that to my ears sounded precisely the same as rehearsal musical renderings. Erol attempted to explain the difference to me in this way:

My sax is a living, breathing part of my own body. It's inside of me, and the sounds it makes come from the inside of me. When you listen to me playing, I am the saxophone, it's my own self I'm playing. ^[xii]

He added, at my inevitable question:

It's not like that during rehearsal. That's a technical thing, not a love thing. ^[xiii]

During performances, band members describe their corporeal involvement with instruments in terms of inextricable intertwinement, saying that the instrument 'becomes part of me', or that he or she is 'part of the sound', or 'part of the instrument'. Band members described the ways that, during performances, instruments came to constitute parts of their own bodies, and that their own bodies came to constitute part of instruments. Players very often talked about the ways in which the edges of their bodies, their fingertips, palms, tongues, feet, lips, disappeared from each of their self-conscious views during performances, and about the ways in which their instruments came to be, during performances, invasive of their own viscera: a flute does not begin, in performance, at the end of a player's mouth, but begins below and beyond this point, at some unspecified point in the lungs, where the breath that sustains the instrument's noisy life was first taken and expelled. As Katz suggest, the point at which breath becomes part of the person and at which it ceases to be is wholly indeterminable, since being respiratorily intertwined in the world is both necessary and unreflected upon. This is the certainly the case during the habitual taking of breaths, but it is not the case during rehearsals, where respiration is under surveillance.

When I first heard band members describe the difference between rehearsals and performances in terms of 'turning into an instrument' in the case of the latter, and 'making technical sounds' in the former, I longed, just for a moment, to clear up the whole matter by fervently lurking in the wings as the band members performed, camcorder in hand, to catch a glimpse of the metal of the trumpet slowly creeping up the fingers at the player's Midas-like touch. In the next moment, I came to realise that what band members said sounded so strange because they were articulating something so taken for granted, so routinely unreflected upon, that it is hardly ever articulated outside the bounds of phenomenological work, except, of course, in 'metaphor'. When players say that instruments become part of them and that they become part of instruments during performances, they are merely commenting on the sensual-corporeal logic they encounter, as their fingers and tongues proceed beyond the point at which the tuba begins in the same way that I routinely fail to recognise the point at which my fingers meet the typewriter keys. Band members don't feel in performance the points at which their tongues and fingers meet instrument, but feel themselves extended into instrument.
?

The fact that band members also hear performance and rehearsal sounds very differently, while I did not, indicates the marked difference in the sensual experiences of these moments. Band members very often remarked that they could not hear music during rehearsals, insisting instead that they could only hear their noisy productions one discrete musical sound at a time. This is easily explained if we consider that hearing itself is placed under surveillance in rehearsal.? In rehearsal, band members are forced to pay attention to the single notes that they are required to play according to the score. Each is carefully surveilled for the purposes of judging its technical correctness according to the prescriptions made for each single note in the score.? This is akin to listening to each tiny letter component part of a word, which is something that is never done in the unreflected upon act of conversing: we must constantly disattend the sound components that make up conversation if we are to speak with everyday competence and coherence. Conversation is, therefore, as Katz constantly insists, a kind of disattended singing, taking place well below self-conscious awareness. Even while the speaker articulates single noises, the listener may run them together into the lines of a familiar song. In other words, the band members and I attended to different characteristics of the same conversation.

multisensuality

The analysis of the ethnographic material is obviously grounded in Merleau-Pontian phenomenology at its most fundamental level, in that I take the body to be the ground for all perception, and in that I also take the sensuous life of the body to be at the heart of thought (a position that allowed Merleau-Ponty to eliminate the dichotomy between mind and body in his

[xiv]

work *Phenomenology of Perception*. In what follows, however, I depart some distance from Merleau-Pontian phenomenology, and moved instead towards the theoretical position on the

[xv]

sensing body articulated by Michel Serres in his 1998 work *Les Cinq Sens* (The Five Senses).

In this work in particular, and in earlier works that precede it in general, Serres takes his point of departure from Merleau-Pontian and Heideggerian phenomenology. Serres finds the work of these

[xvi]

theoreticians repellent, almost revolting, for what he takes to be their ?bodilessness?. ? Serres takes offence at Merleau-Pontian phenomenology in particular because, he says, it consists of ?

[xvii]

lots of phenomenology and no sensation? . Serres is of this mind because he believes Merleau-Ponty to have taken for phenomena to be explored *not* the experience of the body in world at all, but instead the *language* that describes the experiences of bodily sensation.? Indeed, Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception* opens with these words: ?At the outset of the

[xviii]

study of perception, we find in *language* the notion of sensation? (my emphasis).

It may well seem as though Serres's accusations are unfounded; this was certainly my own impression when I read *Les Cinq Sens* for the first time. However, when one closely inspects Merleau-Ponty's descriptions of the senses, one is forced to at least consider being less dismissive of Serres's words.? When Merleau-Ponty describes sensual life in all of his phenomenological work, he does so with reference to a kind of zone of indeterminacy in that he honours the idea that in attending carefully to one sensual phenomenon, other sensual phenomena escape close attention. In order to describe this one sense, Merleau-Ponty must render it still in that he must remove it from a lived context in which it is much more usually and inextricably intertwined with all of the other senses.? He does this for the benefit of language; the sense is held still, out of its more usually intertwined place, so that it can be clearly described.? This is what Serres means

[xix]

when he says that Merleau-Pontian phenomenology is conducted entirely ?via language?. ? The major difference between Merleau-Pontian phenomenology and Serresian renderings of the body in the world, then, pivots on Serres's recognition of the habitually *multisensual* life of the body.

multisensuality in performance

Hearing, in effect, as Serres insists, is a naked faculty, a sense waiting for a project. In rehearsals, hearing certainly has a project: to hear tiny component noises in routine musical conversation, component parts that render musical conversation nonsensical.? But in performance, hearing has a different kind of project, in which it is deafened -- by itself. Connor describes this hearing as ?autistic acoustics?, suggesting that in performance band members do their hearing transparently: hearing hears right through itself, being preoccupied instead with [xx]

what is heard, not with the project of hearing itself. Hearing, which must be deaf to itself if we are to hear habitually at all, leaves the site of the body to dwell in noise, and then brings that noise back to the hearer. Hearing necessitates a journey *outbound* from the body and into noise, from which it returns with its noisy treasures. But hearing is not alone in its project: touch is very heavily implicated in the way that players? hearing extends itself beyond itself.

Touch cannot be separated from hearing sense, because it is touch to the instrument body that produces sound. Hands, fingers, mouths and tongues that reach out to touch instruments during rehearsals are highly surveilled in the rehearsal moment, as each touch ? a touch too light, a tongue flicking too hard ? is monitored for its technical correctness, creating a divide between what is self and what is not.? In performance experiences, bodies are, as Serres suggests, not experienced as subject organs or flesh parts that exist in distinctive separation from objects.? Asking ?what is a hand?, Serres answers himself:

It is not an organ, it is a faculty, a capacity for doing, for becoming a claw, or paw, weapon or compendium.? It is a naked faculty. A faculty is not special, it is never specific, it is the possibility of doing something in general?our hands are that nakedness I find in gymnastics, [xxi]
that pure faculty, cleared up by exercise, by the asceticism of undifferentiating.

Similarly, a band member?s hand or tongue or finger is no longer when it habitually takes hold of instrument; nor is the instrument simply instrument:

The hand is no longer a hand when it has taken hold of the hammer, it is the hammer itself, it is no loner a hammer, it flies transparent, between the hammer and the nail, it disappears and dissolves, my own hand has long since taken flight in writing. The hand and [xxii]
thought, like one?s tongue, disappear in their determinations.

During performances, the body similarly becomes sax, trumpet, trombone; the body becomes wholly instrumentalised. At the same performance moment as hearing sense, touch sense reaches out to dwell in that which is simultaneously touched and heard: the body of the instrument. As a sax man becomes saxophonised through extending his touch down through the instrument by wholly ignoring the point at which he and sax meet, the sax sounds produced through touch entice his hearing out of his body, and touch and hearing take flight together.?

While touch and hearing senses merge together to allow players to escape the sites of their own bodies, vision is conspicuously absent from the sensuous knot that characterises performance. Players are left metaphorically blind by the merging of two skins, instrument and human, and singing of routine conversation that occurs between hearing and sax noise, each of which enables the other.?? During rehearsals, players hold instruments in a condition of visual arrest, carefully surveilling the points at which their bodies meet those of instruments.? This is an unusual state of affairs.? As Serres argues, this version of vision is one that cannot be described as habitual, but is one that is nevertheless honoured in traditional philosophy. The bearer of the look in traditional philosophy remains motionless and:

[s]its down to look, through a window at the blossoming tree: a statue posed on affirmations and theses. [xxiii]

Serres suggests instead that 'we rarely see things in a condition of arrest', and that viewing is not so much about looking and seeing objects as it is about voyaging to or visiting with them. [xxiv] The term 'visit' and the verb 'to visit' mean at first looking and seeing; 'they add to it the idea of itinerary' [xxv] 'the one who visits goes to see?'. This notion of vision, as Connor notes, is 'vision

on the move?'. [xxvi] 'This suggests that the body goes out of itself through sense, and goes to visit or temporarily dwell in what, in this case, is seen? The player's body goes out of its role in performance, but not through vision; band members are blinded: all the surveillance equipment is shut off, and blindness is indeed necessary for band members to become their instruments? Trumpets and their men depend on the cover of darkness, the absence of bright self-surveillance light, in order to become each other? As soon as the observant player starts to notice that his hands meet the surface of the trumpet body, the union is over, and it's back to separate lives? Turning their sight away, band members go blind while their bodies and instrument bodies take advantage of the darkness to join together like the bodies of two surreptitious lovers. The metaphor of making love goes further, because band members do regard the bodies of their instruments as lovers, and spoke of them as such? Band members used sexual metaphors of fucking on the one hand, and making love on the other, to distinguish the difference between engaging with instrument during rehearsals and performances, arguing that performing with an instrument was like making love, and that rehearsing was akin to 'fucking'? As band members made extensive explanations of the difference between the two, it became clear that making love involved 'melting into someone's body?', and that fucking involved appraising a desirable body, but not being allowed to 'connect with it?'. It would seem that band members are articulating an experiential logic that suggests that the act of making love is vulnerable to breakdown when self-conscious attention is paid to the machinations involved in it: rehearsals are broken-down, disconnected musical lovemaking sessions.

As players go blind in performances, their senses of musical smell and taste, which, as I will describe below, are absent during rehearsal, return heightened? In Serres's work, odour is:

The work of transformation, or transubstantiation, which Serres prefers to read through the action of cooking rather than alchemy, therefore not as refinement or purification, but as the work of combination or alloying substance. [xxvii]

Band members talk about the ways that musical instrument voices smell and taste. Taste and smell are not discussed as 'straight' senses, but are infused with other sensual characteristics? Trumpet sounds, for example, are said to taste like melted gold. Flautists know that flute sounds are, as Lanier once said, 'half song, half odour' as if a rose might somehow be a throat?. Trumpeters know that trumpet sounds are strong, certain, arrogant, glorious, proud, clear and *yellow*, and saxophone sounds taste 'like melted honey?.

Band members use all of the senses, excepting vision, to comment on the sensual corporeal realities they encounter during performance, easily interchanging such phrases as 'those sounds tasted so sweet?' with 'that came right from my guts?' or 'my sax was puffing out truly sweet scents?'. Taste that reaches out to encounter sound food, touch that begins not at the hand but down in the guts and then reaches out to instrument through breath, and delightful olfactory visits with wafting sax smells all combine not to mix sensual metaphors, but to mix them in to one sensory knot experienced during performance.

multisensuality in rehearsal

If performances are multisensory experiences, then so too are rehearsals. During rehearsals, band members peer down at their fingers as they manipulate instrument surfaces, subjecting them to visual surveillance. Let us return momentarily to William's tongue. William's tongue is under surveillance, but William cannot, of course, view his own tongue. Tongues are here visualised; band members routinely subject the parts of their bodies that they cannot see to a kind of quasi-visual or touch-seen surveillance. Vision is combined with touch-sense, as the fingers are watched with the eyes and the tongue and the fingers that cannot be seen with the eye are watched through touch. Hearing is also heavily implicated in the surveillance that band members make on their touch: band members are busy focussing their attention on touch to the instrument body, which they attempt to make technically correct by surveilling hearing. Correct touches produce correct sound, and a fierce surveilling of sound indicates that technically incorrect touch has occurred. Hearing, as I have said, is busy listening to itself, and is not deafened to itself, as it is habitually, but at the same moment, hearing is also surveilling touch, just as vision is surveilling touch. Rehearsals involve a direction of the senses to the multiply of points at which a player meets instrument, in touch, hearing, and vision: but smell and taste are conspicuously absent. Band members cannot taste or smell the music they make in rehearsals, which leads me back to the descriptions that band members make of rehearsals as 'recipes'.

rehearsal as recipe, performance as banquet

During rehearsals, band members are the kitchen staff to the conductor's head chef. These kitchen staff are wholly concerned with the written words of the musical recipe, and are not involved with experiencing the musical ingredients as musical foods to be tasted and smelled. The precise construction of the musical dish is a technical exercise in arranging all of the necessary ingredients in order for cooking later. The musical dish may be viewed (visually surveilled), heard, piece by tiny piece (aurally surveilled), and touched (haptically surveilled, but it is not eaten or smelled until performance time, during which band members feast on the musical food. The ingredients of the musical dish are experienced by band members as component parts; as one described it to the agreement of the others, as a recipe for chocolate cake, consisting, perhaps, of the wheat flour of the timing, the emulsifier of the dynamics, the antioxidants of the tuning, the sugar of the key. The entire ingredient list never proceeds beyond a list of component parts required for the whole dish during rehearsal periods. The decadent musical cake may be consumed by audience members present during rehearsals, but it is not for band members to eat. Just as the audience of a speaker paying attention to the component parts of words may string the component parts together to form a familiar conversational song, audience members are able to comprehend complete music during a rehearsal session where a band member cannot. Audience members do not have to feel themselves extended into saxophone in order to hear sax music, and may pay as much attention as they like to the points at which the sax man meets his sax; they may eat musical cake.

Band members, for their part, eat a much more decadent cake. Having been denied their habitual urge to satisfy their sensual appetites, they gorge themselves on musical chocolate cake, inhale its rich freshly baked aroma, feel its creamy texture invade the insides of their bodies, and hear in the music the deep sights of sensual hunger being satisfied. Band members never see the musical cake, they eat it with their eyes closed, in ecstasy, in satisfaction, in sensual extension. Band members don't taste the musical cake they make for audiences, because band members are experiencing in performance the taste of the senses being released from tightly reigned-in self-surveillance. They experience sensual extension into the musical tasted, felt, heard and smelled, but never seen, chocolate cake.

Serres's work is again useful here. Serres refers to the Last Supper (among other banquets) in the 'Tables' section of *Les Cinq Sens*, which deals with taste and smell. Two bodies, or, rather, two sides of one body, emerge from the banquet. On the one hand is the body of the Assumption, 'the body raised up in language', which, as the result of linguistic petrification, is reduced to the condition of statue, and is no longer able to taste and smell; says Serres, 'when it

[xxviii]

is saturated by the word, the body loses its antique graces. On the other hand, and set against this linguistic body, is the body consumed at the Last Supper. This body circulates in the

forms of bread and wine, and is never fixed or held still, but is, as Connor notes ?a mobile transubstantiation?. [xxix] ? In one way, the anosmia of the statue makes a nice metaphor for rehearsal and performance experiences, which are characterised by sensually anosmic bodies in the former case and by fully transformed bodies in the latter. In the case of band members the rehearsal body is similarly musically petrified: this is the musical body raised up in language, this is the body grasped and made still, statue like, rendered separate and beside, not within, the object world.? This body is the subject to the objects of the instrument world and does not circulate inside instruments, just as instruments are prevented from circulating inside players.? It is no coincidence that band members use metaphors of food and sex to articulate the difference between rehearsal and performance experiences: each of these experiences is penetrative of bodily boundaries, and each is vulnerable to breakdown when the points at which the body meets the world are surveilled.? But the body is not linguistically petrified by the band members? successful attempts to reduce their sensual experience to a single sense. Instead, band members render themselves unable to taste or smell by involving all of their senses in a surveillance job on the others. The body of the Assumption, in this ethnographic circumstance, is achieved when the hand is watched with the eyes, but is also and equally achieved when the tongue is watched and heard through touch.? The edible body of Christ is achieved when these mixed up senses turn their attentions away from themselves and out into the world beyond the sited body.

conclusion

Serres?s critique of Merleau-Pontian phenomenology is useful because it allows us to recognise that habitual corporeal life is not lived one sense at a time. Neither is the ?present? bodily life of the rehearsing band member; even surveillance of bodily boundaries, the very ushering in of the present body, is, in this case, carried out multisensually. One multisensual engagement, that experienced during performance, allows the sax man to eat melted honey: hot golden stuff that emerges when man penetrates sax and sax penetrates man.? The other, experienced during rehearsal, reduces the sax man to reading about melted honey on a page, and leaves him starving: able to watch, but not taste. It is little wonder, then, that band members describe performances as close to orgasm (in their view, very penetrative) and rehearsals as a series of uninspiring technicalities.? When musically eating and making love, the sax man and his band of equally hungry musicians actively engage in penetrative activities that, during performance, occasion and entail a taking in of, and an expansion into, musical instruments.? Constructing a recipe and fucking both leave the musicians ravenous; they are held within prisons of their own body sites, of their own making, as they lust after musical food they can eat and bodies they can lovingly encompass into their own bodies.? Activities of making love and eating are, for band members, multisensually delightful, and can never be rendered down to a language that might describe the sound parts that are products of such activities. These are the activities of rehearsals, where the language that describes orgasms and gives ingredient lists of delectable food renders musical bodies still.

?

?

?

?

?

?

?

[i] Michel Serres, *Angels: A Modern Myth*, trans. Francis Cowper, Paris, Flammarion, 1995, pp 131-132

[ii] Personal Fieldnotes, vol.4 March 2001 p 20.

[iii] Ibid., p 35.

[iv] Personal Fieldnotes, vol.5 May 2001 p 5.

[v] M Langer, *Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology of Perception: A Guide and Commentary* Tallahassee, Florida State University Press, 1989, p 32.

[vi] Jeffrey Compton, Embracing the Body of Culture: Understanding Cross-Cultural Psychology From the Perspective of a Phenomenology of Embodiment? (<http://home.earthlink.net/~rationalmystic.cultsoma.htm>) 2001, p 4.

[vii] ibid.

[viii] ibid.

[ix] The description of the pained ankle goes further than being simply a nice illustrative device, for band members describe rehearsal periods as painful. Pain is often the catalyst for the rise of the present body, and it is no coincidence that band members find ushering in the present body a painful experience. This ethnographic data is the subject of a forthcoming article that contrasts Serres's notion of bodily joy with Nietzsche's concept of the habitual pain of living.

[x] David Abram, *The Spell of The Sensuous: Perception And Language In A More Than Human World?* New York,? Pantheon Press, 1996, p 52.

[xi] Jack Katz, *How Emotions Work* Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1999, p 314.

[xii] Personal Fieldnotes, vol.4 June 2001 p 16.

[xiii] Ibid., p17.

[xiv] Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *The Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. Colin Smith, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

[xv] Michel Serres, *Les Cinq Sens*, Paris, Hachette, 1998.

[xvi] Serres, *Angels*, pp 131-132.

[xvii] ibid., p 132.

[xviii]

Merleau-Ponty, op. cit., p 1.

[xix]

Serres, *Angels*, p 132.

[xx]

Steven Connor, *Michel Serres's Five Senses*, expanded version of a paper given at the Michel Serres conference held at Birbeck College May 1999, (<http://www.bbk.ac.uk/eh/eng/skc/5senses.htm>), 1999, p 6.?

[xxi]

Michel Serres, *Genesis*, trans. Genevieve James and James Neilson, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp 34-35.

[xxii]

ibid., pp 34-35.

[xxiii]

Serres, *Les Cinq Sens*, p? 405.

[xxiv]

ibid.

[xxv]

ibid., p 334.

[xxvi]

ibid., p 8.

[xxvii]

Connor, op. cit., p? 9.

[xxviii]

Serres, *Les Cinq Sens*, p 413.

[xxix]

ibid., p 8.