

LINGUISTIC TURN OF PERFORMANCE AND DIALECTICS IN PERSPECTIVE

LINGUISTIC ROTATION OF PERFORMANCE AND DIALECTICS IN PERSPECTIVE

v. 10, p. 01-37, Oct. 2021

Submitted on: 10/27/2021

Approved on: 10/28/2021

DOI: 10.51473/rcmos.v10i10.185

*André Rosalém-Signorelli***SUMMARY**

In this article, we outline a proposal for an approximation between the linguistic turn of performance and the method of scientific investigation or dialectical or historical-dialectical epistemological paradigm. In fact, we launched a substantive hypothesis based on possible correlations between the plans considered in the aforementioned epistemological proposition. These supposed correspondences may be confirmed or refuted in the final considerations of this work. We investigated the possible interfaces between the spheres under study using the analytical-descriptive method based on a bibliographic review. Musical Imagination, represented by the phenomenon of the creative impulse of the Creative Process (*"poíesis"*), based on Dialectic and embodied in the musical improvisation found in *make music or make sound*, is permeated by the sphere of the Linguistic Turn of Performance in a reciprocal, collaborative and mutual way with the aim of promoting artistic-cultural action in its linguistic-communicative integrality.

Key words: Dialectic. Linguistic turn of performance. Musical Imagination. Creative process (*"poíesis"*). Make music.

ABSTRACT

In this article, we outline a proposal to approach the linguistic turn of performance with the method of scientific investigation or dialectical or historical-dialectical epistemological paradigm. In fact, we launch a substantive hypothesis based on possible correlations between the plans considered in the proposition of an epistemological nature. These supposed correspondences may be confirmed or invalidated in the final considerations of this work. We investigate the possible interfaces between the spheres under study through the analytical-descriptive method based on a literature review. The Musical Imagination, represented by the phenomenon of the creative impulse of the Creative Process (*"poíesis"*), based on Dialectics and embodied in musical improvisation verified in musical or sound making, is permeated by the sphere of the Linguistic Turn of Performance in a reciprocal, collaborative and mutual with the aim of promoting artistic-cultural action in its linguistic-communicative integrality.

Keywords: Dialectics. Linguistic turn of the performance. Musical Imagination. Creative Process (*"poiesis"*). Making music.

1 INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

A method is understood as a path to reach a certain end. Demo (1991), states that greater importance should not be given to the method than to the research itself

the most important being to achieve the research objectives. Within this thought, Wright Mills (*apud* Oliveira, 1998), recommends that researchers look for a foundation in expressive authors and, in this way, they can also each be their own theoretician, developing their own method. Parra Filho (2000) highlights that, while certain sciences make use of deductive reasoning, others establish their laws and theories based on induction. For Chauí (1994), “a good method is one that allows you to truly know the greatest number of things with the least number of rules”. (CHAUÍ, 1994, p. 77).

In this article, we outline a proposal for an approximation between the linguistic turn of performance and the method of scientific investigation or historical or historical-dialectic epistemological paradigm.

It is clear that Japiassu (1977) advocates the fact that, etymologically, epistemology means discourse (“*logos*”) about science (“*episteme*”) having emerged in the 19th century.

In fact, we launched a substantive hypothesis based on possible correlations between the plans considered in the aforementioned epistemological proposition. These supposed correspondences may be confirmed or refuted in the final considerations of this scientific article.

Regarding the Historical-dialectical or Dialectical Method, we will dialogue with different theorists, namely: Japiassu (1977), Mello (1982), Savoia (1989), Oliva (1990), Lakatos and Marconi (1992, 2003), Japiassú and Marcondes (1996), Gonçalves (2002), Strey (2002), Vergara (2003), Severino (2007), Hoffe (2008), Castro (2013) and Morin (2013).

2 DIALECTIC OR HISTORICAL-DIALECTIC METHOD

Regarding this scientific method or epistemological paradigm, we take as a basis, above all, the works of Vergara (2003) and Severino (2007).

According to Castro’s teaching (2013), the *dialectic* constitutes, in principle, ***a play of ideas, conceptions or words*** which results in a clash because they are different from each other. The result of the clash of different ideals can provide a new idea.

In view of this, the dialectical method itself consists of dialogue or conversation between different ideas starting from an opinion and criticism to formulate a thesis that can be true or false. Based on whether or not the framework of arguments presented is accepted, thought is constructed and solidified.

O Dialectic Method or Historical-dialectical It has its origins in Hegelian dialectics. This Method opposes the positivist current and criticizes the Kantian explanatory system (ahistorical explanation).

In this plethora of ideas, the thinker's most important task is to always seek authentic knowledge based on the comparison of ideas capable of generating virtue and adding value. That is to say, the highest art is dialectics when it comes to structuring or organizing a coherent and true discourse. From this perspective, dialectics can mean the **art of debating and persuading** thus having a close relationship with the *rhetic*.

In turn, in line with Hoffe (2008), Rhetoric is concerned “[...] not with the world of life as a whole, but only with a well-defined section, with public discourse in the three genres of discourse political and council speech, with festive speech and court speech...” (HOFFE, 2008, p. 61).

It therefore refers to the art of speech and oratory, dispensing with correspondence with the truth, with the ordinary verisimilitude of syllogisms sufficient as a condition of probability, plausibility or acceptability of claims or arguments (as in the case of sophist philosophers). Therefore, the gap of a logical, ethical and social nature that existed between conviction and truth persisted; since the justifications, although defensible, were refutable.

In this context, Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) sought new philosophical paths, taking man as his object of consideration. Within this direction, he understood knowledge not only as the ability to grasp what is or exists, but also and mainly to grasp what *process* by which things come into being by becoming this or that. Likewise, he criticized the *infallibility* of scientific knowledge with a positivist matrix and established paradigms based on assumptions pertinent to the human condition (social, cultural and historical).

In this way, the apparently real could be a mere social and historical construct that appeared “naturalized” in our eyes after a certain period of abandonment, separation or oblivion. For Gonçalves (2002), the very concept of nature is not natural, since it is created and instituted by man. Therefore, the conception of “nature” is something established in the social, historical and spatial spheres.

The aforementioned author defines the term “nature”, in our society, as “that which is opposed to culture and which is seen as something superior and which has managed to control and dominate the

nature" (GONÇALVES, 2002, p. 26 and 27). In this paradigm, it is everything that has a natural characteristic and does not present anthropic intervention. In this way, the conception of nature has shown a relationship of social interest for different human groups.

According to the scientific method in question, things or reality (the object of research) are in constant flux and transformation. Therefore, its focus is *process*, above all, the construction of social processes; because it starts from the understanding that society constructs man and is, at the same time, constructed by him in a dialectical relationship.

In this vein, Mello (1982) unravels the meaning of the notion of "culture" in the sense that it is defined as a network of meanings capable of giving meaning to the world surrounding the individual and society. The idea of "culture" therefore needs to draw on a social context to generate valid experiences as acquired or assimilated knowledge. Ramos (2003) defines how the individual is considered as an object of study in the social sciences:

[...] individual within their social standards, lives in society, as a member of the group, as a "person", as "socius". He acquires the very awareness of his individuality as a member of the social group, since it is determined by the relationships between the "self" and the "others", between the internal group and the external group. (RAMOS, 2003, p. 238).

Therefore, cultural constitutes what is established in the symbolic universe by a certain population, being a particular way of interpreting the world limited to the variables time and space. Hence the emphasis of the method under discussion on human praxis, that is, historical and social action guided by an intentionality that gives it meaning and a purpose closely related to the transformation of living conditions and forms of existence in human society.

In this sense, Oliva (1990), reports that Feyerabend defended "anarchism as a precondition for the effective progress of scientific knowledge and as the only way to avoid scientific authoritarianism, whose central idea [sic] is that 'nothing is worth outside of science'".

For K. Marx (1818-1883), reason is no longer the driving force behind the process of development of history; given that the production and exchange of material goods constitute the basis of all social order. Thus, man ceases to be the center of the story (which, by the way, does not have a center).

In this tuning fork, the *human behaviors* (thoughts and actions or conduct) are not dictated by ideas (or by reason), but by the way in which men participate or *if*

relate in the production of goods necessary for the construction of their own conditions of existence.

Within this interactionist dynamic, this “determination” is not mechanical; otherwise complex and structural. In effect, it is a *dynamic process* (constant transformation) that takes into account the *relation* existing between the levels of the social structure itself: economic, legal-political and ideological. The transversality or articulation and the crossing or intertwining of these three levels leads to a historical construction of a certain mode of production as a result of the combination of all these interfaces. The teaching of Lakatos and Marconi (2003) agrees:

Unlike metaphysics, which conceives the world as a set of static things, dialectics understands it as a set of processes. For Engels (In: Politzer, 1979:214), dialectics is the "great fundamental idea according to which the world should not be considered as a complex of *finished things*, but as a complex of *Law Suit* in which things, apparently stable, in the same way as their intellectual reflections in our brain, ideas, undergo an uninterrupted change of becoming and decay, in which, finally, despite all the apparent failures and momentary setbacks, a progressive development ends up taking place today. (LAKATOS; MARCONI, 2003, p. 100).

In this context, Konder (1981) observes, regarding the aforementioned and called, supposed or alleged, “law of universal transformation and movement” or “law of negation of negation”, that:

[...] realizes the fact that the general movement of reality makes sense, that is, it is not absurd, it does not end in irrational, unintelligible contradictions, nor does it get lost in the eternal repetition of the conflict between theses and antitheses, between statements and denials. The affirmation necessarily engenders its negation, but the negation does not prevail p. 26 as such: both affirmation and denial are overcome and what ends up prevailing is a synthesis, it is the negation of negation (KONDER, 1981, p. 59).

For Marx, there is a *subject-object reciprocity* as an open and dynamic social interaction that is formed or constructed dialectically over historical time in successive encounters or moments. So, Dialectic in Marx constitutes not only a method for arriving at the truth, but also a conception of man, society and the man-world relationship. In this light, once again, Lakatos and Marconi (1992) indicate:

Therefore, if we analyze a being, referring to its origins, being and non-being can be admitted: movement is not an illusion, a superficial aspect of reality, but an eternal and continuous flow, since everything originates from contrary principles. But still, under the label of “movement” different things are analyzed, when there is a need to verify nature: all things have potentialities, movement being their actualization, that is, they are potentialities or possibilities transforming into realities effective [...] finally, the conception of movement, of becoming, as a passage from potentiality to act or reality (LAKATOS; MARCONI, 1992, p.73).

In fact, the interaction between subject and object is dynamic, alive and organized through the historical flow in a constant and continuous manner in each geographic point corresponding to a sociocultural context or reality imprinted in the world of work. Under the aegis of this conception, it is observed that dialectics values the dynamic contradiction of the observed fact and the *creative activity of the subject* who observes.

Therefore, the contradictory oppositions between the whole and the part, as well as the links between knowledge and action with the social life of men constitute the main focus of dialectics. In this sense, science would have no reason to exist if *form* of things coincided with *your nature*. In such a way that the search for true explanations of reality does not take place through causal relations or relations of analogies, but through the unveiling of the “*real apparent*” to get to the “*real concrete*”. Indeed, the “*real concrete*” is revealed through this *social interaction (relationship)* between subject and object through the *creative process (or “poiesis”)*¹.

As Severino (2007) teaches: “(...) knowledge cannot be understood in isolation in relation to the political practice of men, that is, it is never just a question of knowledge, but also of power.” (SEVERINO, 2007, p. 116).

According to Strey (2002), with the act of birth, each individual becomes part of a pre-existing socialization process. The same feeling of belonging that includes people makes each person take ownership of social values through relationships with other members of the social group to which they belong.

On this plinth, man is considered a being constituted through the social relationships he builds by absorbing both norms and values in force in the family, his peers and society. Certainly, in everyday scenes, people are in constant movement resulting from the act of communication. That is, the *Linguistic Phenomenon* generates body movements and gestures performed according to the natural rhythm of speech. In this sense, we have the presence of the vernacular language and the movements or gestures of the anatomical-physiological composition according to prosody (that is, the rhythm of speech).

¹It designates the word of Greek origin that, initially, was used as a synonym for creative process, and later came to designate the creative process of a poem, from its initial idea to its elaboration. Indicates the idea of creating, producing, manufacturing, executing or doing something. It also designates, within the context of Plato's Philosophy, the way man achieves the immortality of the soul. It constitutes one of the modalities of human activity divided by Aristotle in the fourth century BC, between theory and praxis. According to this classification: theory is the search for true knowledge; praxis is the action aimed at solving problems and “*poiesis*”, then, would be the impulse of the human spirit to create something from *imagination* and of *feelings* (HOUALISS, 2021).

It is worth saying, the *interpersonal encounters* promoted generate events, facts or happenings based on *improvisation*^{two} of the linguistic contents spoken by people in the experiential context of their lives and in the conformation or transformation of the human world in the historical-spatial course. To that end, the *do linguistic* represented by the linguistic fact embodied in the practice of human activities is adopted as a primary action.

Even so, the entire communication process would be doomed to failure without the help of human inventiveness and imagination that complement the gaps and fill the demands present in the improvisatory character of oratory or rhetoric.³ Effectively, following Bottomore (1997), this is the notion of “praxis” introduced by K. Marx, according to which free, universal, creative and self-creative human mediation is carried out through production (of doing, creation, elaboration) materializes in practical or concrete terms the ordering of the conditions of existence and construction of life.

In this vein, Vazquez (1977) even uses the term *creative praxis* in the sense of enabling new situations and needs to be faced so that the reorganization of new actions and synthetic solutions is concretely planned with a view to overcoming conflicts and challenges found in the world of work. Obviously, these guidelines were applied to the musical field. On this basis, it is noted that, with the evolution of Research Methodology entering the field of Dialectic, we can prospect for greater participation and involvement of the *imagery*⁴ of the instrumentalist within the scope of pianistic performance, having the *Make Music* while calling me *Do Linguisticas* a starting and ending point for artistic-cultural activity. In the meantime, we will resort to Adorno's statement (1975), who, when looking comparatively at musical language and verbal language, found similarities between the two. Therefore, the perspective of music as a language constitutes a valid, acceptable and coherent statement, whether for aesthetic analysis or with regard to artistic practice.

^{two}According to the Dictionary “online” MICHAELIS (2021): Act or effect of improvising. That which was carried out without prior preparation, impromptu, at the moment. Theatrical representation of an experimental and didactic nature in which the actors' speech and movements are performed without prior rehearsal. Presentation in which the musician creates freely as the piece develops.

³For the purposes of this work, understood as: the art of eloquence; of oratory; it's good to say; to argue well; of word; of language. Therefore, within the scope of this study, we take the terms “oratory” and “rhetoric” as synonyms.

⁴According to the Dictionary “online” HOUALISS (2021): Which can be expressed through images. Which can refer to what contains images. That shows imagination. In fact, the details of this content are not listed as the object of this scientific article.

Therefore, Dialectic constitutes an interactionist vision. Indeed, the “real concrete” is revealed through this *social interaction (relationship)* between subject and object through the *creative process (or “poíesis”)*. In this range of thoughts, there is no way to separate the meaning of the creative process (or “*poíesis*”) of the definition welcomed and adopted by us of *Music Imagination*s (see our book “Interfaces between Musical Imagination and Pianistic Technique”).

In fact, it is at the interface, conjunction, intersection, point of contact or territory of overlap between the aforementioned planes (it is important to underline: creative process, or “*poíesis*”, and musical imagination) that music reveals itself as a language capable of expressing the feelings, designs, reasoning, desires and most intimate and deep desires of people: which populate both the structural and conjunctural settings of environments permeated by human action.

Therefore, as a result of the phenomenon of speech (orality), the individual's expression or communication embodied in *Creative Practice of Sound or Musical Making* gives rise to musical improvisation as the result of a discursive action based on rhetoric or oratory⁶.

Consequently, this *speak musically* (understanding music as language) originates in the Musical Imagination and unfolds through a *Creative Process (or “poíesis”)* active or open formed by imaginative decisions in which the versatility, plurality or multiplicity of means and technical resources constitutes an essential factor for the successful communication of the musical message in an expressive, inventive, imaginative, sensitive and dynamic way in a given historical and sociocultural context.

Following Savoia (1989), this sociocultural structuring is responsible for the formation of each individual's personality; which arises from the socialization process that justifies and legitimizes innate and acquired factors. In this context, innate factors correspond to the characteristics that we genetically inherit from our family members; acquired factors, on the other hand, come from social and cultural nature.

⁵For this scientific article, we will consider the concept of Musical Imagination adopted by Pereira (1948, page 82), Neuhaus (1973, page 70) and Matthey (1988, page 10), among others. In this sense, we have Musical Imagination as the ability to hear the sound before playing (“feeling”). It is, therefore, a perception or sensation of the inner ear. In short: the Image or Mental Representation about the Music (Text) will give rise to an Image or Mental Representation about the Movements (Body) strictly necessary for the good execution of a given passage. According to Neuhaus (1973), it is a dialectical mechanism that is in action (“*Image-Making*”).

⁶According to Rocha (2016), improvisation corresponds to “a sequence of creative decisions in a given context (social, creative, affective, etc.).” (ROCHA, 2016, p. 6).

According to this line of thought, Science is not only the revelation of the world; but also the revelation of man as a social being, taking into account the role of culture and work in each historical moment in the acquisition and expansion of knowledge. With this, we intend to go beyond the so-called or considered simplistic, superficial, shallow and shallow “description” of isolated phenomena to reach *explanatory syntheses based on totality*—which suggest new relationships, new searches, new syntheses, new perspectives, new perspectives, new trends, new dimensions and new networks of knowledge and practices.

From this perspective, in every dialectical process or relationship there are always two dichotomous elements (poles) in relationship. It is in this relationship that they perfect themselves, and never in isolation. However, one only exists in relationship with the other as interdependent entities.

For the Greeks (in the historical period known as Ancient Greece), the concept of Dialectic was equivalent to the idea of dialogue or conversation, with the later addition of the connotation of change, arguing that everything changed through conflict. It was Aristotle (384-322 BC) who was responsible for reintroducing dialectical principles into explanations in a more consistent, densified and systematic way. In the 16th century, with M. Montaigne and, in the 18th century, with D. Diderot, dialectical thinking received reinforcements until it reached its apogee with F. Hegel before its transformation by K. Marx.

We can mention some types of dialectical relationships, such as: subject-object, man-society, form-essence, capital-labor, culture-nature, body-spirit, etc.

Thus, the search for *explanatory, global and comprehensive synthesis of the totality* involves dealing with *contradiction* and the *mediation* Looking to *resilience* of conflicts of interest. It's not about isolating a phenomenon; but to study it within a *historical-social context* which configures the *totality*. In this *totality*, the Dialectical Method observes that everything, in some way, is mutually related and that there are forces that attract and, at the same time, contradictorily, repel each other.

Vergara (2003) states that it is the *contradiction* (ie, *fight, voltage or conflict*) which allows the *resilience* of a given situation; that is, the *historical change or sociocultural transformation* in continuous flow and constant dynamics. In this sense, Marxist dialectics does not only refer to the process of the idea, but also to reality itself. As representatives of this philosophical trend we can point to: Hegel, Marx, Engels, Frankfurt School.

Regarding the so-called Frankfurt School, it is observed that it was formed by M. Horkheimer (1895-1973), T. Adorno (1903-1969), H. Marcuse (1889-1979), W. Benjamin

(1892-1940), W. Reich (1897-1957), H. Arendt (1906-1975), J. Habermas (1929-), E. Fromm (1900-1980), among others. Based on the works of Kant, Hegel and Marx, they constructed a critical theory (critical school) of society and technology (without, however, being tied to the classics; which they reinterpreted and, often, even criticized). In fact, the aforementioned authors formulated criticisms of positivism, totalitarianism, mass culture, the role of science and technology, the role of the family, etc.

2.1 IMPORTANT CONCEPTS ABOUT THE DIALECTIC OR HISTORICAL-DIALECTIC METHOD

Next, we will analyze some founding contents of the method under analysis.

So, it is understood by *Totality* the intelligibility of the parts, which presupposes their articulation with the whole. In this case, the individual does not apply and is not constituted in isolation from society.

In this sense, the *Historicity* corresponds to the instant and cannot be understood separately from the temporal totality of the movement (*flou*). In other words, each moment is the articulation of a more comprehensive historical process.

However, *Practicality* means events or phenomena in the human sphere, which are articulated with each other in temporality and spatiality. They develop through practice, always historical and social, which is the substance of human existence.

According to the design of *Concreteness*, the real empiricity of human phenomena prevails, which gives rise to the origin of economic-political approaches. What is at stake is the real practice of men in social space and historical time (collective praxis). That is why the words experience and experience are so important for this philosophical current.

Based on the notion of *Complexity*, the real is simultaneously one and multiple (unity and totality, but with variety and diversity). There is a plurality of parts articulating both structurally and historically. In this way, each phenomenon is always the result of *multiple determinations and variables* that go beyond simple accumulation and mere gathering. It is a permanent flow of transformations. From this angle, contemporary French epistemologist Morin (2013) defends the principle of thought

which seeks to (re)connect knowledge that, for a long time, has been treated in a fragmented, compartmentalized, departmentalized, stagnant and disaggregated way, generating gaps in the production of knowledge.

For K. Marx, historical development is not a linear evolution. This therefore corresponds to the concept of *Dialecticity*, so central to this philosophical current.

In this paradigm, history is always a complex process in which the parts are articulated among themselves in different ways than simple succession and accumulation. Changes within human reality occur following a logic of contradiction and not identity. There is no passivity or peacefulness in social transformations, but class struggle. History is constituted by a struggle of opposites driven by a permanent conflict immanent in reality.

In this case, the prevalence of *Scientificity*, according to which the method in question is based on Hegelianism as the starting point for subsequent elaborations or systematizations.

This idea means that every scientific explanation necessarily constitutes an explanation whose function is to explain the regularity of causal links, articulating, among themselves, all the elements of the phenomena under study. However, this causality is expressed through a *historical-social process* driven by a general dynamic through the action of *contradictory polar forces* always in conflict.

2.2 PERFORMANCE

Next, we will deal in an exploratory way with the guiding axis that promotes the intertwining, transversality or crossing between musical imagination, musical education, language, research, performance and improvisation.

In fact, below we will discuss the Concept of Performance and the Linguistic Turn of Performance. Before, however, dealing specifically with the so-called linguistic "turn" or "turn" of Performance, it is necessary that we refer to the conceptualization of the term Performance, differentiating it from similar meanings in order to avoid confusion and contradictions in our study.

Therefore, we will conduct our work under the aegis of structuring or basic foundations that are well founded, fixed, established, grounded, supported, supported, substantiated and grounded.

2.3 THE CONCEPT OF PERFORMANCE

In the human sciences, enormous difficulties are noted in defining and using the concepts that designate cultural phenomena. This also applies to the area of music, where it is common to notice a certain amount of confusion when researchers seek to understand what the terms interpretation and performance mean.

This is what we infer from the lesson by Kuehn (2012), the author we use as a reference theory for this study. In this summary, one of the objectives of this work is to demonstrate how the concepts execution, interpretation and performance differ in meaning and purpose. It is worth reiterating that the concepts interpretation and performance designate distinct processes and, as they differ in meaning and purpose, one of the goals is to reach a very clear and rigorous conceptual distinction between the two.

Thus, in the paradigm proposed by Kuehn (2012), the concepts of reproduction, interpretation and musical performance can be brought together to constitute a distinct and, at the same time, more comprehensive foundation of interpretative practice(s). Based on a careful analysis of the concept of musical reproduction, the trinomial musical reproduction, interpretation and performance is proposed as a conceptual framework for teaching and researching interpretative practice(s). Considering Musical Imagination as the mainspring and ejector focus or driving element of the creative process embodied in artistic activity, we have that:

[...] the theoretical field of the discipline increases in its scope, migrating from a notion based almost exclusively on interpretation to that of a multiform artistic process with great productive and transformative potential that also includes the extra-musical elements of reproduction [...] although – in relation to the classical-romantic tradition – the interpretative element and the decorum of a rigorously normative ethics predominate, this does not mean that the performative aspect represents a less productive or attractive element for the interpreter, researcher or musical critic (KUEHN, 2012, p. 1, 11).

Starting from an analysis of conceptualizations in technical-formal terms with consequences in the results of periodic evaluations, Kuehn (2012) considers that:

Well, sometimes used as synonyms, sometimes presented in an interchanged sense, it is still common to notice a certain confusion in the use of the terms interpretation and performance. If the lack of rigor can perhaps be admitted in common sense, in terms of a theory of interpretation or performance, it proves to be fatal, because for any

If research is intended to be scientific, it is essential that the concepts on which it is built are clearly defined. Such an understanding is also essential when we wish to develop studies on a given problem, as is our case. It is therefore urgent to develop a more solid conceptual foundation for the interpretative practice(s). It is also necessary to clarify a series of inconsistencies that the confusing use of the terms "interpretation" and performance has brought to the area. I even believe that it is not an exaggeration to say that the lack of a substantive foundation has been an obstacle in the development of more consistent theoretical models for the discipline. (KUEHN, 2012, p. 2).

In fact, according to Kuehn (2012), artistic practices have always been connected with the theoretical support that gave them consistency. Therefore, musical reproduction, composition and theory or philosophy constituted spheres that fed each other. Starting from an analysis of different moments in history, it is clear how the dialogue between musical creation (the composer), execution (the performer) and intellectual or philosophical production can be fruitful, productive and prolific.

According to Kuehn (2012), in previous historical periods, the exercise of reproduction was always linked to that of composition and musical theory. Furthermore, the composer was also the interpreter of his own work (and vice versa). This model, however, became obsolete and atrophied, given the specialization of the social distribution of work and functions. Regarding this consideration, Dunsby (2006) teaches that:

Wagner is, certainly, the greatest example of theory linked to [sic] practice, because who would dare say that Wagner theorized without producing great art, and who would dare insinuate that what Wagner wrote did not enhance his art? In one way or another, these types of knowledge exist in abundance (DUNSBY, 2006, p. 11).

The 21st century, in turn, as demonstrated by Antunes (2017), has shown itself to be the season of unification of instances and versatility, multifunctionality or polyvalence. Furthermore, the great "turn of the key" consists in going back to the idea of the master-teacher of trade and craft guilds, a feudal practice in which the master constituted a reference or source of knowledge for his disciples in the most diverse areas, eliminating compartmentalization or specification of knowledge focused on mechanical, limited and static industrial work characteristic, above all, of the so-called "Second Industrial Revolution".

In fact, the apprentice received global training and knowledge of all branches of knowledge in the artisanal workshop. In this endeavor, he was not limited to the mere formal or apparent transmission of knowledge; but to the integral, material and substantial training of the apprentice to carry out all phases of work with creativity and autonomy.

Thus, the educational model of craft corporations was built on a comprehensive, integral and integrative paradigm based on the perspective or dynamics of community society. Furthermore, it emphasized the autonomy and creativity of production processes. According to the lesson or understanding of Trindade (2012):

Trades education did not distance itself from the corporate system, on the contrary, due to its integral and integrative nature, it was considered one of the main mediating activities of medieval society. Preliminarily, we can conceptualize it as a pedagogical model of a non-systematic nature that outlined the practical exercise of crafts and socialization to the ideology and morals intrinsic to the Crafts Corporations, which issued and monitored its regulations. In the workshop, the apprentice received global training and knowledge of all phases of the work. He was prepared to perform the job autonomously. (TRINDADE, 2012, p. 130).

According to the teaching expounded by Antunes (2017), in contemporary sociability, craftsmanship, as a product of the past, persists in ways other than that incorporated by industrialism (whose apex was identified by the era of utilitarian education referring to the “Taylorian-Fordist” model).⁷⁾ and by machinery interfering in the constitution of education.

In the same sense, Saviani (1991, 2011) teaches that today's education presents features very similar to the educational practice of professional corporations. Furthermore, in the work and education system of the craft workshop, it was found that: the worker controlled all the activity processes; he had possession of the instruments of work; had autonomy over the time and pace of work; and defined the price of the product based on its use and consumption value.

As for the teaching profession, education falls within the scope of *non-material work*. Indeed, we can glimpse that in teaching activities: the class, for example, is something that presupposes, at the same time, the presence of the teacher and the student. In other words, the act of teaching is inseparable from the production of this act and its consumption. The class is, therefore, produced and consumed at the same time. In this sense, the aforementioned author Trindade (2012) postulates that:

It is clear that the professional activity was succumbed over time by the transformations of the ever more industrial and machine-based reality. Initially, Europe, by adhering to the new dimensions of the means of production (steam engine) changed the property structure. We can call this the “first industrial revolution”. Afterwards, with the United States as a preliminary scenario, Taylorist and Fordist management inaugurates the concentration of capital in joint-stock companies (the large corporation) in which the forms of work organization represent the new dimension of the structure of authority. This is what is commonly called the “second industrial revolution”. Recently and in a more diffuse scenario, the phenomenon of the “third industrial revolution” has been classified as technological (or scientific-technical). A

⁷⁾It is curious to note that we do not intend to address the topics mentioned above in this work, so we are satisfied with the mere mention or note for the sake of curiosity without punctuating the matter with greater verticality or depth.

The current revolution is based on new technologies centered on information technology and telecommunications, that is, on the role of knowledge. It refers to a revolution in the dimension of the qualification structure. In this perspective, while the first industrial revolution required new forms of work organization, subjecting living work to the discipline of industry and, although in the minority, needing more qualified workers; the second revolution, that is, that of work organization methods, made possible the use of large-scale means of production and created new qualifications; and, finally, the information and knowledge characteristic of the current revolution allowed other forms of mobilization of the means of production and labor administration. Each of these revolutions gave rise to a new social division of labor, namely: the first, endorsed the bourgeoisie as the class that owns the means of production and the workers as the class that owns their own labor power; the second, consolidated the bureaucracy by proliferating directors and definitively placing workers as subordinates to the production process; and the third is bringing the development and strengthening of professions in contrast to groups of unskilled or low-skilled workers. (TRINDADE, 2012, p. 101).

In effect, today's education, in its formative processes, represents a contextualized, resignified, reworked and re-energized return to the past as a requalification of the production relations of life and existence established in the old trade guilds. That is to say, it represents the very overcoming of the past understood from the perspective of the continuity of society. Likewise, the history of education incorporates by overcoming artisanal pedagogy at the nexus of transformations in the world of work.

With this theoretical apparatus in hand, the wealth of knowledge enables the construction and consolidation of thinking towards an open, creative, autonomous, liberating and sustainable attitude with regard to musical education, musical performance and improvisation. In this context, musical improvisation gains importance, as it brings to light a whole range of psychophysical possibilities related to the spontaneity of creative processes in both areas: musical education and performance.

Based on the vision that is consistent with Kuehn's (2012) statements regarding performance, it urges separating its meaning from the notions of musical reproduction, musical execution and interpretation. We have seen that these are different moments consistent with the creative process reflected in the performance as a whole, understood as a more plural and broader term. Thus, Kuehn (2012) warns that:

Therefore, initiatives that promote exchange between composers, musicians and performers who work "in the market" would also have an extraordinarily beneficial effect on the production of knowledge. Even though the university was, from the beginning, destined for this purpose, it is good to remember that there should not be any monopoly in the generation of knowledge. One way to recover the lost link between the practical and theoretical production of music would be to gradually promote the integration of different disciplines with theoretical and practical content. In our case, the integration of theoretical disciplines from historical and

systematic approach to the disciplines of musical “creation”, such as composition, harmony, free instrumental practice and instrumental performance (interpretive practices) [...] *Roughly speaking*, it is about evaluating what exactly the performing arts and *performance art* have to offer (or teach) interpretive practices (a discipline that paradoxically was not conceived as *performance art*). In this context, let us remember again ADORNO's postulate (2005, p. 206, 237), according to which “music is mimicry to the extent that certain gestures result in musical sound”. Therefore, the presented model opens up space for theoretical support in which the widespread concept of *performance* emerges in fact founded as a new specialization in the area of music [...] it is based on these principles and premises that both the concept of “interpretive practice” and “interpretive practices” increase considerably in their scope; (KUEHN, 2012, p. 3, 11).

We can glimpse, therefore, in the aforementioned author's proposal, the same tone or nuance in agreement with the perspective of the feudal master teacher cited elsewhere as a transformative educational practice capable of resizing teaching activity for the present day towards an integrative, integral and interactive conception that encompasses composers, sociologists, philosophers, performers, musicologists, etc. In this sense, a solid and comprehensive musical training manifests itself both in the articulation of ideas and in the actual musical production (performance).

Furthermore, the notion of Interpretation, according to Dourado (2004, *apud* KUEHN, 2012), in its own etymology, dates back to Greco-Roman Classical Antiquity. Thus, it is assumed that the Latin verb “*interpret*” be originating from the expression “*inter petros*” denoting and pointing to something “between stones”. In this meaning, the term “Interpretation” designates, in music, the singular reading of a composition having as its starting and ending point its recording in graphic signs corresponding to the musical notation that forms the image of the Musical Text, Musical Content or Score as musical writing consecrated customarily in the historical-temporal and sociocultural course through both written and oral tradition. Therefore, the interpreter seeks to transform abstract musical images and ideas into sound in the most faithful way possible. decodes the symbols or codes represented or written in the Score, which are the result of an entire tradition accepted by convention over the years in the most diverse geographic and social spaces. In this perspective, the meaning of Interpretation is closely linked to the previous musical understanding of the work. by the musician-performer. This time, the Score is considered as a kind of “script”, “template”, “model”, “original”, “standard” or “map” in order to arrive at the understanding of the “truth” of the work and the discovery of the “treasure” embodied in the Composer's thought or “essence”. In this sense, it can be confused with the possibility of reproducibility or

"Musical Reproduction" condition. Therefore, it corresponds to a modality of "Applied Musicology", in which the idea of "Knowing how to interpret" consists of the correct identification, recognition and application of musical patterns, codes and symbols. Indeed, this process requires deep reflection and analysis. Since it is not a fact or event of a spontaneous nature or an event whose occurrence is the result of derivation via direct intuition, it requires a considered stance accompanied by both theoretical and empirical knowledge. As it is a transformative activity, interpretative practice demands dedication, responsibility, specific knowledge, in-depth understanding and vertical knowledge from the musician-interpreter.

Within this scope, according to Kuehn (2012), Interpretation corresponds to the task of bringing to light, mainly, what is among the indications written in the writing of the score by the Composer (and not just the literality of what is written).

According to Schenker (2000, *apud* Kuehn, 2012), the historically established notation hardly represents more than the ancient neumes (they are the basic elements of the musical notation system before the invention of five-line stave notation) requiring the interpreter to look for the meaning behind the symbols, signals or codes. In this sense, it is the field of knowledge that systematically deals with the processes that involve the transformation of text into sound and its techniques. This field presents two interfaces placed in dialogue. It consists, on the one hand, of theoretical elaboration focused on formal analysis and composition. On the other hand, it constitutes the practical application of aesthetic principles and values that focus on the execution of a specific musical work. In short: the idea of Interpretation is equivalent to the notion of a Musical Work as a historical, timeless, perfect, ready, finished, closed, static, impersonal, objective and corporeal product (physical, real and concrete element, the Score). To reveal its real content, a rigorous cognitive exercise of an analytical-rational order is necessary, as we will see when dealing with the so-called linguistic "turn" or "turn" of Performance (also known as the Linguistic Turn of Performance).

Still following Kuehn (2012), many authors sometimes use expressions related to musical presentation as a fact, event or artistic event as a performance or public presentation on stage, and sometimes use terms that refer to theory, exposition, rhetoric, discourse, the teaching and the lecture to designate the Musical Work. There is also a third group of theorists who use the terminology "Musical Reproduction". We therefore have three meanings. One, from "Musical Reproduction". The second, referring to practice

interpretation and the characteristics (permanent or variable, traditional or altered, immutable or changeable) of the musical performance mode. While the third corresponds to the concert as a social event, very close to what is understood as "*performance*" in Anglophone (that is, English-speaking) countries. Different authors have opted for the term "Musical Reproduction", because it allows the attribution of both interpretation and performance as active principles. In this way, the moment of musical reproduction can also be, both the moment of performance and the interpretation of a composition due to the broader, wider and more comprehensive character of the term in question, in accordance with Kuehn (2012):

In other words, conceiving musical reproduction as a far-reaching dynamic process, the elements of *interpretation*'s from *performance* become categories with which the artistic event can be analyzed and critically evaluated [...] Therefore, the effective realization of a musical reproduction implies the *performance*, like this *ad litteram* also the interpretation of a musical composition [...] therefore, the essence of musical reproduction lies in its mimetic process of which both the interpretative element and the performative element constitute active principles [...] 12) therefore, the term "musical reproduction" should not be taken as a synonym for interpretation or performance, but rather as a comprehensive concept that designates the moment in which a composition is presented or "played" musically; 13) therefore, the concept of musical reproduction extends to the mimetic aspect, the performative act, interpretation, execution, as well as the functioning of internal and external rules of a musical presentation on stage (KUEHN, 2012, p. 9, 11).

Therefore, the *reproductive process* of music can occur either through interpretation or through performance. Certainly, the term "Musical Reproduction" is *open and indeterminate concept* (in the sense that limitations, restrictions and obstacles cannot be imposed or hindered). According to Kuehn's (2012) exposition, the term "Musical Reproduction" was probably used by Schenker for the first time. Thus, when criticizing the distorted and adulterated role that musical reproduction occupied in the musical environment, Schenker (2000, *apud* Kuehn, 2012) claimed a "true reproduction" or faithful to the content of the Musical Work.

In the same spirit, Schönberg (1989, *apud* Kuehn, 2012) uses the word "Execution" instead of "Interpretation" in order to curb the exaggerations of some interpreters who placed themselves above the Music and the Composer. According to the composer's assertion: "An intelligent performer, who is truly 'a servant of the work', someone whose mental agility is equivalent to that of a thinker of music – such a person will act like Mozart, Schubert or others" (SCHÖNBERG, 1989, p. 116, *apud* KUEHN, 2012, p. 11). It should be noted, however, that the composer under discussion also used the expression "Musical Reproduction". To the

outlining the guidelines for his project to develop a theory of "Musical Execution", the composer under analysis proclaims that: "The highest principle of all musical reproduction lies in what the composer wrote [must be played] in such a way that each note can be heard clearly" (SCHÖNBERG, 1984, p. 319, *apud* KUEHN, p. 11).

In this sense, the celebrated piano professor at the Saint Petersburg Conservatory, Vladimir Nielsen (former disciple of Nadezhda Golubovskaya) recommended that the interpreter treat the idiomatic and language of each Composer with absolute reverence, maintaining seriousness, sobriety, austerity, the wisdom and fidelity of the musical discourse to the Text that originated it and served as a creative basis⁸. According to Kuehn's teaching (2012), still regarding Schönberg:

To clarify the positions: despite having recognized the importance of a correct or adequate interpretation, the process of creating a musical work ends for Schönberg precisely with the creation of the score. Reproduction represents for him (who is a composer) something superfluous and, when it occurs, the interpreter is seen as a mere "performer" or "executor" of the score. Hence, for Schönberg, objectivity and clarity represent absolutely central attributes for interpretation. This positioning leads Schönberg to another question: "Is performance necessary? Not the author, but the audience only needs it" (*apud* [sic] KOLISCH, 1983, p. 9). Let's continue with the composer: "Interpretation is necessary to fill the gap between the author's idea and the contemporary ear, [and depends] on the listener's ability to assimilate in his time" (SCHÖNBERG, 1984, p. 328). (KUEHN, 2012, p. 8).

It is irreproachable to state that Schenker (2000, *apud* Kuehn, 2012), according to the aforementioned author, had already noted that:

Basically, the composition does not need performance to exist. Silently reading a score is enough to prove its existence; it is enough for the sound to appear in a form only imagined in the mind. The mechanical realization of a work of musical art can therefore be considered superfluous" (SCHENKER, 2000, p. 3 *apud* KUEHN, 2012, p. 8).

With this subsidy or theoretical contribution, we can allude that, according to Kuehn (2012):

"Interpretation" designates, in music, the singular reading of a composition based on its register which, represented by a set of graphic signs, forms the "sound image". The interpreter decodes the graphic signals, transforming them more faithfully into sound parameters. Therefore, "interpreting" is directly linked to understanding the elements that structure a work, such as: pitch, melody, rhythm, harmony, tonality and musical time. Other elements characterize music as language. Among them are articulation, punctuation, form and meaning. Phrasing and cohesion or coherence are also part of this category. All of this demands, on the one hand, an introverted stance, focused on analysis and theoretical reflection (in the Aristotelian sense of contemplation rather than action), while,

⁸See Musical America Worldwide. Carnegie Hall: Tribute to St. Petersburg Piano School, East Windsor, Nov. 9 2010. Available in: <https://www.musicalamerica.com/news/newsstory.cfm?archived=0&storyID=23919&categoryID=5> Accessed on September 10th. 2021.

on the other hand, it demands instrumental practice (the interpretative practice itself [...] 5) before it can be reproduced adequately, the composition needs to be understood in its most diverse parameters and aspects; 6) based on the information that the signals transmit through the image of the text, the composition is reproduced by a mimesis or mimetic action that transforms it back into musical sound (KUEHN, 2012, p. 10, 11).

Certainly, in line with Kuehn's (2012) mention, "Performance" studies date back to the British John Langshaw Austin (1911-1960), who, as a philosopher of language, developed a "theory of speech acts" ("*speech-act theory*"), in which it brings together elements of linguistics and philosophy of language. It is important to highlight that the theory in question constituted a true paradigm shift in the study of humanities and social sciences with consequences, developments, repercussions, impacts, influxes, marks and echoes that are unfolding today. Based on Linguistics, Austin (1975) proposed the theory of the "performative act or utterance" (or "speech act theory - "*speech-act theory*") of the philosophy of language (performative vision of language) influencing the so-called "performative turn" in the field of music, thanks to the interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research field known as "*performance studies*."

Regarding the "speech act theory", Kuehn (2012) highlights the creative character of utterances for the construction or production of the realities of the social world. Also called "*linguistic turn*" or "linguistic turn", Austin considers that human beings not only *reproduce*, through language or speech, the world around you. Indeed, language itself has creative capacity. She is able to *create*, through certain statements, new facts that can affect the reality of the social world (for example, when the couple is declared husband and wife in a wedding ceremony) constituting, generating or forming new realities and sociocultural contexts. Therefore, the words uttered are not necessarily a mere consequence of the world around people; since the social world itself can also be constituted according to statements. There is, therefore, a *dialectical and historical relationship* (or historical-dialectic) of reciprocity and mutuality. As Bakhtin (1992, 1999) points out:

[...] every utterance, even in the immobilized form of writing, is a response to something and is constructed as such. It is nothing more than a link in the chain of speech acts. Every inscription prolongs those that preceded it, creates a controversy, relies on the active reactions of understanding, anticipates them (BAKHTIN, 1999, p. 98).

In this direction, we also find the studies of Vygotski (1998, 2000), worthy of note due to the assertion that the systematization of conceptual thinking is carried out through

of an internalization process, accumulated experience; which occurs through social practice, language and relationships that the subject establishes in their cultural environment.

This time, Austin (*apud* Kuehn, 2012) seeks to investigate what happens at the moment of the "performative act" of speech ("*speech-act*"). Their research deals with themes that are consistent, in their postulates, with the conception of music as a language, presenting similarities in the sense of endorsing or sanctioning language as a basis for itself. In such a way that language is based on itself. In fact, although interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity are different concepts, both are applicable to the topic under analysis. Interdisciplinarity corresponds to a concept that refers to the process of connection or association between two or more disciplines that collaborate with each other based on something, which is common among them and proposes the ability to dialogue between the different sciences, making knowledge understood as a whole, and not as fragmented parts. In transdisciplinarity, there is an intercommunication between disciplines based on one, organizing or complex thinking that goes beyond the disciplines themselves in such a way that there are no borders between them, seeking maximum interaction and respecting their singularities. Thus, each one contributes to the most complete common knowledge possible without transforming them into a single discipline. It is about organizing, scheduling or ordering knowledge. From this perspective, interdisciplinarity considers dialogue between disciplines; however, it continues to be structured within the spheres of disciplinarity. One step further and we would have the idea of transdisciplinarity, where there would no longer be borders between disciplines and other sources and levels of knowledge would be considered. Thus, transdisciplinarity is an approach that aims at the unity of knowledge by articulating elements that pass between, beyond and across disciplines in a search for understanding the complexity of the real world. Both ideas emerged to overcome the concept of discipline, which is configured by the departmentalization of knowledge into different subjects and is marked by the approach of each discipline in a fragmented and isolated way from the others. Regarding the term "Performance", Kuehn (2012) explains:

While the definition of the terms "reproduction" and "interpretation" did not present any major difficulties, the notion of performance has resisted a satisfactory definition in the area of music. It was in the second half of the 20th century that this term began to spread massively in the musical field – perhaps also as a result of the numerous emigration of composers, performers and intellectuals from

Throughout the development process, the individual internalizes spontaneous and scientific concepts. For Vygotsky, internalization constitutes "the internal reconstruction of an external operation" (VIGOTSKI, 2000, p. 74).

German language for the United States. At the same time, the connotation of the term performance expanded its scope, spreading across different areas of knowledge, from philosophy to sport. For all these reasons, the term requires even more clarification regarding its function and meaning within and outside the strictly musical scope. (KUEHN, 2012, p. 7).

Although the original reference to the linguistic and philosophical context of speech circumstances, Austin's "performative act" theory (*apud*Kuehn, 2012) shares a series of affinities with the interpretative practice of music. On this mat, there would be a kind of attraction between them. Thus, the similarities evoked between both interfaces would have made it possible for the performative "turn" or "awakening" seen in the field of linguistics to also occur in the field of music. To reach a common denominator, Kuehn (2012) seeks to formulate the active principle of the performative process through the following conceptual equation:

$$\underline{\text{act} + \text{action} = \text{performance}}$$

As a result, according to the same author, we have that:

The result brings us to another key element of artistic performance: scenic representation and acting, that is, the actor, the mime and their mime. We reveal, so to speak, the extraordinary breadth of meaning that the (symbiotic) relationship of the mimetic-gestural element engenders in the art of music. (KUEHN, 2012, p. 7).

As for the central function of the mimetic or scenic element in music, this dimension coincides with Adorno's point of view (2005, *apud*Kuehn, 2012), for whom:

The central relationship between mimicry and music becomes evident in the sphere of reproduction [...] Music is mimicry insofar as [...] certain gestures result in musical sound. Music is, so to speak, the acoustic objectification of facial mimicry, which, in a certain way, would have been separated from it historically (ADORNO, 2005, p. 206, 237 *apud*KUEHN, 2012, p. 14).

In this turn, Kuehn (2012) offers us a conceptual overview of "Performance" in the Arts in a broad, systematic and comprehensive way, considering it a multiform artistic process that also includes the extra-musical elements of reproduction. Let us listen to his words:

Performance, therefore, in music, it refers us first and foremost to the physical presence on stage, to the body and voice, not only in relation to certain performance techniques on the instrument but also as a means and way of interacting with the viewing public. Its active elements are, above all, in the gestural representation of whoever is "playing" a musical composition, that is, in the interpreter, in the conductor's chironomy, in mime and in biomechanical movements with their particular techniques and "schools" (regional or national). . Much like what happens in the field of music, we can also observe in the plastic arts and visual arts a tendency

for performative actions that critically occupy public space (*happening, environment, action painting or body art*). As a result, these events often turn into spectacles [sic] widely publicized by the media. In the performing arts, the concept of *performance* is associated more with the movement and mime-gestural representation of the actor on stage than with the content of their utterances, generally under the umbrella of interpretation. From the point of view of the cultural industry, that is, of entertainment and mass culture, it is not exactly the interpretation and its statements that matter most, but the *performance*—that is, the *show*. This fact clearly shows that there are musical genres in which the “art of *performance*”, while the musical content appears in the background. Be that as it may, if it is also a good *performer*, the interpreter is committed to “convincing” with his *performance* not only in an instrumental way but also visually, that is, mime-gestural. Considering that relatively little is still known about the real effect that music has on man and the environment, the musician-performer needs to be prepared not only technically but also in terms of ethics to be able to explore all these resources in a “sustainable” way. “. Everything that has been said to define and delimit the conceptual field of *performance* becomes even more evident in the case of the circus, where acrobats, jugglers and other artists strive (and triumph) in their performances, in which case we cannot talk about interpretation. Also at music mega events *pop* we noticed the predominance of performative elements, in which all types of lights and images, the “multimedia effects”, are more reminiscent of a circus show than an actual performance. For all this, the use of the term *performance* needs more consideration when applied to different aspects of musical practice [...] 8) for a musical reproduction to be configured as a performance, the presence of the public is essential (that is, the environment must be that of a performance); 9) although every individual reproduction is peculiar and unique in its sound and temporal parameters, it is also related in some way to other reproductions or recordings of the same composition (to the extent that it may have already accumulated a certain number of interpretations, or which may have been the subject of controversy regarding the choice of certain interpretative options) [...] for all this, the elements reported here start to engender a process in which one migrates from a notion based almost exclusively on interpretation to that of a multiform artistic process that also includes the extra-musical elements of reproduction. (KUEHN, 2012, p. 8, 9, 11).

Regarding the wide-ranging trinomial composed of the notions or ideas of "Reproduction", "Interpretation" and "Performance", as concepts that represent distinct principles, the aforementioned author considers:

The trinomial also alludes to three absolutely fundamental elements of musical practice: 1) the mimetic of reproduction; 2) the comprehensive and contemplative interpretation; and 3) the performative, hence the idea of gesture, staging and spectacle. As the category of reproduction is the most comprehensive, it also encompasses the others. On one side of the figure, we place the elements *intramusical* that structure the work musically, while, on the other, we place the elements *extramusical* which put the musician-performer literally “on stage”, that is, in the spotlight. This is also the moment in which the composition is “updated” both aesthetically and socially (music as a binder of social identity). In this way, at the moment of reproduction, a kind of agonal field is restored, so to speak, in which the musical forces of the composition (rhythmic, harmonic, dynamic, structural elements, etc.) interact with the corporeal and gestural materiality of the composition. *performance*, the social and natural environment (acoustic, for example) of the reproduction site. Used separately, no other concept would do justice to the scope that the concept of “musical reproduction” establishes, because: 1) the term “execution” implies something mechanical that does not take into account the playful and creative aspect of musical reproduction; 2) the term

“interpretation” does not allow its application to bodily aspects, that is, the mime-gestures of the musician-performer; and 3) the term *performance*. It is not to be confused with the interpretative and contemplative aspect of reproduction [...] The concepts of reproduction, interpretation and performance also represent distinct principles, where each field can constitute the object of a wide variety of analyses. Therefore, the proposed model is not restricted to the classical-romantic genre. Depending on the genre and musical language in question, one or another category may be preferred as a starting point for the analysis. In any case, both the proportional measure and the quality of each categorical element will be directly reflected in the result of reproduction [...] in this way, reproduction, interpretation and performance form three central categories of the artistic-musical process and are not confused [...] (KUEHN, 2012, p. 9, 10, 11).

In other words, it is at the moment of "Performance" that the Musical Tradition itself is renewed, resignified and resized considering the aesthetic and social values present at the time of "Musical Reproduction". That said, we can begin the schematic classification of *four concepts* that act as vectors of *make music*, namely: 1) Musical Reproduction: designates the realization of "*hic et nunc*" ("here and now") of a musical composition based on its text or score (as a historical record, the text represents the "objective" or "objectified" part of the composition insofar as it was prepared to serve reproduction as a basis support) and encompasses both musical interpretation and performance (since it constitutes an open and indeterminable concept. In this task, the musician-performer proceeds mimetically (that is, by "*mimesis*" or mimetic action). As it is a historical process, there is no reproduction that could be considered "ultimate" or "definitive". In this sense, "Musical Reproduction" updates the Musical Tradition (the way in which a Musical Work is customarily reproduced over the years). In view of the above, it encompasses, concentrates and encompasses the concepts of Musical Execution, Musical Interpretation and Musical Performance as it is broader and more comprehensive; 2) Musical Execution: means the mere technical-mechanical reproduction of the notation or basic writing of the score without any playful or creative nuances: respecting the notes, rhythms and pauses. In view of this, it constitutes the mere decoding or simplistic deciphering or reading of the Musical Piece; 3) Musical Interpretation: corresponds to the realization of musical expressiveness and artistic content embodied in aesthetic thought involving musical conception, gestures or mimetics linked to phraseology, plasticity, pitch, melodic line, texture, tessitura or extension, dynamics,agogical, harmony, rhythm, musical tempo or tempo, tonality, modulation, form and structure or construction of the musical work, articulation, inflection, intonation, punctuation, sound of the time, style, character, attribution of musical meaning, giving shape to phrases, etc. It concerns reading a text with the

intention of transforming it back into musical sound parameters. Thus, we have that: reading + interpretative practice = work (in the sense that it needs to be understood in form and content, as well as in its historically and socially contingent language parameters). On this plinth, it presupposes a contemplative attitude and an introverted posture, highlighting or highlighting the cognitive-analytical and rational factors in relation to the object of study in order to acquire the appropriate *musical understanding* of the elements listed considering music as language. While, on the other hand, it demands the practice of instrumental technique; 4) Musical Performance: covers the theatricality connected to intramusical content in its scenic aspect and the dynamics of extramusical movements manifesting mainly in scenic representation, mime and gestures on stage (discarded presentations of mere exhibition; empty of meaning or artistic-cultural significance ; endowed with "mannerisms"¹⁰ or exaggerations; "clichéd"¹¹ or standardized; designed by so-called motivations *show off* to try to get out of the trivial or commonplace, but in a vulgar and senseless way; driven by the desire to differentiate themselves, however uncommitted to the necessary pianistic-musical refinement, demonstrating artistic-intellectual irresponsibility, etc.). In this way, supported by Kuehn (2012), the externalization of extramusical content already elaborated in previous stages requires *preparation and rehearsal* prior or anticipated so that the *communication and interaction process* with the public through *audiovisual language* intelligible. In this leather, he says with living experience, the "*hic et nunc*" ("here and now", simultaneity or instantaneity) of the stage, spontaneity and *improvisational nature of the presentation*, the gestures and bodily aspects of the musician-performer in relation to the way and means of making music with the instrument in the *meeting* with the audience. The terms concert, recital, staging, "*show*" and spectacle refer to performance as an artistic and sociocultural event or fact. Therefore, Kuehn's (2012) view of Performance, elucidating that:

Furthermore, it covers the technical elements that involve its execution with the instrument and that highlight certain musical elements of a composition. Its function is to highlight specifically musical content, thus making it clearer to the viewer. By employing mimetic, mime and gestural techniques, the performer employs them as a means of underlining certain elements *intramusical* to the viewing public. To achieve this, there are a series of techniques and elements *extramusical*, such as those of scenic representation, in which, even if

¹⁰The reference in quotation marks is justified by the use of the expression in its common sense meaning, making further clarification or additional elucidation unnecessary.

¹¹The word was taken as it is understood in everyday common sense, dispensing with further explanations and justifying the use of quotation marks.

Only gesturally, the musician-performer resembles a “mime” or “actor”. In this way, we come closer to the concept of *embodiment* as “physical presence on stage”, which, in its professional version, includes a kind of *coaching* or psycho-physical [sic] training program for the artist or *performer* to train your memory, and to prepare for certain stage situations that demand intense physical and emotional stress. [...] A *performance* is mainly in the elaboration of the elements *extramusical* of musical reproduction. This category includes gestures, mimicry and the musician-performer's technical dexterity on the instrument (virtuosity). All of these elements are related to corporeality, that is, to the act of “playing” the music. Essentially *extrovert*, refer to *externalization* of content already created in previous stages, but which is now generated through means other than purely musical ones. Having a strong playful character, they can also cover multimedia effects, as well as musical and visual production. “Perform” therefore means “act” and “transform”. Its function is in the interaction with the spectator public, who is not perceived passively as a mere “receiver” but, in a sense, *broad*, also as “actor”. In this process, each party assumes a certain social role that stimulates and feeds each other. (KUEHN, 2012, p. 9, 10).

We use this conceptual framework and start from these premises in the teaching work area with our piano students; regardless of age, level of piano proficiency and number of students in the same class or class. It is worth mentioning that we also use this conceptual scaling in the Monitoring discipline. Therefore, in our teaching practice, we have figured or listed the conceptual subsidies mentioned above with the aim of streamlining the artistic work process.

Therefore, in our teaching practice, we have figured or listed the conceptual subsidies mentioned above with the aim of streamlining the artistic work process.

2.4 THE LINGUISTIC TURN OF PERFORMANCE

By way of exordium, we bring to the collection an important contribution from Kuehn (2012):

After all the advances in musicological research, it makes no sense to revisit historical music like someone who simply goes to a museum. It is necessary to recreate it through lively interpretations that bring it into contemporary times. It is at the moment of its reproduction that the composition goes through a process of “updating”, the scope of which goes far beyond the notion of “interpretation”. Hence also the need to more rigorously designate and delimit the elements of the performative process of transforming image into sound. Although, for a long time, this aspect has been relegated by musicological research, it is clear that the performance practice of the concertist and conductor demands, in addition to musical knowledge, also an understanding of their mime and gestural representation on stage. (KUEHN, 2012, p. 3).

Therefore, of classical-romantic origin, the concept of Musical Work is problematic and needs to be redefined; as well as the relationship between image, musical notation and sound. Therefore, the meanings in question reveal a series of contradictions, paradoxes, inconsistencies,

contradictions and inconsistencies. According to this conception, the expansion of the notion of "Performance" began to encompass presentation, execution, realization, functioning and the internal and external conditions of artistic representation as a whole. Regarding the so-called "Second Industrial Revolution", in the second half of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century, we have the dizzying development of industrial machinery and the increase in the capacity for technical reproducibility. In this regard, Kuehn (2012) points out:

With the improvement of technologies in different recording media, not only the composition but also the interpretation became reproducible, and could thus become a new object of musicological investigation. Consequently, the concrete possibility of comparing different performers in categories such as artistic individuality, historical fidelity and musical expressiveness in audio and video has had an enormous impact in practically all social spheres and has allowed the status of a work of art to extend to mechanical reproduction as well. of a composition. In short, the study of interpretative practice as a category of technical analysis and historiography of music configures a discovery of the 20th century [...] (KUEHN, 2012, p. 6).

Due to the historical circumstances mentioned above and conceptual aspects, Kuehn (2012) states that Theodor Adorno (1903-1969) preferred to adopt, in his theory, the term "musical reproduction". Likewise, the term "Musical Reproduction" can be understood as the creation in sound terms of a Musical Work based on the Score as a representation of the "sound image". Indeed, Adorno (2003, *apud* Kuehn, 2012) emphasized, regarding "Musical Reproduction", that:

In what way can the reading of a work reveal the degree of freedom it provides for the interpreter who performs it – this seems to me to be the central task of a theory of reproduction, which, however, as a theory, could not penetrate what is fuses indissolubly in its configuration and which, in its fullness, involves the imitator as a whole man (ADORNO, 2003, p. 441 *apud* KUEHN, 2012, p. 12).

Therefore, for the philosopher and musicologist in question, every musical reading constitutes an interpretation endowed with freedom whose limits still lack definition; since the concept of "Musical Reproduction" involves the work, the performer and the interpretation in an inseparable whole. Thus, despite the fact that the performer of a Musical Work can be identified as, in addition to being an interpreter, an "imitator"; musical reproduction also involves aspects of human integrality (that is, ethical, political and social issues) and must provide plenitude. In this way, the Adornian concept designates "Musical Reproduction" as an occurrence "*on site*" of a Musical Work created based on a written record in the form of text or score. Therefore, breaking with the mechanical denotation that the term acquired with the technological improvement of industrial media and mass media,

Adorno (2003, 2005 *apud* Kuehn, 2012) understands the term "Musical Reproduction" as embracing or incorporating the element "*hic et nunc*" ("here and now") of the Work of Art as the unity of its presence in the very place where it is located.

Thus, the entire history of the Musical Work is linked to its phenomenological presence¹² as a unique, living, creative, open, indeterminate, unfinished, dynamic, changeable, unrepeatable and indispensable artistic fact or social event. In fact, the very concept of a Musical Work begins to be reclassified, resized, reworked, reoriented, rewritten, revised, redescribed, re-identified, re-authenticated, reinvented, resignified and re-circumscribed into a new taxonomy. Thus, its nature as a sociocultural and artistic event or social fact or sound event stands out within a phenomenological perspective loaded with essential or substantial symbolism, meaning and content. Such contents consist of transformative and creative materials or elements of the realities or contexts of the modes of production of life and the conditions of human existence.

Furthermore, the phenomenological dimension of "Performance" provides new ways of living and experiencing life and one's own body, generating means of historical-critical intervention on the natural and social environment acting or acting in culture with a view to transforming certain behaviors (vision "*behaviorist*"¹³) socially dictated or conditioned by the capitalist mode of production in its intrinsic contradictions. In this supplement, Kuehn (2012) provides us with the record that:

Until the mid-1970s, approximately, cultural studies were focused mainly on questions about their textuality and understanding (hermeneutics) (which, in practice, meant that work and text are confused). In subsequent decades, however, academic research began to focus on the *performance* as an artistic and social event. Ultimately, it was as a sociocultural event that the *performance* could become a research category in social anthropology and ethnomusicology ("social fact" or "sound fact"). Also noteworthy is the trend seen in *performance* as an inexhaustible source of experience, that is, of life (or experience) and the body (*embodiment*). Another trend uses the performative act as an action that acts [sic] critically under [sic] the social or natural environment, often with the

¹²The Phenomenological Method, born mainly in the work of Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), according to Vergara (2003), opposes the positivist current as it is a subjectivist tradition questioning the excessive prioritization of the object in the constitution of true knowledge. In this support, it proposes another way of conceiving the reciprocal relationship between subject and object. It is, then, a research method, an epistemological paradigm and a philosophical current. According to Triviños (1987), extraordinarily popular currents of thought after the end of the Second World War, such as existentialism, fed on the phenomenological source. From this point of view, the Phenomenological Epistemological Method or Paradigm aims to study the essence and manifestations of things by observing the object or phenomenon through the senses. This is what we deduce from the teachings of Severino (2007).

¹³It is crucial to note that we do not intend to address the topics mentioned above in this work, so we are satisfied with the mere mention or note for the sake of curiosity without punctuating the matter with greater verticality or depth.

objective of pointing out certain socially conditioned patterns of behavior, staging them to, in this way, expose their paradoxical aspects. In short, as aesthetic paradigms focused on the relationship between subject and object were being questioned, people were also awakened to the extraordinary potential of *performance* as an instrument of artistic, political and social intervention (FISCHER-LICHTE, 2004, p. 15-22, 29, 153). (KUEHN, 2012, p. 8).

In fact, there is no Musical Work without someone playing or singing it. Therefore, the concept of Musical Work is subordinated to the variables time and space. Likewise, it is also subject to subjectivity or personality (character '*intuitu personae*' or "on account of the person", non-transferable, inalienable and unavailable) of the interpreter.

Therefore, in the case of a re-reading, or better still, a "personalized reading" of the musical text or score, the concept of "Musical Reproduction" also encompasses Interpretation as an element "*hic et nunc*" ("here and now") in which a composition is reproduced by the musician-performer as an act of recreation ("*poíesis*").

This Phenomenological Vision of the Musical Work characterizes, in its approach, the so-called Linguistic Turn of Performance. Nevertheless, the aforementioned Phenomenological Vision is supported by solid scientific bases that substantiate the so-called Phenomenological Method already discussed. In Music, the Phenomenological Method has repercussions based on the Linguistic Turn ("*linguistic turn*" or linguistic turn) of Musical Performance (also called performative turn). According to this conception, the Musical Work is not constituted by the Score, Musical Text or Musical Content. Therefore, the Musical Work represents something alive, open, dynamic, sensitive, active, changeable, rich in nuances and variations in flow.

Thus, it is not closed, prefixed, ready, perfect or finished; but open and capable of creation through the *imaginative process with an improvisatory character*. From this perspective, it breaks with the positivist formalism present in the conservatorian or conservatorist tradition, granting greater freedom to the interpreter in relation to the composer's thinking in essence. Within this premise, Kuehn (2012) talks about John Cage (1912-1992):

Hence, it would initially be logical to conclude that the silent reading of a musical work could not, under any circumstances, constitute a performance, were it not for certain paradoxes that break with traditional aesthetic paradigms. One of these paradigms is, without a doubt, that of subject and object. The composer John Cage (1912-1992), an American disciple of Schönberg, certainly holds the merit of having pointed out some of these paradoxes. Furthermore, he is remembered for his contribution to the performative element in concert music (KAPP, 2002, p. 460-468; FISCHER-LICHTE, 2004, p. 24). Cage's compositions and concerts mainly highlight the enormous critical and social potential of the performative act. By carrying out the act of musical reproduction itself *ad absurdum*, Cage's performance questions the traditional paradigm of

interpretation and even that of “concert”, which ends up inverting. This is what happens with the 1952 composition, titled 4' 33". The number in the title indicates exactly the time during which the pianist (or other instrumentalist or group formation) must, during the three movements of the piece, remain seated next to their instrument, without, however, playing a single note [...] on the other hand, for Cage, the cycle of creating a musical work ends only with the performance. This is the core that differentiates (and distances) Cage and other contemporary conceptions from those of Schenker and Schönberg. In any case, it is curious to note that here a point of view that heralds of romanticism, such as the composers Liszt and Wagner, previously defended, seems to be radicalizing (KAPP, 2002, p. 456-457 and 461). (KUEHN, 2012, p. 8).

Finally, the Phenomenological conception of Performance considers that the relationship between text and music is precarious and paradoxical. Therefore, the text is nothing more than a rudimentary record of the composition. Thus, it can be said that every reproduction represents a kind of “update” of an “original” (the definition of which requires separate research).

Furthermore, it is clear that this bias even allows the “updating” of the Musical Tradition itself through historically subsequent reproductions in each sociocultural context, as we have already highlighted.

Therefore, the cycle of creation of a musical composition ends only with its reproduction on stage (and not with its writing) and, in the absence of a musical reproduction itself, the score is considered to represent only the historical record of the composition (and not the “work itself”) resizing, oxygenating, airing, renewing and giving new meaning to the concept of Musical Work as we previously emphasized.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In view of the above, we can infer the intrinsic relationship between the so-called Linguistic Turn or Turn of Performance and the Scientific Method or Dialectical Epistemological Paradigm. In other words, it is at the moment of performance that the musical tradition itself is renewed, resignified, reconfigured and resized considering the aesthetic and social values present at the moment of performance in a continuous, dynamic, lively and constant interactionist flow.

In this summary, we have seen that, with the evolution of Research Methodology, we can prospect for greater participation and involvement of the *imagery*¹⁴ of

¹⁴As we have already detailed elsewhere, according to the Dictionary “online” HOUALISS (2021): Which can be expressed through images. Which can refer to what contains images. That shows imagination. In fact, the details of this content are not listed as the object of this scientific article.

instrumentalist in the scope of pianistic performance, having the *Make Musicas* a connecting link for the *Do Linguísticas* a starting and ending point for artistic-cultural activity. Furthermore, the *improvisatory character* of performance (called, here, simply musical improvisation), leveraged amid the trigger point materialized in the phenomenon of the creative impulse represented by the Creative Process (“*poíesis*”) intrinsic to Dialectics and responsible for the freshness of the presentation, is guaranteed by the dialectical interaction between artist and audience, similar to the relationship between interlocutors in the phenomenon of oral communication or not (even in the case of using LIBRAS – Brazilian Sign Language) requesting the resource to the performer's imagery in order to highlight the dynamic aspect of the performance through the engaged participation of the entire body during the Musical or Sound Making. It is imperative to highlight that we started from a technical-mechanical conception of the so-called musical reproduction that sought to automate individuals through ready-made patterns or finished stereotypes, we went through scientific technicality with natural bases aiming at the faithful realization of the musical content and we arrived at performance based on the aspects subjective personal, phenomenological, psychomotor and psychophysical aspects of the pianist-performer. In such a way that the progress of scientific approaches, over the years, highlights the importance of *Musical Imagination* in pianistic practice (title, in fact, of our Master's Dissertation) walking “*pari passu*” with the oxygenation of ways of conceiving musical activity. In this sense, we have the prevailing methodology of Musical Imagination combined with the Creative Process (“*poíesis*”) as a guiding thread of study, practice and performance leads to the development of musical vocabulary as a corollary of the activity of *musical improvisation* underlying the inner world present in the imagery of the performer-instrumentalist. In this context, the improvisation provided by “*poíesis*” gives the musician greater freedom, airing the performance and bringing a freshness unrelated to the “smell of study”.¹⁵ This time, it is observed that the poetic meaning contained in the improvisatory, spontaneous and free character of the performance can be achieved with creativity and naturalness. Thus, musical improvisation¹⁶ Creativity is an essential component for its development.

¹⁵The pianistic tradition reports that Cádúio Arrau instructed his students not to play with a “smell of study”, but to achieve the poetic meaning contained in the improvisatory, spontaneous and free character of the performance.

¹⁶The Grove Dictionary of Music defines the term “musical improvisation” in the following terms: “The creation of a musical work, or its final form, as it is being performed. It may mean the immediate composition of the work by the performers, the elaboration or adjustment of details in an already existing work, or anything within these limits.” (GROVE DICTIONARY OF MUSIC, 1994, p. 450).

We have seen that, depending on the theoretical basis exposed, the concept and application of the idea of Musical Imagination is in line with the formulation or characterization of the essence of the expression Creative Process ("*poíesis*") have an intimate connection with the musical thought present in the Dialectical or Historical-Dialectic Epistemological Method or Paradigm applied to Performance through the Linguistic Turn of Performance. Likewise, from a dialectical point of view, as a result of the phenomenon of speech (orality), the individual's expression or communication embodied in *Creative Practice of Sound or Musical Making* gives rise to musical improvisation as the result of a discursive action based on rhetoric or oratory¹⁷.

Therefore, this *speak musically* (understanding of music as language) originates in the Musical Imagination and unfolds through a *Creative Process (or "poíesis")*, active or open based on Dialectic and formed by imaginative decisions in which the versatility, plurality or multiplicity of means and technical resources constitutes an essential factor for the success of communicating the musical message in an expressive, inventive, imaginative, sensitive and dynamic way in a given context historical and sociocultural. In this limbo, the Musical Imagination, using the *musical improvisation*, also relies on the Dialecticity present in the Linguistic Turn of Performance in order to rhetorically expose the content of the Musical Text to the public, considering music as a language, idiom or vehicle for the free expression of thoughts, feelings, sensations, desires, images, representations, genuinely human symbols, signs, codes and ideals.

Thus, we have the Musical Imagination, supported by the Creative Process ("*poíesis*") typical of Dialectic, using the musical improvisation present in *make music or make sound* extracts from the Praxity observed in the so-called Linguistic Turn or Guidance of Performance the material or substrate necessary for the concretization, materialization and perfection of its expressive ideals. In fact, it removes its content from the interfaces placed in a dialogical relationship, equipping, empowering and instrumentalizing itself through the resources and means offered with the aim of promoting interaction, connection, cooperation, collaboration, integration, socialization or interactivity between the human beings and satisfy their linguistic-communicative verve. In other words, Musical Imagination makes use of musical improvisation as an expressive way within the context of linguistic-communicative action

¹⁷Consider the fact that, according to Rocha (2016), improvisation corresponds to "a sequence of creative decisions in a given context (social, creative, affective, etc.)." (ROCHA, 2016, p. 6).

embodied in the Creative Process (*"poíesis"*) immanent to the Dialectic of the assembly of a given Musical Work acting through the Praxity found in the Linguistic Turn of Performance.

Therefore, the Musical Imagination, triggered by the Creative Process (or *"poíesis"*) with a focus on Dialectic, seeks inspiration for instrumental and vocal practice in the Linguistic Turn of Performance; that is, the parameters and vestments necessary in order to freely express the contents specific to the headquarters of human relationships in a synchronous way or in real time. In this way, Musical Imagination uses the premises verified in the apparatus of the Linguistic Turn of Performance to carry out linguistic-expressive skills and abilities effectively within the communicative context specific to the human conditions of existence and production of life through the Praxis activated by exercise of the Creative Process (*"poíesis"*) based on Dialectic.

In this north, it is necessary to glimpse that the Praxis revealed by the Musical Imagination shared with the Creative Process (*"poíesis"*), supported by Dialectic, seeks in the Linguistic Turn of Performance the tools, weapons and techniques fundamental to artistic-musical expressiveness. In other words: Musical Imagination, represented by the phenomenon of the creative impulse of the Creative Process (*"poíesis"*), based on Dialectic and embodied in the musical improvisation found in *make music or make sound*, is permeated by the sphere of the Linguistic Turn of Performance in a reciprocal, collaborative and mutual way with the aim of promoting artistic-cultural action through the dialectical context in its linguistic-communicative integrality. Furthermore, in these terms, we have that artistic practice or musical fact reconfigures, reworks, reorganizes, reorients and readjusts itself into a transformative, liberating, dynamic, living, changeable, critical-reflexive, emancipatory, creative and sustainable experience or experience.

Therefore, we glimpse that the Praxis on screen is achieved through the conception of Musical Imagination adopted in conjunction with the meaning of Creative Process (*"poíesis"*) based on Dialectic. We also verified that the understanding of Music as a phenomenon of Language constitutes, along with the contents mentioned above, a possible axis of connection or means of crossing between the Praxity of Dialectic and the Linguistic Turn of Performance (also called "Turn" or "Turn " Performative). In this way, we found that musical improvisation can therefore promote the identification of the *make music* as a starting point for joining the two interfaces in question, namely: Search and

Musical Performance.

In a practical way, it is noted that an education focused on creative processes privileges creative expression and the flow of inventiveness in a spontaneous, natural and free way. It is extremely important that educators are prepared to not only teach music in a professorial and autocratic way, but also to sensitize students by producing the *empowerment* capable of generating safe, conscious, responsible, confident and convincing artists and teachers. In this way, students will be impacted and marked through meaningful, personal, active, critical-reflective and relevant learning, providing sustainability, legitimacy and credibility to the democratic process configured in the collective study of everyone involved.

REFERENCES

ADORNO, TW "Fragment über Musik und Sprache". ***Gesammelte Schriften***. Band 16: Almost a fantasy. Musikalische Schriften III. Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp, 1975.

ANTUNES, R. *From Fordist utilitarian education to freeze-dried multifunctionality*. **National Meeting of the National Postgraduate and Research Association**, 38, 2017, São Luís.

BAKHTIN, M. Speech genres. *In*: Bakhtin, M. **Aesthetics of verbal creation**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1992.

BAKHTIN, M./VOLOCHINOV, V.N. **Marxism and Philosophy of Language**. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1999.

BOTTOMORE, T. **Dictionary of Marxist Thought**. Rio de Janeiro, Jorge Zahar Editor, 1997.

CHAUÍ, M. **Invitation to Philosophy**. Ática Publisher. Sao Paulo-SP. 1994.

DEMO, P. **Introduction to Science Methodology**. São Paulo; Atlas Publisher, 1991.

GROVE MUSIC DICTIONARY. **Concise Edition**. Edited by Stanley Sadie. Translated by Eduardo Francisco Alves. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 1994.

HOUALISS "ONLINE" DICTIONARY, c2009. *Portuguese online dictionary*. Available in: <https://www.dicio.com.br/imagetico/>. Accessed on: 29 Jul. 2021.

DUNSBY, J. "Performers on performance." *In*: Rink (org.). **Musical performance**. Cambridge: University Press, 2006.

HOFFE, O. **Aristotle**. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2008.

HOUISS, A.; VILLAR, M. de S. **Houaiss Dictionary of the Portuguese Language**. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2001.

JAPIASSÚ, HF **Introduction to epistemological thinking**. 3rd ed. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1977.

KONDER, L. **What is Dialectic**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1981.

KUEHN, F.M.C. *Interpretation, musical reproduction, performance theory: bringing together the elements for a conceptual reformulation of the interpretative practice(s)*. **Per Musi**. v. 26. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2012. p. 7-20. Available at: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/pm/n26/02.pdf> Accessed on: May 9, 2021.

LAKATOS, IN; MARCONI, M. de A. **Methodology of scientific work**. São Paulo: Atlas. 1992.

LAKATOS, IN; MARCONI, M. de A. **Fundamentals of scientific methodology**. 5. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2003.

MATTHAY, T. **The visible and invisible in piano technique**. London: Oxford University Press, 1988.

MELLO, LG de. **Cultural anthropology: initiation, theory and themes**. Petrópolis: Voices, 1982.

MORIN, E. **The Path to the future of humanity**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2013.

NEUHAUS, H. **L'art du piano**. France: Editions Van de Velde, 1973.

OLIVA, A. (Org.). **Epistemology: the science in question**. Campinas: Papyrus, 1990. OLIVEIRA, P. de S. **Methodology of the human sciences**. São Paulo. Hucitec – Edunesp. 1998.

PARRA FILHO, D.; SANTOS, J. **Scientific methodology**. São Paulo: Futura, 2000.

PEREIRA, AS **Modern piano teaching**. 2nd ed. São Paulo: Ricordi, 1948.

RAMOS, Arthur. **Introduction to social psychology**. 4th ed. Santa Catarina: UFSC, 2003.

RINK, J. (org.). **Musical performance**. Cambridge: University Press, 2006.

ROCHA, JLS **Creative group piano learning**. São Paulo: Blucher, 2016. Available at: <https://www.blucher.com.br/livro/detalhes/aprendizagem-criativa-de-piano-em-grupo-1228> Accessed on: May 9, 2021.

SAVIANI, D. **School and democracy: theories of education, curvature of the stick, eleven theses on education and politics**. São Paulo: Cortez: Autores Associados, 1991.

SAVIANI, D. **Historical-critical pedagogy**: first approximations. Campinas, SP: Associated Authors, 2011.

SAVOIA, M. Gentil. **Social Psychology**. São Paulo: McGraw-Hill, 1989.

SCHENKER, H. **The Art of Performance**. Translated by Irene Schreier Scott. Edited by Heribert Esser. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

SCHÖNBERG, A. **Style and Idea**. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

SCHÖNBERG, A. **Stil und Gedanke**. Leipzig: Philipp Reclam jun., 1989.

SEVERINO, A.J. **Methodology of scientific work**. 23. ed. rev. and current. São Paulo: Cortez, 2007.

STREY, MN (Org.). **Contemporary social psychology**. 7. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Voices, 2002.

TRINADE, GC **Craft work in contemporary pedagogical thought**. 2012. 222 f. Thesis (Doctorate in Education) – Federal University of São Carlos, São Carlos.

TRIVIÑOS, ANS **Introduction to social science research**: qualitative research in education. São Paulo: Atlas, 1987.

VAZQUEZ, AS **Philosophy of Praxis**. 2nd ed. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Paz e Terra, 1977.

VERGARA, SC **Projects and research reports in administration**. São Paulo: Atlas, 2003.

VIGOTSKI, L.S. **The social formation of mind**: the development of superior processes. Translation: José Cipolla Neto, Luís Silveira Menna Barreto, Solange Castro Afeche. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1998.

VIGOTSKI, L.S. **The construction of thought and language**. Translation: Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2000.