

Music Analysis and the Social Life of Jazz Recordings

By Matthew W. Butterfield

Recorded music long ago relieved us of the hard labor of performing what we wanted to hear. It relieved us of the necessity of going to a concert hall. And now it has even relieved us of any need to listen. In the soundtracking of America—in the constantly segueing fragments that fill our public and private spaces—music is merely the inescapable background, the relentless mood-setter, the arbiter and signal of proper behavior.

—J. Bottum

Elaine: But Jerry! I'll be ostracized from the community!

Jerry: There's a community? All these years I've been living in a community and I never knew about it.

—*Seinfeld*

Music Analysis and Musical Community

In recent years, music theorists have taken an increased interest in jazz and produced more and more analytical studies of improvised jazz solos.¹ For many involved in jazz research, this has been an encouraging sign. Most obviously, it has signaled the respectability jazz has attained within the musicological disciplines since the mid-1980s as a music worthy of detailed criticism. It has also expanded the range and depth of jazz scholarship, providing new points of entry into the field for emerging scholars who may otherwise have pursued a different course. More importantly, however, the growing sophistication of contemporary analytical methods has enriched our understanding of the nature of jazz improvisation, enabling us to ask better questions about the music than in the past.

The expanding repertory of analyses also reflects the increased presence of jazz scholars in academic music departments. Until fairly recently, analytical studies of jazz were relatively rare, and the possibility of making a career teaching and researching jazz from within the musicological disciplines was slim, at best. In the last twenty to thirty years, however, jazz education has largely moved beyond the traditional community-based system of apprenticeship, documented in Paul Berliner's *Thinking in Jazz* (1994:36–59), and taken up residence inside the academy.² Music theo-

Current Musicology, nos. 71–73 (Spring 2001–Spring 2002)

© 2002 by the Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York

rists who specialize in jazz, such as myself, are increasingly finding homes for themselves in music departments seeking either to develop a jazz studies curriculum or simply to diversify their range of course offerings. Often working alongside jazz performance faculty, we now play an active role in training jazz musicians and in cultivating an audience for them among non-musicians. In this context, we have a better opportunity than ever before to affect the ongoing evolution of the jazz tradition, to influence its musical values, and thereby claim a position of greater relevance for local jazz communities.³

Our involvement in those communities is paradoxical, however, for our analytical activities implicitly advance their dissolution. Musical performance involving two or more participants typically serves an integrative social function. It is a form of face-to-face social interaction, which is to say that musically interacting individuals negotiate social relationships through performance, just as they do in other social-interactive contexts. The social bonds emanating from musical interaction tend to be particularly strong, however, because making music requires that performers coordinate a host of temporal and acoustic processes seldom shared in non-musical interactions. For example, locking into a rhythmic groove with others, participating with them in the mutual articulation of time, typically implies a profound interpersonal connection: we rarely share the experience or expression of specific temporal processes with others for they tend to be personal, bound up with intimate processes of the body such as breathing or the beating of one's heart. When we breach this rhythmic privacy and participate with others in the maintenance of an exacting rhythmic groove, we signal some sort of visceral social connection that often feels quite intimate.⁴ This connection can extend to listeners and dancers as well to the extent that they are cognitively and emotionally involved in the musical event and open to the shared experience it projects.⁵

Musical performance itself is thus an "erotic" social practice—an expression of *eros*, the principle of attraction, union, and involvement which binds together—because participation in musical activity tends to encourage the formation of particularly intense social bonds among participants, thereby favoring the development of community.⁶ This is especially true of jazz. More than just a musical style, jazz is also a system of values shared by members of a community brought together by the socially productive forces of its musical activities. Ideally, live jazz performance is social interaction *par excellence*: performers interact musically (and thus socially) with one another and with their audience, whose members participate in turn by evaluating the music and communicating their critical responses to one another and to the musicians as the music unfolds. The recurrence of this

collective interactive process in a series of musical performances with the same participants consolidates social relationships and ultimately fosters the formation of community.⁷

By contrast, analysis works against the erotic social function of music, for it is a solitary pursuit that privileges social isolation in listening: analysts work alone with scores, transcriptions, or sound recordings. The various underlying musical processes and connections to which analysis typically addresses itself are accessible only through the elimination of face-to-face interactive contexts, which are distracting and inhibit the formation of analytical insights. Hence, as a component of the professional activities of music theorists, the doing or reading of analysis advocates a solitary musical experience, ideally a private "performance" situation in which specifically "musical" values are held distinct from and privileged over social ones.

I am not suggesting that analysis is entirely noninteractive. After all, analysts do in some sense interact with composers or performers, as well as with their own readers. Such interactions are mediated, however, and not face-to-face; their erotic potential is therefore attenuated. On the other hand, one might argue that communities of scholars do emerge after the fact of analysis when analysts engage in face-to-face exchanges of ideas at conferences, symposiums, or in other less formal contexts, even online through special-interest discussion groups. But there is a qualitative difference between the erotic effects of social interaction *about* music and social interaction *through* music. The former is really not so different from conversation about other things, like sports or fine dining, with regard to its integrative social potential. By contrast, the latter is more visceral, more immediate and direct, more emotional, and ultimately more powerful in terms of its erotic effects. The crucial point here is the actual fact of being there, where music itself serves as an interactive medium through which strong social bonds are formed and collective experience is shared and affirmed. The solitary listening contexts privileged by analysis thus largely result in the loss of the integrative social function of jazz performance practice, and thereby imply the dissolution of local jazz communities.

This may perhaps seem trivial. After all, what harm can mere music theorists do? Does anyone outside of our field actually read music analysis anyway? The density of analytical writing, the complexity of our techniques, and the impenetrability of music-theoretical jargon have effectively instituted a barrier, shrouding our activities in mystery, ensuring that no one without the proper credentials (not even our parents) will have any idea what we do, much less suffer the pernicious effects of our influence. But the power of music theorists to affect the social function of music on a large scale lies less in our published accounts of musical works

than in the musical values we advance in the classroom for both undergraduate music majors and non-majors.

Analysis lies at the core of formal education in music. College and university music departments generally require undergraduate majors to complete a more or less standard music theory sequence that incorporates some form of analysis, whether they intend to pursue a career in applied music or musicological research. Most students find analysis to be quite difficult, often even painful, but we make them suffer through it because we see it as an invaluable mode of inquiry, a practice that makes one a better listener and a better musician. If nothing else, through analysis students acquire a deeper and more detailed understanding of a specific musical work. Ideally, however, they also learn the value of analytical thinking: they discover how the concepts of music theory can both illuminate and enliven their experience of music, and they learn to use the tools of analysis to enhance their skills at performing, composing, or just listening to music.

In addition to theory courses for music majors, jazz theorists are often called upon to teach jazz history courses in order to accommodate the curricular multitasking needs of their departments. Such courses have become increasingly popular as general education offerings, for they tend to attract substantial numbers of non-majors and thereby bring increased funding to the department.⁸ Students typically come to these classes with little or no background in music. Consequently, like musicologists and ethnomusicologists who also provide such courses, we typically teach active listening skills through a kind of informal style analysis. At the most basic level, students learn to discern the distinct timbre of each instrument and to identify the prevailing mode, meter, and tempo of a tune. They also learn to recognize rhythmic grooves, textural types, and styles of accompaniment; to distinguish solo choruses from ensemble passages; to differentiate between improvised and composed melodies; and eventually, even to identify the form of a given tune. More importantly, they learn to analyze the relationships between these parameters in order to draw conclusions about musical style, such that they can situate a performance in an appropriate historical or cultural context. Ideally, however, they move beyond simple categorization as they develop their listening skills and ultimately attain some degree of aptitude in evaluating the aesthetic qualities of the music we ask them to listen to.

Thus music majors and non-majors alike get practice doing some form of analysis in their music courses. The difference between them at the undergraduate level is really a matter of degree, however, and not kind. It lies primarily in the purpose and scope of their analytical activities, the level of sophistication and detail their analyses attain, and the degree of

formality each exhibits (music majors, after all, must actually write their analyses, while for non-majors analysis is primarily an aspect of listening). Whether or not students ever achieve a high level of proficiency, however, the lesson they learn in the classroom is clear: *music itself rewards analysis*. It merits close scrutiny, for there is more to it than first meets the ear. As a form of highly focused, rigorously organized, active listening, analysis provides the most direct and thorough access to all the layers of meaning and emotional expression found in a musical work. It leads to very deep and moving experiences with music.

Analysis is thus positioned in both theory and history courses as a privileged mode of listening, a highly valued way of experiencing music. If our teaching is successful, our students will continue to practice it in some form beyond the classroom. They may not actually write analyses or take any interest in reading them, but they may well find that doing a bit of analysis—however informally—helps them get to know individual pieces of music better and enhances their experience of them. This is surely a desirable outcome, but it carries with it significant social costs: we are training students today in ever greater numbers to deal with *jazz in solitary analytical situations*, but not in interactive performance situations.

Moreover, we are fostering their dependence on and preference for recordings, for conventional analytical practice positively *requires* recordings for the analysis of jazz improvisation: they enable repeated listening, which favors the kind of in-depth exploration that characterizes analysis; they guarantee the potential for intersubjective corroboration of analytical insights; and their textualization through transcription facilitates the application of common analytical tools. Indeed, from an analytical perspective, live performance can be quite maddening: the music simply flies by too quickly to grasp everything, such that the experience often feels incomplete or inadequate, as though one has missed something important. Recordings, however, allow one to capture and fully experience an abundance of musical relationships unavailable to perception in live music contexts; one gains a greater sense of awareness and control over detail, enhancing the depth of the experience. Thus recordings often seem more accessible and substantive, ironically more *real* than live performances.

In this way, a music curriculum rooted in analysis tends to support and affirm a musical economy dominated by recordings. It does not cause that dominance, but it does not resist it either, and this has enormous implications for the well-being of local jazz communities, which depend on thriving live music scenes both for the financial survival of musicians and for the community-building function of their performance activities. The recording economy, like analysis, has tended increasingly of late to work against the erotic social potential of jazz performance practice for a variety

of reasons: it transforms the social relations of jazz music-making activities; it has had a significant impact on the way Americans value jazz and relate to jazz musicians; and it has had far-reaching effects on the social life of jazz performance events. Accordingly, before examining how we might use analysis to challenge and subvert the implications of this economy rather than sustaining its dominance, we must evaluate the social life of recordings.

Transformations: The Social, Economic, and Political Effects of Recording

The history of jazz is coterminous with and inextricably linked to the history of radio and recording technology. Jazz musicians have always depended to a greater or lesser extent on these media for their survival—they have an obvious financial stake in the commodity market they support. Since radio stations adopted the disk jockey format in the late 1930s, airplay on jazz radio has served two interrelated economic functions for jazz musicians: (1) it advertises a performer's new and old recordings, thereby generating royalties for the artist and profits for the record label; and (2) it popularizes individual musicians and bands, thus maintaining their value and demand on the performance circuit. Conversely, live performance events themselves advertise an artist's recordings. High sales then ensure further recording opportunities, and the cycle starts again when these recordings reach listeners through jazz radio.

This economy has been present throughout much of the history of jazz; in fact, it has been largely constitutive of that history. But advancements in recording technology have ultimately transformed the social value of recorded music. Recordings of early jazz generated considerable excitement as a result of their novelty and the increasingly wide range of music they made available to listeners. Because of their poor sound quality, however, they could only serve as an impoverished simulacrum of live performance; they could not supplant the real thing.⁹ Today, on the other hand, modern digital recording technology and high-fidelity stereo playback systems make possible flawless performances with the most exquisite experience of musical sound imaginable. Due to the situational vagaries of live performance contexts and the fallibility of human performers (and sound technicians), recorded listening often offers a *better* acoustic experience of the music today; in this way, it is actually the performance that provides an imperfect simulacrum of the recording. In part for this reason, recordings have become the dominant mode of reception for music in the United States; many people simply find them more fulfilling than live music.

This state of affairs is extremely profitable to those on the production side of the recording business. When musicians compose or perform on

commission, they typically receive income for their services only once, and from a single source: the individual or organization who commissioned the work or performance. The cost to this party is usually quite steep, of course. On the other hand, public concerts for which a fee can be charged to each individual in attendance enables musicians and others involved in the production of the concert to receive payment from a much larger pool of consumers (potentially hundreds or even thousands) for a single performance. The cost per consumer is thereby reduced, but the profits generated can be considerably higher. With recordings, however, each performance can be heard and purchased by an infinite number of consumers at a relatively low cost. One performance then generates as many payments as there are consumers. Recordings thus have the potential to generate the maximum profits per performance.¹⁰ Costs of production are much higher and the financial risk is unquestionably greater, but the possible payoff makes it worthwhile. Most of the money goes to the record label, of course, for contracts in the music business are typically structured to exploit the performers. But musicians do at least gain notoriety from recordings, especially when they receive air time on jazz radio, and this establishes their marketability on the live performance circuit. Thus, as everyone in the music business knows, the real money ultimately lies in recordings, and the challenge for musicians is to land a recording contract with a major label that has access to a national or international distribution network.

There are significant social implications to the dominance of recorded music today, however. To begin with, jazz musicians tend to take a more compositional approach to improvisation in the recording studio. They leave less to chance, for there is quite a lot at stake: recordings give a jazz musician's peers and other knowledgeable members of the jazz community the opportunity for repeated listening and intense critical scrutiny; poorly received recordings can be very damaging to an artist's career. Consequently, in the studio, jazz musicians are more likely to plan their solos in terms of motivic development and broad dynamic, registral, textural, and rhythmic intensifications. Modern recording technology then allows them to edit errors or blemishes to ensure the highest quality for the product they will ultimately present to the jazz market.¹¹

This has not always been the case, however. It took time for musicians to adjust to the situational particularity of the recording studio and the unique social and musical potentials it offered. According to Jody Berland, this is the way new cultural technologies seem to work in general:

[Marshall McLuhan] contends that each new medium adopts the "content" of its predecessor and thereby disguises its real historical efficacy. Another way of putting this is that cultural hardware pre-

cedes the software that will constitute its content. As Brecht said of radio, it finds a market, and then looks for a reason to exist. The hardware is initially promoted through software appealing to a targeted market on the basis of already-established tastes: early gramophone records, for instance, were mainly recordings of classical music, because it was the middle class who could afford the gramophones, and classical music made gramophones respectable. . . . Similarly early CDs were either classical music or re-releases from the 1960s. As the hardware becomes more widely available, new software (radio programs, video games, CDs) emerges for a larger, more fragmented market. (Berland 1992:43–44)

Berland speaks here in terms of the larger economy from the perspective of marketing and the technological development of new commodities. But we can adopt this framework to illuminate how musicians themselves approach working with new technologies. In the early days of sound recording, musicians initially treated the recording studio (i.e., the new “hardware”) as they had always treated a conventional theater or concert hall: a microphone merely substituted for an actual audience. In other words, they brought the concert frame (i.e., the old “software”) with them into the recording studio.¹² Time in the studio was expensive, and recording techniques were initially quite primitive, so the performers were under some pressure to make an adequate recording in just two or three takes; imperfections abounded, much as in live performance. As the technology developed, however, musicians and recording technicians became aware of new possibilities for ensuring high quality performances. Multi-track recording equipment made possible the recording, mixing, and mastering of a performance part by part, thereby eliminating the need to pretend in the “liveness” of the studio situation. A new framework (i.e., new “software”) has thus emerged governing musicians’ understanding of performance activities in the studio. This has allowed new social patterns and compositional possibilities to arise, such that it is now feasible to record and release “performances” that never actually took place *as* performances.¹³

This is a well-known aspect of pop music recording practices, but it has become increasingly common in jazz as well. For example, in recording his 1995 album *MMTC* (Monk, Miles, Trane & Cannon), Freddie Hubbard had saxophonist Vincent Herring and drummer Carl Allen “[lay] down many of the tracks so Hubbard could record his parts in various sessions over a ten-month period” (Shuster 1995:22). Guitarist John Scofield employed a similar procedure to accommodate Wayne Shorter on the former’s 1996 CD *Quiet*. Scofield and most of his ensemble recorded their parts in February of that year and then sent the tapes to Shorter in Los Angeles, where he overdubbed his parts: “We just comped when there was

to be a solo, pretending Wayne was playing. Then, when he recorded, he responded to that" (quoted in Stewart 1996:26). What is telling here is that neither Scofield nor his *Down Beat* interviewer Zan Stewart express the slightest surprise or embarrassment that Shorter never actually played his part with the other performers—the practice of overdubbing has become that mundane, even in jazz. Listeners, on the other hand, still experience the recording as though the musicians were all co-present during the recorded performance. The final product thus effectively masks from public view a radical transformation of the social relations of jazz performance practice. This is truly an extraordinary state of affairs: recording not only eliminates face-to-face interaction with an audience, but also absolves musicians of the need to interact with other live bodies while making music, should such interaction prove to be inconvenient! Technological advancements have thus altered the social meaning of jazz performance as it takes place in the recording studio. Musical interaction there is largely mediated; as a result, it loses much of its erotic social potential.

According to Richard Bauman, however, mediated communication does often serve one function that conventional dyadic, face-to-face social interaction does not: it tends to enact the authority of the "source utterance"—the original statement that is relayed through a mediator to a secondary target audience. That is, through mediation, the original speaker (or performer) acquires power and authority:

[M]ediational routines . . . play out the process of authorization insofar as they demonstrate by their very design the dominance of the temporally prior source utterance over the target utterance [i.e., the relayed message]. The mediator's replication of the source utterance, by preserving its integrity and displaying special care in its reproduction, amounts to an act of discursive submission, the subordination of present discourse to discourse that emanates from the past. Moreover, I would suggest, submission to the form of the source utterance has a concomitant effect on the rhetorical power of the text: upholding the integrity of the form opens the way to acceptance of the validity of the message. In this way . . . mediational routines . . . are reflexive enactments of the process by which discourse is invested with authority. (Bauman 2001)

With recording, the source utterance takes place in the studio. It is replicated and relayed to its ultimate target audience through LP, cassette, or compact disc via some playback device. This mediation invests the performer(s) and the performance with authority in several ways. First, the performance acquires significance as a message targeted not at a mere individual, but at millions of anonymous potential listeners. Second, the ab-

sence of the musicians during the playback of recordings sets them apart socially, for they are unavailable for social interaction with ordinary listeners. Instead, they are defined as a special class of people with social access to one another, but to whom the general public may not communicate directly. Third, the availability of the recorded performance in commodity form testifies that someone with some degree of control over the technological media of sound reproduction—i.e., someone with power—has already evaluated the performance and deemed it worthy of recording and distribution. Fourth, the performance carries a price tag: it is not just a valued utterance, but one worthy of financial sacrifice on the part of the consumer. Note that commodification here in no way undermines or contradicts the authority or artistic value of the recorded performance, as Lewis Hyde (1979) would argue. Instead, commodification itself actually enacts the authority and value of this performance.

Thus in addition to transforming the social relations of jazz performance, recording alters the social stature of musicians fortunate enough to obtain contracts with good record labels. They become “recording artists,” celebrities within the larger jazz community. Their activities thus acquire a special significance beyond that of ordinary musicians, for it is these individuals who get interviews in jazz trade magazines like *Down Beat* or *JazzTimes*, whose music is played and discussed on jazz radio and is subjected to critical review by music theorists and others who practice music analysis. More importantly, because recording invests jazz musicians with authority, it is generally only recording artists who play consequential roles in jazz history; other musicians participate in this history only insofar as their influence ultimately infiltrates the recording studio in some tangible form. Lastly, it is primarily recording artists whose activities are typically documented by historians, ethnomusicologists, and journalists, by whom they are thus understood and represented as the principal culture-bearers of the jazz tradition. For these reasons, recording artists today comprise the core constituency of what is commonly understood as *the* jazz community; they are its honorary members, and their activities and practices define what it means to be a jazz musician.

Oddly, then, it is the fact of recording that ultimately produces this community as a social group, and not necessarily active participation in musical activity—especially outside of New York. This has had profound social ramifications at the local level, however, for “local” musicians (i.e., those of limited renown without widely distributed recordings) have little cachet on the jazz market. They lack the authority of the recording artist, for as locals, they are too available to ordinary folk to be perceived as extraordinary musicians; few people in general seem to go out of their way to hear them play. Instead, jazz fans are drawn increasingly to concert

events featuring established recording artists from out of town in lieu of casual nights out at local jazz clubs. Those musicians with serious talent and ambition are usually forced to go to New York in pursuit of success, thus draining the local talent pool and diminishing the attractiveness of local jazz as a nightlife commodity. Fewer and fewer jazz clubs are then able to survive in this financial climate, so fewer employment opportunities remain available for local jazz musicians. The net result, I believe, has been a decline in participation at the local level and the steady dissolution of local jazz communities.¹⁴

There are further social effects of the dominance of recorded music in America today bearing more on the experience of listeners. As observed above, recordings are essential for the analytical practices commonly cultivated in college music courses, and they do offer the potential for very deep, emotional experiences with music. The more compositional approach taken by jazz musicians to improvisation in the recording studio is intended in part to accommodate the kind of focused, or “active,” listening undertaken in these contexts.

But we need not attend to music actively when listening to recorded music. Recordings free our musical experiences from performance events, such that we can listen to music anywhere at any time to supplement any conceivable activity. We might listen alone or in the company of others. Our attention may rest on the music itself, or on any number of extramusical pursuits—after all, the performers cannot be offended if we ignore them for a while, or stop paying attention altogether. As a result, we begin to separate musical sound from the conventions of audience social behavior traditionally associated with music of a given style. For example, we do not need to sit quietly in rapt attention while listening to a recording of a Brahms string quartet, nor is there any reason to applaud at the end of a fine improvised jazz solo on a CD. In fact, with recordings, listeners frequently look to music not for the richly textured musical experience acquired through analysis, but for the mood that it sets, the atmosphere it creates as accompaniment to our various nonmusical activities, such as exercising or cleaning one’s dingy apartment. In this “muzakification” of our listening habits, music recedes rapidly into the background of our social experience of musical situations rather than constituting the main line of activity in the foreground of those circumstances.

Record producers and radio station programming directors have taken note of this trend on the part of consumers and have begun building radio playlists around this mode of listening. They rely on the marketing research of agencies like the New Jersey-based firm Broadcast Architecture (BA), founded in 1988. BA applies the “Mix-Master” test to new recordings to determine their potential to attract listeners and improve ratings. As reported in *Down Beat*, the test works as follows:

About 100 people gather in a hotel ballroom. Each cradles a little remote control box in their hands with a dial. Music plays over a speaker system in 10-second sound bytes. Occasionally, it's longer—12 seconds, maybe 15. The participants listen to about 600 sound bytes in two-and-a-half hours. They turn the dial one way if they like the song, the other way if they loathe it. The scores range from zero to 100. A score of 70 or better means airplay is likely. Below 70 and it's usually history.

In a nearby room, station officials and BA consultants stare at a video monitor with lines that dance across its screen. Jokingly called the EKG, the lines show listeners' real-time reactions to the sound bytes as grouped by demographics: avid listeners, part-time listeners, men, women, age, ethnic groups. The lines also show when squealing saxophones break the mood, solos drone on too long and when listeners want to change stations.

Pass the test, you get on BA's recommended airplay list, delivered weekly to its 26 client stations, nine in the top 10 radio markets nationwide. Weekly trade papers report BA's decisions, and non-client stations follow its lead. (BA isn't the only consultant on the scene but unquestionably the most successful.)

To paraphrase one San Francisco Bay Area musician, if BA gives your song a thumbs up, nationwide airplay is guaranteed—thumbs down and it's time to take up plumbing. (Levin 1999a:38)

Those BA client stations who have adopted the firm's "smooth jazz" playlist have witnessed a dramatic rise in their Arbitron ratings. As a result, this genre has emerged in the past ten years as one of the most successful programming formats in practically every radio market in the nation. In principle, this has brought more listeners to jazz than at any time since the Swing Era. But many well-known jazz musicians (including those who, like Pat Metheny, Chick Corea, and the Yellowjackets, originated the smooth jazz format in the late 1980s) have found their music increasingly left out in the cold. They fail the test and are then unable to get airplay. Dore Steinberg, a former music director at San Francisco's KKSF, explains why: "There is a formula, a real value system to what works. . . . If you go off on a synth guitar solo that rocks out or your saxophone bleeps or you puncture that atmosphere for a moment, you either have to find an edit to get that out or it's not going to get play" (ibid.). The procedure described in the following anecdote is typical of the kind of on-air editing radio stations do today:

Kenny Garrett's alto saxophone spills from the speakers inside the Sacramento, California, studios of KXJZ. Over a soothing Latin

groove, Garrett caresses the Frank Sinatra classic "It Was a Very Good Year." Meanwhile, DJ Paul Conley, his right hand on a volume fader, keeps his eyes glued to a compact disc player's clock. At exactly 3 minutes and 15 seconds, Conley slides the fader down, slowly taking Garrett to a whisper and then to nothing.

The ending is premature. Garrett and his General Music Project II still had another 2 minutes and 13 seconds of blowing. Conley has left the sound of Garrett up in my headphones, while he brings up the next cut, Art Pepper's 1956 ballad, "Diane." As Pepper now booms out to thousands of listeners in the Sacramento Valley and Lake Tahoe, Garrett takes a sharp left from poetic tonality into more dissonant territory.

"It becomes a little edgier," says Conley, an occasional producer of National Public Radio's "Jazz Profiles." The fade was no accident. KXJZ Music Director Gary Vercelli designed it in advance, believing that a more frenetic solo might scare off listeners. In fact, Vercelli has marked the CD's jewel box with a small yellow post-it, noting the DJ should fade by exactly 3:42—the point at which Garrett takes his solo "out." (Levin 1999b:44)

With much contemporary jazz today, however, such live in-studio editing is unnecessary. To survive, many musicians take it upon themselves to accommodate the stylistic demands of the market in advance. The enormous popular success of smooth jazz suggests not only that a system of atmospheric or ambient values governs musical reception for a large portion of today's jazz market, but that this aesthetic increasingly prevails in the domain of musical production. There is nothing unusual about this sort of self-censorship, of course, as Adorno suggests:

The customary invectives against commercial mischief in music are superficial. They delude regarding the extent to which phenomena that presuppose commerce, the appeal to an audience already viewed as customers, can turn into compositorial qualities unleashing and enhancing a composer's productive force. We may phrase this in the form of a more comprehensive legality: *Social compulsions under which music seems to be placed from without are absorbed by its autonomous logic and the need for compositorial expression, and are transformed into an artistic necessity: into steps of the right consciousness.* (Adorno 1976:208; emphasis added)

Under present market circumstances, however, there is considerable cause for concern among mainstream traditional jazz musicians for whom smooth jazz carries little appeal, and who consequently resist "absorb[ing]

... its autonomous logic." Since KJAZ of Alameda, California, went off the air in 1994, no single commercial, twenty-four hour, all-jazz FM radio station outside of the smooth jazz format has graced the airwaves anywhere in the United States. Furthermore, during the 1990s, most public radio stations significantly curtailed their jazz programming or eliminated it altogether in favor of classical, folk, or talk-radio formats (Levin 1999b). There are thus fewer and fewer media outlets available to these musicians to get their music to the public. Meanwhile, the popularity of smooth jazz continues to rise, and its market power dictates an aesthetic in which many mainstream jazz musicians find no expressive potential. With few marketable alternatives available, their resistance to this aesthetic leaves them in an increasingly precarious financial position.

The smooth jazz format has been so successful because it is designed to accommodate the passive listening practices fostered by recordings. As suggested by Dore Steinberg above, anything in this style that grabs a listener's attention and unsettles the soporific mood it sets must be assiduously excised. The "Fusak" that emerges from this surgical "melodectomy" just barely distinguishes itself from traditional Muzak by cloaking itself in a pale façade of jazz style. Its social function is the same, however: it sets the mood for a particular activity or occasion without asserting itself as the main line of attention in that situation. But passive listening practices are possible (and increasingly common, it appears) with virtually any kind of music, no matter how interesting or exciting it may be. My jazz history students, for example, often interpret moments when I play them recordings in class as opportunities to chat with their neighbors—I either have to remind them to listen, or head off their disattention by giving them something specific to listen for. They have simply grown accustomed to the idea of music—especially instrumental music—as a "background" accompaniment to some other activity.

This is not surprising, of course, for recorded music today saturates our lives: we hear it virtually everywhere we go, from the dentist's office to the mall to the bar or café. Its very omnipresence, according to J. Bottum, "has even relieved us of any need to listen" (2000:59). But beyond the financial implications for mainstream jazz musicians, this widespread muzakification of listener behavior has significant ramifications for the social life of live jazz performances: audiences today frequently bring conflicting social agendas, musical values, and behavioral framing practices to jazz clubs. A performance by the Wallace Roney Quintet I attended at Zanzibar Blue in Philadelphia will serve as an example.

At the time of this show in late December 1996, Zanzibar Blue, Philadelphia's most prestigious jazz club, had just moved from its home of six years on 11th Street in Center City to a new location at the Bellevue Hotel on Broad Street. The new space was larger, allowing Zanzibar to

augment its patronage, and also more distinguished, for at the time, Broad Street just south of City Hall in Philadelphia was undergoing a cultural renaissance as the "Avenue of the Arts." The Bellevue, a luxury hotel in the heart of Center City, sits next to the Academy of Music (home of the world famous Philadelphia Orchestra), the Merriam Theater of the University of the Arts, the Clef Club of Performing Arts, and the new Wilma Theater.

Krin Gabbard has written of the elite stature that jazz has attained in recent years. He observes its presence as background music for luxury car, credit card, and banking commercials: "Advertisers no longer use jazz to connote the nightlife and slumming that can be purchased along with their products—jazz can now signify refinement and upper-class status, once the exclusive province of classical music" (Gabbard 1995:1–2). This lofty standing is certainly evident at the new Zanzibar, where the music complements the club's exquisite (and quite expensive) cuisine. Zanzibar's décor is elegant and plush, with fine wood paneling articulating the dark Oxford green color scheme. The management maintains a strict dress code: sneakers and athletic gear are forbidden, and blue jeans are officially "discouraged." Thus in contrast to nightspots like the very informal Ortlieb's Jazzhaus in North Philly, Zanzibar Blue clearly targets an upscale clientele. This is reflected in their hefty entertainment fee of fifteen dollars per person per set—rather inexpensive compared to the thirty to forty dollar minimum one can expect to pay at some of the more prestigious New York clubs, but quite pricey for the Philadelphia market nonetheless.

The stage at Zanzibar is elevated about one-and-a-half feet above the main floor of the dining area. A wall borders the stage on the right, opposite a massive pillar that articulates the front left corner, and unfortunately blocks the view of those seated on that side. Several rows of tables line the main floor in front of the stage, arranged perpendicular to it such that patrons on either side get a view of the musicians. To the left of these tables sits a row of booths separating the central dining room from the kitchen area.

On the night of the Wallace Roney performance, my friends and I arrived at Zanzibar about fifteen minutes before the set began. The six members of our party were seated in one of the booths to the left of the stage, three of us facing the musicians, the rest with our backs to them. We ordered drinks, but mostly passed on food since, as we were graduate students at the time, we really could not afford it. At nine o'clock sharp, the band walked on stage, the emcee introduced them, and the music began.

The ensuing set was remarkable not so much for the music that was performed, but for the sheer difficulty of attending to it amid a host of distractions. The band had to compete with waiters and waitresses who con-

tinued serving dinners and cocktails to patrons shouting their orders above the music, as well as with kitchen sounds such as blenders, dishwashers, and the occasional broken glass or plate. The audience itself displayed an almost complete indifference to the musical events taking place. Throughout the performance, they continued their dinner conversations, albeit at a higher volume to rise above the level of the music. The family on one side of us was consumed by a discussion of the Chicago Bears (who evidently were not very good at the time). On the other side, a group of three couples interrupted their conversation to clap politely only when they observed our enthusiastic applause at the conclusion of a good solo—without our cues, I cannot imagine they would have taken any notice of the music whatsoever. In fact, more often than not, we found ourselves to be the only table in the restaurant actively attending to the music, and because of this the performance never really got off the ground. There was little interaction between the band and the audience, our table notwithstanding, as we were not seated to advantage near the stage.

Unfortunately, this was not the first time that the new Zanzibar had had problems with noise during a performance. In early December of that year, about three weeks prior to the Wallace Roney show, the legendary Abbey Lincoln was scheduled for a four-night stint there. She sang one set and was so appalled and offended at the inattentiveness and general lack of respect she received from the audience that she canceled the rest of her Philadelphia engagement.

To its credit, the Zanzibar management was sensitive to the problem. Sometime after the Wallace Roney performance, they installed a wall closing the kitchen off from the main dining area in hope of reducing kitchen noise. And they began placing small placards on their tables requesting that their patrons remain quiet out of respect for the musicians and other customers. But beyond that, there was little they could do to control the behavior of their patrons. The fact of the matter is that Zanzibar Blue is a business whose ultimate goal is to make money. Their income derives primarily from food and drink orders, and not from the entertainment fee. Thus, they can ill afford to discipline their customers for making dinner conversation *at dinner*.

This tension between commerce and art is not unique to Zanzibar Blue, of course. It is an increasingly common feature of jazz club performance throughout America. Since the bebop era, jazz clubs have been the proper milieu of the music, where it is most at home. The informality of the setting and the availability of alcohol in particular have traditionally favored the erotic social potential of the music. But the noise associated with drinking and dining at Zanzibar and elsewhere has never been so great a problem for live jazz (which can actually accommodate a fair

amount of audience clamor and extramusical activity) as the high degree of disattention from its patrons. Such disattention testifies to a new social function and aesthetic value for the music, and new patterns of audience social behavior. In such contexts, the principal focus of the evening for most of the customers—what they interpret as the main line of activity in the situation—is not the music at all, but the meal. Some treat the music as an aspect of the background décor that lends upper-class stature to the occasion. It is a piece of apparel, a fur coat in sound, clothing the meal and those partaking of it in elegance and refinement. Prestige arises not only from the fact that this “background” music is live, but also that it is performed by world-class jazz musicians. For others, however, the music is supposed to set a relaxing mood conducive to dinner conversation without drawing attention to itself. When the musicians challenge their definition of the situation by playing a louder, more assertive style of music, the diners respond by simply raising their voices.

The frame confusion that has emerged at jazz clubs like Zanzibar Blue has led many jazz musicians to prefer concert performance over nightclub events. Their reasons may be both personal and economic, as suggested by pianist Keith Jarrett in explaining why his trio does not generally play small-room venues anymore:

Unfortunately, there’s much more than the setting itself. For example, we can’t go into a club and play one night. And we’re not getting younger, and we have other things we do. Plus, you don’t want people tearing down the doors, and the socioeconomic implications of playing not enough nights for the amount of people, and the ticket prices go up—all that bunch of baloney. (quoted in Ephland 1996:20)

Sonny Rollins, on the other hand, makes more explicit his preference for the prestige of concert performance over the lack of dignity he associates with nightclub gigs:

Jazz needs some dignity. It needs to be looked at as a serious, important art form. And if you’re going to be playing in nightclubs, I don’t care what you say, you’re not going to get that kind of respect for it. Not that the respect is even the thing that’s going to put jazz over the top—I don’t know. But it’s just the idea that if you’re just playing nightclubs, it just diminishes the music in some kind of way. At this time, 1997, I think it’s just not enough to be playing nightclubs. It’s just not enough, you know. It wasn’t for me 20 years ago. It’s not proper. If you want to do it, OK. But you shouldn’t *have* to do it. (quoted in Belden 1997:25)

Jazz concerts do certainly provide professional jazz musicians with a better opportunity to display their craft to an appreciative, attentive audience—one whose behavior is guided largely by the conventional social structure of concert events, and not by extramusical concerns. Thus for many jazz musicians and jazz fans, concerts have become the ideal format for live performances—one in which their music is properly evaluated and given the respect it deserves as an artistic achievement.

The association of the concert hall with prestige has been an element of jazz history almost since its inception. Indeed, jazz musicians have always borne something of a chip on their collective shoulder, an inferiority complex vis-à-vis the cultural establishment of “legit” Western art music, and have always coveted the prestige associated with the concert hall. They typically perceive performances at prestigious venues like Carnegie Hall or Lincoln Center as milestones not just for themselves, but for the music in general. For example, Paul Whiteman, widely hailed as the “King of Jazz” in the 1920s, believed that the only way to prove the value of the new music he was performing was to present a concert at New York’s Aeolian Hall:

I believed that jazz was beginning a new movement in the world’s art of music. I wanted it to be recognized as such. I knew it never would be in my lifetime until the recognized authorities on music gave it their approval.

My idea for the concert was to show these skeptical people the advance which had been made in popular music from the day of the discordant early jazz to the melodious form of the present . . .

My task was to reveal the change and try to show that jazz had come to stay and deserved recognition. (Whiteman and McBride 1974:94)

Wynton Marsalis’s acclaimed Jazz at Lincoln Center concert series is merely the latest (and evidently most successful) effort to date to establish jazz firmly as “America’s classical music.” The repertory jazz movement has emerged with considerable momentum in the past two decades in response to this classicizing impulse; ensembles such as the Smithsonian Jazz Masterworks Orchestra are dedicated to performing note-for-note recreations of the masterpieces of Duke Ellington, Count Basie, and others. But the listening practices and social behaviors that emerge in the concert hall bear little resemblance to those described in much of the jazz literature or represented with such nostalgic yearning in films like Robert Altman’s *Kansas City*—they lack the erotic social potential of traditional jazz nightclub performance. Historian Scott DeVeaux perhaps expresses it best: “As

jazz acquires degree programs, piano competitions, repertory ensembles, institutes, and archives, it inevitably becomes a different kind of music—gaining a certain solidity and political clout, but no longer participating in the ongoing formulation of meaning; no longer a *popular* music in the best sense of the word” (1991:553).

Conclusion: New Roles for Analysis

For a variety of reasons, then, recording and the music culture it has produced work against the integrative social function of jazz music-making activities. In the studio itself, recording has led to the compartmentalization of performance practice, such that jazz musicians no longer need to be co-present during the recording process. The very act of recording then transforms the social stature of musicians, investing their activities with authority as recording artists, thereby setting them apart from average citizens while simultaneously devaluing the activities of “local” jazz musicians. Moreover, the omnipresence of recorded music in recent decades has pushed the role of music into the background “soundtrack” of our lives, where it frequently lends ambience to extramusical activities, much like Muzak. In this context, smooth jazz has come to dominate the jazz market, especially on radio, leaving fewer and fewer media outlets for mainstream—much less avant-garde—jazz musicians to get their music to the public. As a result, frame confusion abounds in jazz nightclubs today, as listeners accustomed to hearing jazz as background music on recordings fail to understand conventions of audience behavior at live performance events. This has led many prominent jazz musicians out of the nightclub and onto the concert stage, where a different economy and social architecture prevail, positioning the music itself as the main line of activity rather than as accompaniment to something else, but significantly curtailing its erotic efficacy.

Because it cultivates active listening practices, training in analysis does offer a means for resisting the growing muzakification of our students’ listening habits, thereby subverting the passive modes of listening so often elicited by recordings. But, as we have seen, both the social isolation required for analysis and its actual dependence on recordings work toward the dissolution of local jazz communities in a variety of ways. Instead of challenging the negative social implications of the recording economy for jazz musicians, analysis supports and affirms that economy by fostering a preference for CDs over live performance events. It is not that jazz as a musical tradition is in any danger of extinction from the effects of analysis and recording. Young musicians are still finding their ways to the music and succeeding, still attracting audiences and making a decent living at it. In fact, *Down Beat* magazine recently made a point of forecasting a bright

future for jazz by devoting their issue of June 1999 to a cast of twenty-five "rising jazz stars" all under forty years old. Their editorial motives were clear: "We feel the need to take stock and watch for those young players who not only ensure the music's survival, but promise to take it to the next level" (Enright 1999). But the social appeal and erotic efficacy of live jazz performance events, especially at the local level, disappear within an analytical practice that can only accommodate recorded music. I have chosen to explore an essentially negative critique of the present jazz scene in order to understand not how jazz seems tenaciously to survive against all odds, but why so many jazz performances today fail as integrative social events when evidently they were so successful in the past.

We are thus confronted with a predicament: how can we analyze jazz without negating its social foundation? How can we avail ourselves of the insights gained from analysis and simultaneously advocate the erotic social power of the music? How can we use recordings in analysis to resist the negative social effects of the recording economy, and thereby support local jazz musicians and the communities their performance activities sustain?

I believe that music theory can best promote the integrative social function of jazz by developing practical tools for the real-time analysis of music in the context of live performance events. The specific goal of such analysis would be *to reinvigorate the social life of musical events by cultivating strategies for cognitive and social involvement*. Listeners are "involved" in a performance when the music sustains their attention as the main line of activity, leaving them open to its aesthetic *and* erotic effects (and in effective jazz performance, I believe these are inextricably related). Analysis would be a means of critical engagement with the event as a whole, eliciting and maintaining involvement in the process. It would proceed by evaluating the contextual relationships between music perception, social behavior, and situational structure—a function of the social, economic, temporal, spatial, and acoustic organization of the event. The configuration of these elements in a given musical situation sets the terms for analysis, for it determines a social organization in which music functions a particular way, in which certain musical values are perceptually relevant and others not. Bound by situational constraints, analysis would then be geared toward criticism, as analysts would draw on an array of techniques and concepts to evaluate how effectively the musician(s) play the situation—i.e., how they respond to the situational constraints of the event both musically and socially.

Ruth Stone's *Let the Inside Be Sweet* (1982), a music ethnography of the Kpelle people of Liberia, can be viewed as a precedent for the "situational" paradigm for analysis proposed here.¹⁵ Stone sets out to develop a unitary approach to ethnography that will bridge the gap she perceives

between those ethnomusicologists who study musical sound and those who focus on musical behavior. Her answer to this intradisciplinary schism is ethnography centered on the musical event itself, rather than on the explication of either musical or cultural systems. Event-centered ethnography, she contends, provides empirical grounding for statements about both musical sound and behavior, each of which is relevant for the production and comprehension of musical meaning in a given situation.

The analytical aims of Stone's event-centered ethnography differ from the situational approach I am proposing here, however. The goal of the former is to generalize from an analysis of a society's paradigmatic musical events to an understanding of its culture, where culture appears as the more or less stable set of practices and values embodied by that society. The particular musical event then constitutes an exemplary part or product of broader musical and cultural systems. By contrast, the goal of a performance-centered music-analytical practice is less to read culture through the musical event (or even to uncover the production of culture as an outcome of the event) than to examine the perceptual and social possibilities generated in specific musical situations: how the structure of the situation shapes the possibility for music perception and the emergence and maintenance of musical community. Culture functions in this approach not as the endpoint of analysis, but as a background context for the specific situation, a provisionally stable field of practices and values by which participants infer musical meaning and adopt appropriate social behavior.¹⁶

I am ultimately advocating an informal analytical practice—one that serves a practical purpose for listeners, but that need not be written up formally. In order for this mode of analysis to move beyond "active listening" on the one hand, or mere anecdotal accounts of performances on the other, however, we will need to develop analytical techniques by theorizing about possibilities for musical experience in the context of live performance situations. Preliminary written accounts, which will be experimental in nature and undertaken after the event as a means of reflecting upon its success or failure as an integrative sociomusical occasion, will advance this purpose, illuminating aspects of experience that require more theorizing.¹⁷ The goal, however, is to arrive at a cogent theoretical framework with practical pedagogical applications.

Because it seeks to integrate aspects of music perception and social behavior, a situational analytical paradigm requires an interdisciplinary approach. Music theory, of course, offers an array of practical techniques through aural skills training that can be cultivated to sustain cognitive involvement in ongoing musical processes. Without scores or recordings, one loses access to a considerable volume of musical detail, for many of the pitch structures we commonly identify in analysis are not accessible in live performance contexts—this is not to say that they are inaudible, but

that their audibility is a function of situational structure. Other musical parameters, however, are more cognitively available and socially relevant in performance. Listeners respond to mode, texture, timbre, tempo, register, and rhythm in particular; they are also sensitive to dramatic shape, processes of intensification, as well as elements of continuity and discontinuity. We need to develop practical tools to facilitate tracking such elements in real time and evaluating their effects.

Theories of music perception could also be adapted for practical analytical applications, and concepts drawn from cognitive psychology, cognitive semantics, and music semiotics, as well. Though developed and typically illustrated with reference to musical scores, such theories implicitly address real-time musical experience, and can be used to provide explanatory frameworks for understanding how music produces its aesthetic effects.¹⁸ Research in sociology, anthropology, ethnomusicology, and performance studies would provide theoretical grounding for analyzing the social organization and situational structure of performance events, illuminating their erotic potential, while also addressing rhetorical practices for writing about performance events.¹⁹

There are, of course, significant consequences to a situational paradigm for analysis. Most obviously, the object of analysis must change. Conventional analytical practice typically concerns the illumination of a musical work that putatively exists in an objective sense, that is self-identical through time, independent of the contexts of its creation and continued reception—in a word, autonomous. Works are thus attributed a universal status above and beyond their specific realization in performance, such that what one says of a piece is said in a general sense, pertaining to all its potential performances at the cost of the particularity of any single performance. Such reliance on the “work-concept” enables analysts to escape the dependence of a piece of music on the contexts in which it is encountered; it sustains a clear opposition between the musical and the extramusical, and thereby provides a way of rationalizing away the vagaries of particular performances.²⁰

However, from a situational perspective that emphasizes the interrelatedness of musical sound and situational structure, the formation of the musical/extramusical opposition is itself a contextual matter; understanding of immanent context is then a precondition for an understanding of the notes and for evaluating the relationships among them. We cannot assume the objective existence of the work as such, but must explore the situational structure through which the work is presented as an object—that is, through which the illusion of its autonomy is maintained and promulgated. This entails a fundamental shift in the underlying theoretical aims of analysis: instead of theorizing about pitch structures and analyzing particular musical works to illustrate our claims, we theorize about

situational structures and use particular performances to illustrate them. For jazz analysis, this also implies a shift in the way we use recordings: instead of treating the recording itself as a work, it becomes a vehicle for practicing the techniques of real-time analysis that will be employed in live performance events.

A more important consequence of a performance-centered analytical paradigm is the loss of the potential for intersubjective corroboration. In analyzing works, theorists have access to scores, transcriptions, or recordings. In analyzing specific performance events, however, we often have none of these. Unless we take steps to document the event through audio or video recording—a complex process requiring considerable foresight and planning (not to mention securing permission from a number of parties)—nothing remains to enable the verification of our analytical claims or critical conclusions.

It would be a mistake, however, to imagine that such documentation would adequately solve the problem of intersubjective corroboration for the analysis of live performance events, for documentation is less significant in this regard than the transformation of situational structure. Conventional analytical practice treats listening as an experimental pursuit and sets up situational constraints to control musical experience, to delimit its focus and circumscribe the perspective from which the music is beheld. This enables us to isolate and magnify particular details in order to test their effects. The solitary listening contexts we adopt for analysis thus resemble artificially constructed lab situations; they promote the best conditions for intersubjective corroboration of analytical claims.

By contrast, live performances typically offer an abundance of angles from which to approach the music. Perspectives vary according to the spatial positioning of participants and their immediate acoustic environments, the background knowledge and experience they bring to the event, their individual social motivations for being there, and the availability of side activities to occupy their attention. A video or audio recording can provide only a limited point of view that cannot adequately represent the range of possible perspectives. Thus even with recorded documentation, not only are the situational constraints of live performance events not conducive to intersubjective corroboration, the sheer diversity of perspectives available at such events renders it less meaningful.

Under such conditions, analysis necessarily becomes a different kind of activity; no longer able to accommodate the requirements of a quasi-scientific mode of inquiry, it becomes more of an ethnographic pursuit, a kind of music-theoretical fieldwork. Rather than falling back on a recording and taking the performance event out of its context to consider it from an "armchair" analytical perspective, we bring analysis into live per-

formance events, as something we can do while there, rather than something done after the fact. Analysis then becomes a form of participant observation, the ultimate practical application of the concepts and skills we develop in music theory and cultivate in our students. It relinquishes the kinds of claims that require intersubjective corroboration, and seeks instead to advocate for the social life of musical events, to recapture the atmosphere of carnival that live jazz should possess, and thereby inspire participation and motivate listener involvement. In this way, it resists the domination of recordings, the social structures they produce, and the modes of listener behavior they entail.

A situational paradigm for analysis would broaden the scope of our involvement with jazz and extend the relevance of music theory to others in jazz studies with less knowledge of our discipline. It would bring theory into interdisciplinary dialogue with fields such as ethnomusicology, sociology, anthropology, and communication studies, which have not traditionally held much relevance for music theorists. We could then enter into real discussions over the present and future state of jazz, and take a proactive stance in ensuring not so much the preservation of the music as the continued health and viability of the musical situations in which it is encountered, thereby enabling jazz to grow both musically and socially.

Notes

1. Since 1990, these include, among others: Block (1993), Brownell (1994), Charry (1997–98), Folio (1995, 1997–98), Kurzdorfer (1996), Larson (1997–98, 1998), Lindeman (1997–98), Martin (1996, 1997–98), Murphy (1998), Potter (1990), Smith (1991), Strunk (1996), Waters (1996), and Williams (1997–98).

2. For an account of jazz education in colleges and universities, see Butterfield (2000:269–83).

3. There are, to be sure, many kinds of communities. Throughout this essay, however, I shall be concerned primarily with localized, “face-to-face” communities—communities whose members generally inhabit the same (relatively small) geographic area, and who, for the most part, know (or at least know of) one another. Such communities are to be distinguished from larger, more anonymous communities defined by, say, ethnicity (e.g., the African American community) or profession (e.g., the medical community). Hence, I am less concerned with the “jazz community” as a largely anonymous, global assemblage of jazz musicians and jazz fans defined by their love of and concern for this music than with more local communities comprised of individuals who develop social relationships through the socially productive forces of jazz music-making activities.

4. This interpersonal negotiation of groove and the social connection it implies also underlies Charles Keil’s theory of “participatory discrepancies.” See Keil (1994a, 1994b). This, incidentally, explains why it is often so difficult to make good music with a person one does not like.

5. For a detailed account of music as an agent of community formation, see Butterfield (2000:119–69).

6. I derive this usage of “erotic” from Lewis Hyde, who views gift exchange as an “erotic commerce” opposed to commodity exchange, which derives from *logos*, the principle of differentiation (1979:xivn). Gift exchange, asserts Hyde, unites its participants in a social bond with one another, whereas commodity exchange draws a boundary between them.

7. On musical interaction in jazz and its social implications, see Monson (1996:73–96) and Berliner (1994:416–46).

8. *Down Beat* reported in 1995 that up to five hundred students per semester would typically take Gerald Wilson’s jazz history course at UCLA (Helland 1995:24). I have had similar enrollments in my courses at Eastern Illinois University and the University of Virginia between the fall of 2000 and the spring of 2002.

9. To be sure, our perception and evaluation of these recordings must be relative, conditioned by the high-fidelity playback equipment available today, but I do not believe we should assume that they were easier on the ears back in the 1920s.

10. This is true, of course, with printed music, which like recordings, is infinitely reproducible and generates income with each sale. But the profits are on a lesser scale, for printed music appeals only to those with musical instruments who can read and play music; it takes work on the part of the consumer to realize the musical product. Recordings, on the other hand, require no musical skill. They offer an instant visceral experience to anyone who purchases them, provided they have some kind of playback device (and most people in America today do).

11. Sonny Rollins makes this explicit in an interview in *Down Beat*:

I became very self-conscious about recording around the '70s. I wanted to do a lot of takes on everything and try to put out the best representation of what I could do. Of course, I was doing that in the '60s also, so I shouldn't say that. I mean, when I was with RCA, I had access to the RCA studios up on 24th Street, and I used to go by there 24 hours a day, you know, whenever I wanted to, and practice. Then, I also was able to do a lot of different tracks. I remember I was up there with George Avakian, who was producing me at that time, and I had the option of doing as many tracks as I wanted to—he deferred to me. So that was something I started doing before. But in the '70s, I also wanted to have that kind of control. I always wanted to have control, of course, over what I did, for one thing because I wanted to make sure that what came out was the best representation of Sonny Rollins, and I thought I knew what that is. Now, I might not be perfect in that. Some people hear things in my playing that I don't hear, you know. But nevertheless, I felt that I wanted to be able to have the final say in what came out. (quoted in Belden 1997:24–25)

12. The same could be said of early cinema: actors, directors, and producers initially brought theatrical practices with them to the film studio. It took time for them to realize the distinctly cinematic possibilities the new medium had made available.

13. Cf. Cook (2001:20): “But it is in the case of recordings that product and process have become most inextricably intertwined. The recording (a marketable

product) purports to be the trace of a performance (process), but is in reality usually the composite product of multiple takes and more or less elaborate sound processing—in other words, less a trace than the representation of a performance that never actually existed.” See also Shumway (1999:192).

14. Chicago is a case in point. In a 1996 interview in *Down Beat*, tenor players Fred Anderson and Von Freeman reminisced about the 1940s and '50s, when “63rd Street, 58th Street, 61st Street, 55th Street, 43rd Street, 47th Street, 38th Street—these South Side streets all had taverns and places with jam sessions.” This thriving scene collapsed in the 1970s, and since then, as Freeman observes, “it’s *hard* to find cats who can play” in Chicago. The “difference between New York and other places [is] the competition. And everybody migrates there who wants to make it.” The interview, appropriately entitled “Tenacity,” reflects Anderson and Freeman’s continuing survival in Chicago, decades after the disintegration of its jazz scene, as the exception to the rule (Corbett 1996:29). For a discussion of Von Freeman’s role in Chicago’s South Side jazz community during the 1970s and early '80s, see the article by T. M. Scruggs in this issue (pp. 179–99).

15. Two other precedents worth noting here are Rose (1994) and Howard (1994).

16. Although an account of the social production of culture is beyond the scope of the present argument, it is important here to acknowledge the potential for feedback from specific musical situations to the general level of culture: background cultural values can be generated and transformed by individual events in the social foreground. This is an underlying theme in the work of anthropologist Victor Turner. See, for example, the many fine essays in Turner (1986).

17. For a preliminary example of situational analysis in this direction, see Butterfield (2000:247–63) where I provide an account of a live performance of Ron Carter’s “Blues for D. P.” and compare it to a recorded performance from his 1994 CD *Jazz, My Romance* (Blue Note D106382).

18. See, for example, Meyer (1956, 1973), Narmour (1990, 1992), Lerdahl and Jackendoff (1983), Rozin (2000), and Zbikowski (forthcoming).

19. On the social organization of performance situations, see especially Goffman (1959, 1974), Harrison-Pepper (1990), Turner (1986), Schechner (1977), Schechner and Appel (1990), and Small (1998). For discussions of ethnographic writing and strategies of presentation, see Van Maanen (1988) and Marcus and Fischer (1986).

20. The “work-concept,” according to Lydia Goehr (1992), is a “regulative idea” that has governed the production, commodification, and circulation of musical objects since the early nineteenth century. Goehr offers this view as a historical corrective to the analytic theories of Nelson Goodman (1969) and Jerrold Levinson (1980), both of whom she critiques at length (Goehr 1992:13–86). See pages 89–119 for a detailed account of the work-concept’s operation.

References

- Adorno, Theodor W. 1976. *Introduction to the Sociology of Music*. Translated by E. B. Ashton. New York: Continuum.
- Bauman, Richard. 2001. Mediational Performance, Traditionalization, and the Authorization of Discourse. In *Verbal Art Across Cultures: The Aesthetics and*

- Proto-Aesthetics of Communication*, edited by Helga Kotthoff and Hubert Knoblauch, 91–117. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Belden, Bob. 1997. Sonny Rollins: Jazz Artist of the Year. *Down Beat* (August): 18–25.
- Berland, Jody. 1992. Angels Dancing: Cultural Technologies and the Production of Space. In *Cultural Studies*, edited by Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler, 38–51. New York and London: Routledge.
- Berliner, Paul. 1994. *Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Block, Steven. 1993. Organized Sound: Pitch-Class Relations in the Music of Ornette Coleman. *Annual Review of Jazz Studies* 6: 229–52.
- Bottum, J. 2000. The Soundtracking of America. *Atlantic Monthly* (March): 56–70.
- Brownell, John. 1994. Analytical Models of Jazz Improvisation. *Jazzforschung/Jazz Research* 26: 9–29.
- Butterfield, Matthew W. 2000. *Jazz Analysis and the Production of Musical Community: A Situational Perspective*. Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania.
- Charry, Eric. 1997–98. Freedom and Form in Ornette Coleman's Early Atlantic Recordings. *Annual Review of Jazz Studies* 9: 261–94.
- Cook, Nicholas. 2001. Between Process and Product: Music and/as Performance. *Music Theory Online* 7, no. 2: 1–31.
- Corbett, John. 1996. Tenacity: Fred Anderson, Von Freeman, and the Chicago Tenor Tradition. *Down Beat* (July): 28–33.
- DeVeaux, Scott. 1991. Constructing the Jazz Tradition: Jazz Historiography. *Black American Literature Forum* 25: 525–60.
- Enright, Ed. 1999. Twenty-Five for the Future. *Down Beat* (June): 18.
- Ephland, John. 1996. Why Play Standards? *Down Beat* (February): 16–20.
- Folio, Cynthia. 1995. An Analysis of Polyrhythm in Selected Improvised Jazz Solos. In *Concert Music, Rock, and Jazz Since 1945: Essays and Analytical Studies*, edited by Elizabeth West Marvin and Richard Hermann, 103–34. Rochester, N.Y.: University of Rochester Press.
- . 1997–98. "The Great Symphonic Theme": Multiple Takes on Stella's Scheme. *Annual Review of Jazz Studies* 9: 3–24.
- Gabbard, Krin. 1995. The Jazz Canon and Its Consequences. In *Jazz Among the Discourses*, edited by Krin Gabbard, 1–28. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Goehr, Lydia. 1992. *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- . 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goodman, Nelson. 1969. *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Harrison-Pepper, Sally. 1990. *Drawing a Circle in the Square: Street Performing in New York's Washington Square Park*. Jackson, Miss.: University Press of Mississippi.
- Helland, Dave. 1995. Those Who Can, Teach. *Down Beat* (May): 22–24.

- Howard, Jessica H. 1994. Participatory Discrepancies, Live from Lincoln Center: Towards a Terminology for Looking at Music in Performance. *Indiana Theory Review* 15, no. 2: 41–71.
- Hyde, Lewis. 1979. *The Gift: Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property*. New York: Random House.
- Keil, Charles. 1994a. Motion and Feeling through Music. In *Music Grooves: Essays and Dialogues*, by Steven Feld and Charles Keil, 53–76. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1994b. Participatory Discrepancies and the Power of Music. In *Music Grooves: Essays and Dialogues*, by Steven Feld and Charles Keil, 96–108. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kurzdorfer, James. 1996. Outrageous Clusters: Dissonant Semitonal Cells in the Music of Thelonious Monk. *Annual Review of Jazz Studies* 8: 181–201.
- Larson, Steve. 1997–98. Triple Play: Bill Evans's Three-Piano Performance of Victor Young's "Stella by Starlight." *Annual Review of Jazz Studies* 9: 45–56.
- . 1998. Schenkerian Analysis of Modern Jazz: Questions about Method. *Music Theory Spectrum* 20: 209–41.
- Lerdahl, Fred, and Ray Jackendoff. 1983. *A Generative Theory of Tonal Music*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Levin, Charles. 1999a. You Can't Do That . . . Or Can You? Market Testing in Jazz Radio, Part I. *Down Beat* (March): 36–39.
- . 1999b. Reconfiguring the Public Radio Puzzle: Market Testing in Jazz Radio, Part II. *Down Beat* (April): 42–46.
- Levinson, Jerrold. 1980. What a Musical Work Is. *Journal of Philosophy* 77: 5–28.
- Lindeman, Steve. 1997–98. Miles's "Stella": A Comparison in the Light of the Two Quintets. *Annual Review of Jazz Studies* 9: 57–76.
- Marcus, George E., and Michael M. J. Fischer. 1986. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Martin, Henry. 1996. *Charlie Parker and Thematic Improvisation*. Lanham, Md., and London: Scarecrow Press.
- . 1997–98. The Nature of Recomposition: Miles Davis and "Stella by Starlight." *Annual Review of Jazz Studies* 9: 77–92.
- Meyer, Leonard B. 1956. *Emotion and Meaning in Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1973. *Explaining Music: Essays and Explorations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Monson, Ingrid. 1996. *Saying Something: Jazz Improvisation and Interaction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Murphy, Frank. 1998. Thematic Metamorphosis in the Early Recordings of Ernest Loring "Red" Nichols (1905–1965). *Jazzforschung/Jazz Research* 30: 171–79.
- Narmour, Eugene. 1990. *The Analysis and Cognition of Basic Melodic Structures*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1992. *The Analysis and Cognition of Melodic Complexity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Potter, Gary M. 1990. Analyzing Improvised Jazz. *College Music Symposium* 30: 64–74.
- Rose, Jeremy Harold. 1994. *Playing Out: A Multiple Case Study of Coordination and Presentation in Nightclub Bands*. Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota.
- Rozin, Alexander. 2000. *The Intensity of Musical Affect: A Model of Experience and Memory*. Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania.
- Schechner, Richard. 1977. *Essays on Performance Theory, 1970–1976*. New York: Drama Book Specialists.
- Schechner, Richard, and Willa Appel, eds. 1990. *By Means of Performance: Intercultural Studies of Theatre and Ritual*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shumway, David R. 1999. Performance. In *Key Terms in Popular Music and Culture*, edited by Bruce Horner and Thomas Swiss, 188–98. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
- Shuster, Fred. 1995. Freddie Hubbard: When Your Chops Are Shot. *Down Beat* (October): 22–25.
- Small, Christopher. 1998. *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening*. Hanover, N.H.: Wesleyan University Press.
- Smith, Gregory. 1991. In Quest of a New Perspective on Improvised Jazz: A View from the Balkans. *World of Music* 33, no. 3: 29–52.
- Stewart, Zan. 1996. John Scofield: My Unplugged Romance. *Down Beat* (October): 24–26.
- Stone, Ruth M. 1982. *Let the Inside Be Sweet: The Interpretation of Music Event Among the Kpelle of Liberia*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Strunk, Steven. 1996. Linear Intervallic Patterns in Jazz Repertory. *Annual Review of Jazz Studies* 8: 63–115.
- Turner, Victor Witter. 1986. *The Anthropology of Performance*. New York: PAJ Publications.
- Van Maanen, John. 1988. *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Waters, Keith. 1996. Blurring the Barline: Metric Displacement in the Piano Solos of Herbie Hancock. *Annual Review of Jazz Studies* 8: 19–37.
- Whiteman, Paul, and Mary Margaret McBride. [1926] 1974. *Jazz*. Reprint. New York: Arno Press.
- Williams, James Kent. 1997–98. Oscar Peterson and the Art of Paraphrase: The 1965 Recordings of “Stella by Starlight.” *Annual Review of Jazz Studies* 9: 25–44.
- Zbikowski, Lawrence. Forthcoming. *Conceptualizing Music: Cognitive Structure, Theory, and Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.