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Almost exclusively, studies on musical improvisation focus on what the performer does—the process through which improvisation "happens." But how performers improvise is only one component of how improvisation reconfigures musical experience. Improvised music is not only created by performers. It is heard by listeners; they parse the musical texture and group certain passages together while comparing their own present and past musical experiences. In the context of an uncertain and transitory musical landscape, a listener makes choices—conscious or unconscious—in order to navigate through what he or she hears. For jazz improvisation, this navigation relies on signposts of style. Jazz listeners routinely gain an intimate knowledge of certain performers’ styles (as reflected in cultural touchstones such as the long-running "Blindfold Test" column in Down Beat magazine). This familiarity extends to new, previously unheard improvisations, so that even within an unknown recording, a listener might recognize a familiar musical voice.

How does a listener recognize a performer, even in an unfamiliar recording? This project addresses this question, first by probing the diverse ways in which listeners talk about stylistic identification, and then by developing models of listening and exploring these models’ ramifications. Using an explicitly intertextual lens, the study compares similar-sounding moments (typically conceived in melodic parameters) from different recordings to explore the kinds of criteria that tie together disparate musical strands into a single improvisational formula, or "lick."

Starting with the Down Beat blindfold tests, the first two chapters explore the range of interpretive approaches that listeners use for stylistic recognition. Although individual listeners’
responses are diverse, particular ways of listening recur across jazz cultures; these prevalent listening approaches correlate with jazz’s musical characteristics as well as its social and economic context. Chapters 3 and 4, drawing upon theories of categorization, suggest how a listener’s initial exposure to a performer’s style impacts the way subsequent music is heard and interpreted. The final chapter integrates these individualized listener processes into a shared culture of jazz listening, emphasizing how listeners use skills of stylistic recognition to parse influences and interpret musical meaning.
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Upon hearing the opening melodic notes of "I Want To Talk About You," a listener might respond in numerous ways. Most would automatically recognize the instrument as a saxophone. A listener with absolute pitch might notice that the first note is an E♭. Given the saxophone’s appearance, its fluid articulation, and the piano and bass that subsequently enter, a listener might assume that the song falls within a jazz idiom, perhaps guessing from the recording’s clarity that it comes from some time between 1950 and the present. A listener attuned to the timbral characteristics of the saxophone family might think that it is a tenor saxophone, or perhaps an alto. When the piano and bass enter, the tempo and the relationship of the saxophone to the other instruments might suggest that the song is a ballad. A listener might immediately like or dislike it. And a listener experienced with a particular body of recordings might guess—or, perhaps, know—that the player is John Coltrane.¹

How does a listener recognize a performer, even in an unfamiliar recording? Such an inquiry invites us into an array of interrelated questions connecting concepts of style and intertextuality, resemblance and categorization, interpretation and analysis. How does a listener develop

¹ John Coltrane, “I Want to Talk About You,” recorded 1958, on Soultrane, Prestige 7142.
this ability? What is the relationship between present and past musical experiences and how do particular experiences become linked with one another? These questions occupy the core of this project, and their explorations over the next five chapters present a multifaceted reflection on this commonplace practice.

For members of the jazz community, listening to music with the aim of identifying a particular performer (or performers) is a part of everyday life. Pervasive interest in individual players’ styles encourages stylistic identification as a common way of listening to jazz, and its presence, in turn, reinforces an interest in improvisational style. Stylistic markers often serve as discursive currency—the lingua franca of jazz insiders. Players, critics, and listeners routinely frame the music in terms of an individual player’s style. In a representative example, alto saxophonist Phil Woods describes the process of identifying an unknown performer by citing other players as stylistic pillars:

It could be Ernie Henry, Lou Donaldson, Leo Wright, or Sonny Criss... There’s a tradition of alto playing, post-Parker; all the guys I mentioned took Parker and sort of distilled him into their own voice. Some of the young alto players now are coming from a different thing: they don’t even listen to Cannonball [Adderley] or [Benny] Carter, and they haven’t done their Bird lessons. I wouldn’t say they all sound like anybody in particular, but this was a case of guys copying their idol and yet retaining their individuality.²

Woods’ dual emphases on history—a respectful distillation and “copying” of predecessors’ styles—and individuality—the development of a distinctive improvisational voice—mirrors that of jazz musicians and listeners as a whole. Most importantly, he couches the entire discussion in terms of listening to players and gaining familiarity with their styles.

concerned with jazz, studies on "thin slices" of music have shown that listeners exposed to very short segments of music (at the lower limit, a tenth of a second) are able to apprehend significant information about what is being played. Robert Gjerdingen and David Perrot have shown that, even in clips of less than a half of a second, listeners can often accurately determine a song’s genre, and Carol Krumhansl has extended this work to show that listeners can recognize familiar songs from similarly condensed clips. None of these studies, however, treats the nuanced ways in which listeners assess music within a particular genre, nor how listeners’ initial recognition of a particular artist or genre might shift or reconfigure itself over timespans that extend beyond short clips.

Studies of a particular musician’s improvisational style, on the other hand, are ubiquitous in the world of jazz scholarship (as well as criticism and pedagogy), but these studies focus almost exclusively on how improvisation occurs. Even the few treatments of how listeners apprehend style in jazz are often still poetically oriented. This focus on explicating how performers improvise without explicitly acknowledging the role of analysis and interpretation in this process yields an awkward gap. Analysts subjectively parse a musical texture drawn

---

3 Robert O. Gjerdingen and David Perrott, “Scanning the Dial: The Rapid Recognition of Music Genres,” *Journal of New Music Research* 37, no. 2 (2008): 93–100; Carol L. Krumhansl, “Plink: "Thin Slices" of Music,” *Music Perception* 27, no. 5 (2010): 337–354. Gjerdingen and Perrott use self-agreement as their criteria for accurate judgments of genre. This approach directly confronts the subjectivity of listening; the authors note how “the frequently contradictory feedback from thousands of customers, each of whom was absolutely convinced of the authority of his or her personal classifications of genre, was a healthy corrective to notions of an essential and fixed definition of any particular genre” (94). Based on an initial empirical study, Joseph Plazak and David Huron have proposed a potential chronology of features that listeners respond to at various time scales, ranging from instrumentation (100 ms) to rhythmic syncopation (3000 ms). Joseph Plazak and David Huron, “The First Three Seconds: Listener Knowledge Gained from Brief Musical Excerpts,” *Musicae Scientiae* 15, no. 1 (2011): 29–44.

4 See, for example, Benjamin Givan’s study on Django Reinhardt. Benjamin Givan, *The Music of Django Reinhardt* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2010).

5 Caroline Anson Davis’s 2010 dissertation, for example, examines jazz listening with the aim of explicating “the shared knowledge structures that musicians use in performance and discussion” (35); her orientation toward how musicians improvise impacts how the entire project is framed. Davis’s approach, although diverse in scope, is essentially sociological, exploring the relationship between the social environment and the associative connections of the musicians she interviews. Although aspects of my project connect to this aim, my dissertation’s orientation toward questions of style and identification differentiates it from Davis’s study. Caroline Anson Davis, “Semantic Knowledge of Eminent Jazz Performers: A Study on the Impact of Community Affiliation and Expertise” (PhD, Northwestern University, 2010).
from subjective transcriptions of subjectively chosen recordings—all while focusing on what the *improviser* does. The vast majority of scholarship on style in jazz, therefore, focuses on the explication of particular stylistic idioms without fully explaining the fundamental underpinnings of the analysis.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the frequent analyses focusing on improvisers’ repetition of short melodic segments. Although musicians and critics have long acknowledged the existence of formulae in jazz, treatments of improvisational formulae became particularly prevalent following Thomas Owens’s 1974 study of recurrent patterns in Charlie Parker’s solos. Bolstered by interest in applying Milman Parry and Albert Lord’s theory of oral composition in Homeric and medieval epics to a context of improvised music, and drawing on parallel work by Leo Treitler (who applied Parry and Lord’s idea of the formula to the oral transmission of plainchant), jazz scholars developed tools for the analysis of recurrent formulae in a wide array of styles.

---

6 These stylistic analyses ignore a central question: at what stage and through what means does a series of distinct, unrelated musical passages become emblematic of a unified “style”? This question cannot be answered by interrogating the improvisational practices of performers; rather, it requires entering the individual, subjective realm of listeners. This project, therefore, seeks to turn away from questions of creative production (i.e., *poiesis*) toward listener consumption and interpretation (i.e., *esthesis*).

7 Thomas Owens, “Charlie Parker: Techniques of Improvisation” (PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1974). In his dissertation, Benjamin Givan notes that treatments of melodic formulae date to as early as 1927, when Louis Armstrong published a series of books containing transcriptions of short, recurrent phrases from his improvisations. For a review formulaic approaches to jazz analysis, see Benjamin Marx Givan, “Django Reinhardt’s Style and Improvisational Process” (PhD, Yale University, 2003), 61-63 and Chapter 3 (particularly pp. 162-172).

Formulaic studies of improvisation offers several practical challenges to analysts. In Parry’s original definition, a formula is "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given melodic idea." This definition, oriented toward poetic conditions that cannot be straightforwardly applied to untexted music, must be reconfigured for analyzing jazz improvisation. For each adaptation, the analyst has to answer several fundamental questions in order to generate a definition of musical formula. In an article on melodic formulae in the recordings of guitarist Charlie Christian, Jonathan Finkelman explores these challenges:

How does one define the boundaries of a formula in the context of a freely flowing melodic line? How long or distinctive must a pattern be in order to be classified as a formula? How similar must fragments be in order to be perceived as related to each other? And what criteria of similarity does one apply? Once they are pronounced similar, how is it determined which fragment is the “formula itself” and which a variation of the formula? How “varied” can a variation be? Or should the term be limited to include only phrases that are repeated note-for-note, or nearly so?"10

To Finkelman’s questions about segmentation, similarity, hierarchy, and ontology, one might add further methodological challenges of stylistic context. Benjamin Givan has recently argued of the importance of stylistic context in jazz analysis, showing how the traditional readings of the iconic "Blue 7" by Sonny Rollins can be wholly reinterpreted by considering Rollins’s placement in a wider stylistic idiom.11 Each formulaic study addresses these questions in its own way. Owens, who presents 64 Charlie Parker “motives” (each potentially with several

---

variants) without explaining how these formulae were selected, has been criticized for the lack of clarity in his approach. Yet, as Givan points out, Owens’s approach also evinces a flexibility that other methodologies lack.\textsuperscript{12} Gregory Smith, by contrast, examines pianist Bill Evans’s improvisations with a rigid, largely contour-based system for segmentation of his formulae.\textsuperscript{13} This method allows for consistency, but sometimes yields awkwardly segmented melodies.

**AN APPROACH TO ANALYZING STYLISTIC IDENTIFICATION**

How can analysis remain flexible without being opaque? These differing approaches to formulaic studies of jazz improvisation point toward a need for an analytical apparatus that can accommodate variation and similarity without assuming strict definitions for musical objects. Analytical observations, one might argue, necessarily reflect *degrees* of truth. George Lakoff posits that in day-to-day conversations, "concepts have vague boundaries and fuzzy edges" and "sentences will very often be neither true, nor false, nor nonsensical, but rather true to a certain extent and false to certain extent, true in certain respects and false in other respects."\textsuperscript{14} Theories of prototypical categorization allow us to acknowledge analytical truths as flexible, yet at the same time productively illustrate reasons for this flexibility.

As I explore stylistic identification throughout this dissertation, I suggest the following argument:

1. Stylistic identification is a mode of listening valued by jazz listeners.
2. Stylistic familiarity can be fruitfully modeled by theories of categorization.
3. Although categorization processes can be diverse and complex, general trends *do* emerge.

\textsuperscript{12} Givan, “Django Reinhardt’s Style and Improvisational Process,” 164.
\textsuperscript{13} Smith, “Homer, Gregory, and Bill Evans? The Theory of Formulaic Composition in the Context of Jazz Piano Improvisation.”
This first point, the significance of stylistic identification as a mode of listening among cultures of jazz musicians and fans, anchors Chapter 1. The second point and third points provide the grounding for the analytical expeditions undertaken in Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5.

What is style?

Before exploring processes of stylistic identification in greater depth, we might begin with a definition of style. For Leonard Meyer, style is the "replication of patterning, whether in human behavior or in the artifacts produced by human behavior, that results from a series of choices made within some set of constraints." Meyer highlights the centrality of repetition in any conception of style, while at the same time conceding the fact that this repetition is inexact. Similarly, Meyer acknowledges that style can emerge in act or object; musical scores or recordings, like performances, reflect underlying stylistic features.

For my purposes, however, one element is missing from Meyer’s definition. Musical composition is not the only type of human behavior that involves "replication of patterning" based on choices and constraints. Musical hearing, too, requires a listener to make choices about what is heard and what is deemed significant or insignificant (choices) based on the listener’s goals, past experiences, and the listening circumstances (constraints). Nicholas Cook, for instance, has shown the substantial role that a listener’s imagination plays in the construction of music out of its constituent sounds. Style, therefore, is not merely the arena of the composer, but also that of the listener. Crucial to any conception of style is interpretive action. A listener does

---

17 Cook, *Music, Imagination, and Culture*. 
not merely absorb pre-existent patterns repeating themselves in a musical work, but rather creates them, drawing connections and building upon what he or she hears.\footnote{In this definition I run counter to poietic-oriented theories of style such as those by Kendall L. Walton, who argues that any stylistic appraisal of a work of art involves empathizing with the process that created it. Kendall L. Walton, “Style and the Products and Processes of Art,” in \textit{The Concept of Style}, ed. Berel Lang (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 72–103.}

Style operates simultaneously at various levels. Meyer conceptualizes style in terms of a three-part model of \textit{dialect}, \textit{idiom}, and \textit{intraopus style}.\footnote{Meyer, \textit{Style and Music: Theory, History, and Ideology}. Meyer defines these stylistic schema in terms of composers, but I will refer to improvisers, following Benjamin Givan’s application of Meyer’s theory in Givan, “Gunther Schuller and the Challenge of Sonny Rollins: Stylistic Context, Intentionality, and Jazz Analysis.”} At the broadest level, a dialect encompasses a set of attributes associated with a number of improvisers. Simultaneously, Meyer defines an idiom as the individual approaches of one particular improviser. Intraopus style, the most specific designation, refers to the internal style created by features "replicated within a single work."\footnote{Meyer, \textit{Style and Music: Theory, History, and Ideology}, 24.} In the following chapter (section 1.1.5), I will further expand this conception of multi-layered style. In all of these treatments, however, I envision musical style as a field of categories generated by each individual listener.

\textit{Stylistic identification as a mode of listening}

Stylistic recognition relies on two processes: familiarization and identification (Figure 0.2). As a listener hears more and more music, he or she gradually gains familiarity with the players involved, building stylistic categories for what is heard. This process occurs over a long period of time (often years), and rarely proceeds in a straightforward and linear upward curve; it relies...
centrally on missteps and continual reorientations by the listener. This long-range process is
followed by a short-range process: the listener hears a piece of music and, over the course of
the listening experience, identifies the player.

These two stages, however, are not as different as they might seem. On Figure 0.2, the
musical stimulus on the far right of the diagram (marked as "Short-range identification") would
be only incrementally different than the musical stimulus that just preceded it. Likewise, the
process of familiarization does not end at some point, to be replaced by identification; rather,
the listener’s stylistic familiarization continues indefinitely. I would like to suggest that the
long-range process of familiarization is made up of repeated attempts at stylistic identification.
A listener who wants to know who is playing will begin by guessing, then guess again, and in
this process of repeated guesswork he or she will eventually gain familiarity with the player’s
style.

As such, my analyses present sequences of short, resonant examples. With each new musi-
cal excerpt, I am continually reapproaching the emergent stylistic categories that form. This
method allows for an analytical approximation of the process of stylistic familiarization, which
I see as fundamentally dynamic.
For a listener, stylistic recognition is fluid, both in terms of the musical features a listener responds to as well as the relationships between similar musical moments. Rather than aiming for sweeping generalizations about "what experienced listeners do"—a problematic notion that requires grappling with what is meant by "listener," "experienced," etc.—I instead offer suggestive, competing models for processes of resemblance and categorization. Necessarily drawing on my own experiences as a jazz listener, as well as perspectives gleaned from conversations with other jazz listeners and descriptions of stylistic identification in the *Down Beat* blindfold tests, I offer hypotheses about the ways in which listeners might process style. Figure 0.3 graphically illustrates my methodological process; note that the hypothetical models of listening do not connect directly to any of the *Down Beat* blindfold tests in particular, but rather emerge from a general synthesis of my own intuitions, conversations with jazz listeners, and trends evident in the blindfold tests.

In the following chapters, I present many different theoretical models of listening, including ones with rigid hierarchies and ones without hierarchies at all. None of these approaches is intended to describe the process of stylistic recognition in its entirety; rather, I provide simplified models that can serve as suggestive means for a reader to reflect upon his or her own listening habits and processes.

A brief analogy will help to clarify this stance. In *Objectified*, a documentary about industrial design, designer Dan Formosa summarizes his attitude toward ergonomics:

> We have clients come to us and say, ‘Here is our average customer.’ For instance, ‘Female, she is 34 years old, she has 2.3 kids,’ and we listen politely and say, ‘Well, that’s great, but we don’t care...about that person.’ What we really need to do, to design, is look at the extremes. The weakest, or the person with arthritis, or the athlete, or the strongest, the fastest person. Because if we understand what the extremes are the middle will take care of itself.\(^{22}\)

---

21 This introspective approach does not preclude differing conclusions about the music being analyzed. See the discussion below.
22 Gary Hustwit, *Objectified* (New York: Plexifilm, 2009), DVD.
By considering how the object might function in extreme cases, the designer is able to accommodate the behavior of all users, not simply the "average." For music, this principle allows me to present radically different listening perspectives without resorting to prescriptive or normative assumptions. Listeners’ differing backgrounds and interests can produce radically divergent listening experiences. Comparing the comments of a professional jazz saxophonist who focuses almost exclusively on timbre with that of a listener oriented primarily toward harmony reveals disparate reactions to similar—or even the same—musical examples. If I can model boundaries of listening habits, any individual listening experience should be contained within a sum of these exemplars.

With this aim to explore boundaries of listening experience, my project is, unsurprisingly, methodologically diverse. I use a wide range of approaches in order to embrace the expansive range of ways to listen to music. My analyses, at the same time, intend no "definitive" interpretations. Another listener, for example, might disagree with how I choose to segment a particular melodic line. Whether or not a reader agrees with my particular choices for segmentation, however, is less relevant than the plausibility of the process given the segmentation choice as an axiom. In other words, if I hear it as X, what are the ramifications for the ways in which I form categories Y and Z?

*****

This project began with the ambitious goal of answering a simple question: How does a listener recognize a performer, even when he has never heard the recording before? And while this question lingers in the background throughout the entirety of my dissertation, I came to be preoccupied with an interrelated issue—the extent to which stylistic markers are constructed not only by the musicians that deploy them, but also by the listeners who apprehend them.
Melodic formulae, a frequent topic of interest for scholars, are dually constructed by the performer and the listener. Shifting attention away from the poietic sphere toward the esthesic, this project situates listening as the central arena in which style operates.

23 See footnote 8 in this chapter.
A NOTE ON TRANSCRIPTIONS

Most of my analyses rely on transcriptions of recordings. Whenever possible, I have tried to include an appropriate level of detail so as to support the points I am trying to make without creating overladen scores. While many issues of pitch and rhythm are relatively clear on the recordings, some aspects of performances are difficult to transcribe using standard notation. Following the conventions used in the transcriptions by Paul Berliner and Ingrid Monson, I sometimes add extra notations for variations in rhythm pitch, and timbre. See Appendix A for more information.

"Well, I tried my best to make that Jimmy Hamilton, but it would have to have been the Ellington orchestra, and I couldn’t make it the Ellington orchestra.”

In a blindfold test from the November 1984 issue of Down Beat magazine, saxophonist John Carter attempts to identify the players in an unknown recording. Probing an initial guess at Jimmy Hamilton, Duke Ellington’s longtime clarinetist, Carter faces a contradiction from the ensemble’s sound. Interestingly, Carter does not choose to say that he "thought it was" Jimmy Hamilton, or that the ensemble "didn’t sound like" Ellington’s. Instead, he tries to "make" the unknown player Hamilton, and he fails to "make it the Ellington orchestra.” The repeated use of the word "make" emphasizes the active and constructive nature of listening to jazz—or, indeed, listening to any music. No listener is wholly passive. He or she makes choices and plays a role in constructing what is heard. Listening is creative, in the truest sense of the word: the listener, together with the performer, creates musical structures. In order to identify an unknown player, a listener like Carter builds sonic categories; he makes it a particular player, and then assesses his creation, adjusting it slightly or scrapping it altogether in order to generate a new structure. Stylistic recognition is more than identifying what is on the recording. Rather, it requires a

---

listener to draw his own internal stylistic map (and then re-draw it, palimpsestically, over and over), enabling him to navigate even in unfamiliar territories.

1.1 *Down Beat's "blindfold test"

In 1946, jazz critic Leonard Feather began his first "Blindfold Test" column with a political pronouncement:

To allay all prejudices, to cut through all the vast variety of points of view in jazz, we propose to play a series of records each month to a noted figure in the jazz world. With these records, we will test his or her reactions to all kinds of music, from Dixieland to Bebop.²

As evidenced by Feather's opening statement, the blindfold test belied a political undercurrent from the start. The blindfold test, which emerged as a cultural phenomenon in the decade preceding Feather’s first column, had developed associations of scientific rigor,³ virtuosity,⁴ and,

---

³ First introduced to medicine in 1917 by Torald Sollman, the "blind test" (and, subsequently, the double-blind method of clinical trials) really began taking hold in the 1930s, with the 1937 publication of the results of a five-year study led by Harry A. Gold. One of Gold's co-authors, Nathaniel Kwit, attributed their use of the term "blind test" to originating from an ad campaign for Old Gold cigarettes with the heading "Take the Blindfold Test." Arthur K. Shapiro and Elaine Shapiro, “The History of the Double-Blind Procedure,” in *The Powerful Placebo: From Ancient Priest to Modern Physician* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 137–174, particularly 136-154. This ad campaign apparently provoked discussion among medical doctors; another study from 1934 disproves the advertiser’s claim. Richard W. Husband and Jane Godfrey, “An Experimental Study of Cigarette Identification,” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 18, no. 2 (1934): 220–223. Other commentators have seen precedents for the blindfold test as early as the late eighteenth century. See Ed Cohen, *The Placebo Disavowed: Or Unveiling the Bio-Medical Imagination*, 2002. The blindfold test may have made its transition to music through other advertisements, such as the 1919 spread on the Cremona phonograph, which said "Have You Made the Blindfold Test?" and proposed that customers "hear it, see it, compare its superiority blindfolded with other machines—let your "ear" for music be the judge." “Cremona Advertisement,” *Morning Oregonian* (October 26, 1919): 12. In the same year, similar ads ran for the New Edison phonograph, and made an even bolder claim. Presaging the famous Ella Fitzgerald Memorex ads ("Is it live, or is it Memorex?"), the New Edison ads showed Metropolitan Opera soprano Frieda Hempel fooling a panel of blindfolded judges by first singing, then playing the phonograph. The ad copy reads: "Go hear the New Edison. Hear it with your eyes closed, for that is the best way to listen to music. You will feel that the artist himself is standing before you—alive!“ “New Edison Advertisement,” *The Outlook* 123 (1919): 468–469.
⁴ Blindfold tests have long been associated with virtuosity and genius in other domains. For one example, see Eliot Hearst and John Knott, *Blindfold Chess: History, Psychology, Techniques, Champions, World Records, and Important Games* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2009).
above all, political democratization. Blindfold tests require subjects to reexamine their preconceptions about a subject, and these exercises had begun to revolutionize cultural biases in the music world. In a 1938 blindfold test, judges selected African-American composer William Grant Still to compose the theme for the upcoming New York World’s Fair. The significance of this commission was not lost on Still. In a correspondence with his friend, Still writes, "It seems to me that this must be the first time, musically speaking, that a colored man has ever been asked to write something extremely important that does not necessarily have to be Negroid, and I must admit that I can’t help being proud of the distinction." The blindfold test, which forced musical institutions to rethink inherent cultural prejudices, was also applied to issues of gender inequality. The year before, conductor Antonia Brico challenged Spanish musician Jose Iturbi to a blindfold test to disprove Iturbi’s claims about the inferiority of women musicians.

With his column, Feather combines these egalitarian and de-mythologizing ideas associated with the blindfold test—which were, as mentioned, widely circulating in the zeitgeist—with its underlying scientific and virtuosic connotations. The column purported to achieve this aim by playing unidentified recordings for musicians and asking them to rate the tracks. Although not explicitly stated as one of the goals at first, interviewees often attempted to guess the performers as well. This stylistic identification, I argue, became one of the central tenets of the exercise.

Prior to its arrival in the pages of Down Beat, Feather’s column had run in Metronome for several years, and had even earlier precedents as a segment on Feather’s radio show. With
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5 “Still Chosen to Do Fair Music: Noted Composer Selected in Blindfold Test,” The Baltimore Afro-American (August 6, 1938): 10; William Grant Still to Alain Locke, August 6, 1938, Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, Howard University; excerpt from letter reprinted in Catherine Parsons Smith, William Grant Still (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 64.


7 Gary Giddins, “Leonard Feather, 1914-1994,” The Village Voice (October 11, 1994): 94. Feather had broadcast the blindfold test on various radio programs, beginning with Bob Bach’s program “Platterbrains,” which dates to at least 1940. Harold Jovien, “Tapping Wires: Along Airlanes,” Atlanta Daily World (June 24, 1940): 2. These programs began with a “Jazz Jury” (a panel of experts) and gradually grew more inclusive as the blindfold test became increasingly well known. Even after the Metronome and Down Beat columns had begun, Feather continued to broadcast blindfold tests.
Down Beat, however, the blindfold test really took hold. Quickly becoming one of the most popular features of the magazine, the "Blindfold Test" even occasionally made headlines in other news outlets. One instance appeared in 1959, when a blindfold test gaffe—a mistaken observation that a recording by well-known American jazzmen Max Roach and Hank Mobley sounded like music "that Europeans play"—was reprinted in the Pittsburgh Courier.⁸ Even the expression "blindfold test" became associated with Feather’s segment, and on October 25, 1952, Down Beat filed a trademark for the phrase with the United States Patent and Trademark Office.⁹

In most discussions of Feather’s column, the "blindfold test" is primarily valued for its political impacts and for disseminating the idea, as Gary Giddins puts it, that "people often judged a work of art differently when they didn’t know who signed it."¹⁰ In one of the most widely cited blindfold tests, Roy Eldridge, despite his self-proclaimed ability to distinguish black players from white players, failed to correctly identify the musician’s race for more than half of the recordings.¹¹ The limited scholarship examining Feather’s column has focused overwhelmingly on these political dimensions, accentuating the blindfold tests’ impact disproving a myth of aurally essentialism (typically, race- or gender-based) or its role in stirring journalistic uproar between different camps of musicians (particularly the avant-garde as opposed to the traditionalists).¹²

---

⁸ George E. Pitts, ““Miles Ahead’ Or Miles’ Head Is the Issue,” Pittsburgh Courier (November 7, 1959): 16.
⁹ Down Beat Incorporated Corporation, “Blindfold Test,” US Trademark 71637173, filed October 25, 1952, and issued June 30, 1953. According to Gary Giddins, Feather expressed his displeasure at this trademark; this dissatisfaction could relate to Feather’s attempt to continue the column when he joined one of Down Beat’s competitors, the magazine Jazz Times. At the new periodical, Feather succeeded in starting a new blindfold test column, avoiding the Down Beat trademark with the alternative name “Opening Chorus.” Giddins, “Leonard Feather, 1914-1994.”
Beyond its knack for stirring up controversy, the annals of Feather’s "Blindfold Test" reflect an emergent interest in stylistic identification among jazz listeners. In the early years, Feather asks interviewees only for general "reactions" to the music that they hear. Later, he systematizes these reactions by asking for a "star rating"—placing a priority on aesthetic evaluations. As the column continues, interviewees' identification of players becomes the focus of the column and eventually takes precedence as the primary goal explicitly stated at the column’s outset: "The "Blindfold Test" is a listening test that challenges the featured artist to identify the musicians who performed on selected recordings."13 Gradually, the column turned away from general aesthetic "reactions" and reoriented itself toward highly specialized "challenges" to identify unknown performers.

In addition to the shifting focus of the Down Beat column, the blindfold tests also indicate a growing culture of stylistic identification existing outside of the journalistic confines of the magazine. Feather, to some extent, propagates this trend by calling upon his readers to try their own blindfold tests. In an excerpt from a 1968 newspaper column, Feather writes: "If you are in the mood to win money and fool friends with a blindfold test, try Capitol 2278. [ . . . ] Most of it is so remote from the world of jazz that your blindfoldee will execute an incredulous double take when he observes the label legend: Stan Kenton and orchestra."14 As Feather encouraged jazz listeners to try administering at-home blindfold tests on their friends, musicians’ comments reveal stylistic identification in their day-to-day interactions with friends and colleagues. Upon hearing saxophonist Davey Schildkraut, Lee Konitz recalls that "Warne Marsh once thought he was Bird," highlighting the ways in which stylistic identification operates as discursive currency for jazz musicians. Another example illustrates the pervasiveness of stylistic identification among jazz listeners:

This is [Antoine] Roney’s first Blindfold Test, but he says that his dad challenged his two sons to guess styles from an early age on. "It wasn’t no game for my father," he

---

recalls. "This was for real. I mean, how much of a game is it when you’re five years old and your dad says, ‘Who’s that on drums?’ and if you give the wrong answer he gets upset? ‘You can’t tell who that is?’ It’s a Philly thing. You knew what kind of horns were used, what kind of drums the guy played. It definitely developed my ear."

In Roney’s family, stylistic identification became part of his and his brother’s musical upbringing, and similar sentiments echo throughout the jazz community.

Beginning in December 1996, blindfold tests began to be conducted in front of audiences, reflecting a widespread acceptance of and interest in stylistic identification among jazz listeners. Although radio broadcasts of blindfold tests had made the phenomena public events since the beginning, jazz listeners have become increasingly engaged with stylistic identification. Since 1996, these public events now occupy roughly half of the blindfold tests appearing in *Down Beat*, and regularly involve audience participation when the interviewee is stumped. Once a private, scientific exercise, the blindfold test—and stylistic identification—have become endemic to jazz listening cultures.

*****

Using the information gleaned from examining over forty years (1969-2014) of blindfold tests in the *Down Beat* archive, I explore a number of questions about stylistic identification that will be treated in the remaining chapters:

1. Does this really happen? Do listeners really identify unknown players? (*proof of concept*)

2. What sort of evidence do listeners use? What musical and non-musical cues aid in a listener’s identification of an unknown player?

3. How do listeners organize this evidence into useable knowledge? How do they conceptualize style?

16 Dual blindfold tests, in which two or more listeners are simultaneously interviewed, likewise illustrate some of the ways in which jazz listeners collectively identify players in day-to-day life (see, for example, the quotation from a blindfold test of Kenny Barron and Mulgrew Miller appearing on p. 51).
4. How is this stylistic knowledge attained? Through what process does a listener gain familiarity with a player’s style?
5. How do listeners talk about style? To what ends do they use this stylistic knowledge?
6. Why is style important in jazz?

Interrogating the blindfold tests for underlying listening processes provides several challenges. It is important to acknowledge, of course, that these blindfold tests cannot hope to show every internal observation that the listener experiences. The process has been filtered through the journalistic lens of the magazine, in the editing and transcribing of the comments and, before that, in each listener’s internal gauge of what he or she deems relevant and interesting to say aloud. The blindfold tests also serve a performative function. In successfully

---

17 Consulting the limited extant audio recordings of Leonard Feather conducting the blindfold test reveals the extent of this editorial manipulation. The ratings given by the listeners, for instance, may be highly suspect when comparing the recorded interview with the print transcription in the magazine. In one audio interview, for example, Stacy Rowles comments on one recording (beginning at timecode [8:12]):

*Stacy Rowles:* I don’t know...I don’t recognize the horn player right away, but I really liked...uh...his sound. I liked the modal thing that he went into. I like modal playing a lot, but there’s a point where it just gets too much and too monotonous. You lose the...the, you know, melodic—I really enjoy melodic playing much more, but modal playing is...is nice. I don’t know, I thought it might be Art, uh—Woody Shaw. But, um, I don’t know. I don’t really recognize the player right away. Sounded great to me though, excellent.

*Leonard Feather:* Would you—would you rate four out of five, something like that?

*Stacy Rowles:* Uh—oh yeah, excellent, yeah sure.

By comparison, in his final published version in *Down Beat*, Leonard Feather adapts some of Rowles’ intermittent observations and detours to a condensed, linearized final form:

*Stacy:* I don’t recognize the horn player; I liked his sound and the modal thing he went into. I enjoy melodic playing more—modal playing sometimes gets monotonous after a while, but it’s nice. I thought it might be Woody Shaw. It sounded great to me, excellent—four stars.

Most notably, Feather’s provocation of a possible four-star rating disappears in the pages of *Down Beat*. Blindfold test participants often express hesitance at rating their peers, and evidence of this kind of editorial manipulation suggests that the *Down Beat* interviewer may have a large role in shaping the listener’s resulting star ratings. Many features of the interviewee’s language are retained, however, and in general the blindfold tests become increasingly faithful to the listener’s original comments in recent decades. Leonard Feather, “Jimmy/Stacy Rowles. Interview, October 19, 1986 – Leonard Feather Show. Rowleses. Blindfold, October 26, 1986,” October 26, 1986, MP3, originally audiotapes, Leonard Feather Jazz Collection. International Jazz Collections at the University of Idaho Library, University of Idaho, [http://digital.lib.uidaho.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/lfc/id/6927/rec/41](http://digital.lib.uidaho.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/lfc/id/6927/rec/41).

identifying players on unknown recordings, musicians are advertising their prowess as "well-read" jazz listeners; a frequent trope of these tests is a listener expressing shame or embarrassment at missing identifications, or, conversely, celebrating when successful. At times, this performative function becomes literal performance, when *Down Beat* hosts live blindfold tests in front of audiences or broadcast on the radio.

More significantly, most listeners’ comments reveal a wide gap between the implicit processes at play and the descriptions that the participants explicitly articulate. Listeners frequently provide few or no clues of what they respond to (as in the response: "Oh, that’s Mike LeDonne. That’s one of his signature things").\(^\text{18}\) Ironically, an inverse relationship often exists between the listener’s ease of identification and the information that he or she conveys verbally. For the "obvious" stylistic identifications, many listeners find the process so straightforward and unremarkable that it is not worth commenting on.\(^\text{19}\) Many of the most explicit discussions of the stylistic identification process, therefore, actually come from mis-identifications or unsure guesses, in which the listener must carefully interpret what he or she is hearing and spend time deciding between several potential candidates. As Eric Clarke has suggested,

> When perception proceeds in an unproblematic way, we are usually unaware of the sensory aspect of the stimulus information, and are only attuned to the events that are specified by stimulus structure. But when the relationship is problematic, the stimulus structure itself can become more evident.\(^\text{20}\)

In the case of the blindfold tests, the ability to *articulate* the various pertinent cues ("the sensory aspect" that shapes "the stimulus structure") often relies on the listener encountering a non-obvious performer (the "event specified by the stimulus structure"). In light of these challenges, the blindfold tests’ textual remnants can be viewed only as a starting point for the


more thorough theorization of these processes that unfolds over the course of the remaining chapters.

Throughout these discussions, I refer to the blindfold test participants as listeners rather than players. This serves several functions. First, not all of the blindfold test participants are professional jazz musicians; the column includes contributions by actor Bill Cosby, record producer and music critic John Hammond, and recording engineer Rudy Van Gelder, as well as musicians from other styles like rock musician John Mayall, blues musician Robert Cray, and minimalist composer Steve Reich. Blindfold test participants, whether they are jazz musicians or not, are engaged in a culture of jazz listening. In addition, however, I use this rhetorical strategy in order to shift attention toward listening and away from the performer-oriented perspective pervasive in jazz analysis.

1.1.1 Proof of concept

Before continuing, it is worth asking the question: do listeners really do this? Even within some segments of the jazz community, disbelief exists about listeners' abilities to recognize players based on style alone. Reflecting on the blindfold test as a whole, Marty Ehrlich strongly disputes this myth: "There's a notion that you can't recognize people unless you've just been listening to their records [...] But how can someone not recognize Kenny Wheeler? A personal

---

sound is a major goal. Ehrlich connects this identifiability to jazz musicians’ preoccupations with attaining an individualistic sound—a recurrent theme throughout the blindfold tests.

Whether or not they have previously heard a particular recording, jazz listeners like Ehrlich are often able to identify familiar soloists; indeed, the existence (and continued popularity) of the blindfold test attests to listeners’ abilities at this task. In one blindfold test, Lew Tabackin comments on the ease of this kind of identification:

That’s amazing; even in the ensembles, you know who’s playing, right away: [Coleman] Hawkins and Ben Webster. It’s a beautiful example of the contrast in style of Hawkins and Webster. Hawkins is the intellectual, he’s probing, very adventurous; he’s always stretching. And Ben Webster is just beautifully rhapsodic, melodic, just so warm. I never heard this record before; it’s beautiful!23

To listeners like Tabackin, certain musicians are so identifiable that it becomes obvious. This obviousness reflects an apparent paradox in stylistic identification. Stylistic identification is at once both an intensely individual experience and one shared among members of a community of jazz listeners. Even two musicians correctly identifying the same player on the same recording will respond to different features, and yet listeners routinely make comments that reflect the shared acceptance of certain players’ stylistic identifiability ("Everybody knows it’s Johnny Hodges"24; "Well, it’s so obvious it’s Oscar Peterson"25; "There’s certain instrumentalists that we should know in two seconds, especially somebody as colossal as Sonny [Rollins], whose influence has been so great."26; "As if you can’t recognize Paul Motian within six seconds"27).

Not only are jazz listeners able to distinguish a player from style alone, some listeners’ blindfold tests evince a remarkable clarity in articulating the identifying features. Ralph Peterson, for example, quickly recognizes a fellow drummer based on a series of clues:

---

“Immediately] That’s [Roy] Haynes. He speaks a certain language—a very distinct kind of dribble in the left hand, and the way he works around the tom-toms with his right hand. I could literally see him when I heard that. He gets a wide-open bass drum sound, and the way Roy freed up the hi-hat is amazing—releasing the confines of the 2-and-4 and creating such a dance with his ride cymbal, and then playing accents and having his hi-hat be a part of the coloring mechanism as opposed to the timekeeping mechanism. I’ve got to play later; I can get some ideas! 5 stars.”

In addition to the specificity of his identification process, Peterson’s comments reveal other facets of stylistic recognition. For musicians like Peterson, paying close attention to other players’ individual stylistic traits is an opportunity to look for new ideas for use in their own playing. But, even for non-musician listeners, stylistic identification provides another dimension to recorded performance. Tony Whyton has observed that jazz recordings and the “disembodied voices” that they produce can provoke an experiential gap in listeners. The soloist is present aurally and absent physically.28 Peterson’s remark that “I could literally see him when I heard that” points to how listeners use stylistic identification to synaesthesically expand the experience and fill this gap. Stylistic identification, for some listeners, opens a new emotive realm; one blindfold test interviewee comments that “Sonny [Rollins] played one note, and I don’t know if it’s because I knew it was him, but man, you feel something.”29

In many listeners’ comments, stylistic identifiability is connected to the strong individualistic component of jazz music. Despite recent attention to collective aspects of jazz performance,30 individuality remains central to jazz musicianship. As Marty Ehrlich remarks in the previously mentioned quotation, “A personal sound is a major goal.”31 Down Beat’s blindfold tests are replete with references to a common goal of having a distinctive aural identity; Ted Curson, for instance, lauds Don Cherry for establishing himself “in such a way that everybody, if they

30 Monson, Saying Something: Jazz Improvisation and Interaction; Robert Hodson, Interaction, Improvisation, and Interplay in Jazz (New York: Routledge, 2007).
31 Mandel, “Blindfold Test: Marty Ehrlich.”
play that way, they’re copying him. [...] And that’s five stars as far as I’m concerned—getting people to identify you.”

For musicians, part of this need relates to an economic reality to separate oneself from competitors in a crowded marketplace. Gary Bartz, for instance, says,

An older musician understands that you have to have a voice. You can’t sound like somebody. If you do, you’ll end up with people calling, ’Get me somebody who sounds like so-and-so.’ When I was coming up, we all were trying to find our own voice. Yeah, we could imitate people, you could mimic for fun, but you wouldn’t do that on your gig.

For Bartz, the ability to compete—to find (and keep) a gig—requires the development of an identifiable sound.

Many musicians, however, couch this discussion in terms of self-expression. Trumpet player Jon Faddis sees personal expression as paramount:

You know, lots of times after I finish a set with Thad’s band people come up to me and say, ’How can I play high?’ But that’s not really as important as extending your own personality into the instrument. There are thousands of trumpet players who can play high, but it doesn’t mean anything unless you express yourself musically.

Other musicians refer to this identifiability as “transcending the horn.” Art Farmer summarizes his perspective on identifiability and self-expression in an identification of an unknown trumpet and piano duo:

I don’t need to hear any more. That was Clark Terry and that was Oscar Peterson on piano, and if there are any people who can play with a duo, well then it’s Clark and Oscar. [...] There’s absolutely nothing I can say against him. He’s a musician and he’s a trumpet player and he’s Clark Terry. When you hear a few notes you know who you’re listening to. And that’s what’s so important I think—an identity. You hear the person; it’s just not a matter of hearing the horn.

What we call it is transcending the horn, and that’s when the individuality comes out—the humanity comes out in music, when you don’t think about this is a trumpet and this is a saxophone … you think about the player. And all of the great players who make their mark, they do so because of this—because of being able to play the hell out of their instrument. They take their instrument and sort of meld it

---

34 Nolan, “Blindfold Test: Jon Faddis.”
into an extension of themselves—they make a statement and say, ‘This is me; this is the way I feel.’ That’s what I like to hear, and I can always hear that from Clark.35

This "transcendence," once again, bridges the gap between the disembodied voice of the recording and the physical space that the player occupies. Antoine Roney likens hearing a recording of Stanley Turrentine to having a conversation with him: "When I hear Stanley, I see his face, not the saxophone. He transcends the metal of the instrument, and makes it live. What comes out of the bell is him. Notes, phrases, the comical thing—just like when he’s talking to you."36

Listeners not only identify players on previously unheard recordings, they rely centrally on this ability to expand and illuminate crucial aspects of their musical experiences.

1.1.2 Sources of evidence

So, if listeners really do identify players in previously unknown recordings, how exactly do they do so? What features might clue a listener in? Drawing connections between what they hear and what they have previously heard, blindfold test participants observe certain features that remind them of a particular player or players. These resemblance criteria—to be discussed in greater depth in Chapter 2—can take any form. In their identifications in the blindfold tests, participants respond to everything from a player’s chordal voicings to the acoustics of the recording. Taking note of what musical parameters listeners consistently cite as identifiers of a player’s style, we can trace the wide range of criteria used in stylistic identification.

Although the blindfold tests reflect a diverse range of approaches to sonic identification, several general trends emerge. First, no single criterion predominates for all listeners. Although certain listeners might respond to one feature over another, different parameters are often

36 Macnie, “Blindfold Test: Antoine Roney.”
cited at different moments. Second, most listeners deploy a complex of interconnected criteria in their identifications rather than focusing on one particular musical domain. Finally, listeners use this knowledge in conversation (see section 1.1.5), and the available terminology (or lack of it) impacts how blindfold test participants frame the experience of stylistic recognition.

**Timbre**

As an initial hypothesis—one common among many jazz listeners and players—let us assume that timbral features are a listener’s primary means of identifying players. Berliner, who suggests that timbre is the "most obvious" element of an musician’s sonic character, outlines a series of characteristic timbral features, including the spectrum, vibrato, articulation, and attack.\(^{37}\) Fernando Benadon has contended that timbre (alongside other spectographic features) serve as more significant cues for listeners identifying unknown saxophonists than do pitch, rhythm, and contour.\(^ {38}\) Although acknowledging the importance of other musical features to musicians developing an individual sound, Travis A. Jackson likewise argues that "possession of a timbrally distinctive sound is perhaps more prized by the individual musician than anything else."\(^ {39}\)

Does timbre occupy a primary role in blindfold test participants’ identifications? In some blindfold tests, it indeed serves as a prominent cue to identify a variety of unknown instrumentalists:

- Louie Bellson: "Feather: What is it that tipped you off to Shelly [Manne]?
  Bellson: First of all, he gets a very beautiful, delicate sound on the cymbals and the drums."\(^ {40}\)

\(^{37}\) Berliner, *Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation*, 125.
\(^{38}\) Fernando Benadon, “Spectrographic and Calligraphic Cues in the Identification of Jazz Saxophonists,” in *Proceedings of the 5th Triennial ESCOM Conference*, September (Hanover, Germany, 2003), 246–249. Benadon’s study, it should be noted, offers only a preliminary study, as it is limited by its sample size (seven participants) and experimental scope (four identifiable saxophonists, selected via multiple-choice for sixteen short excerpts).
• Dexter Gordon: "Sonny Criss. After two notes I could tell, because of his sound, and that's very important."\(^{41}\)
• Ravi Coltrane: "I can hear Chris Potter's sound even before he starts to improvise."\(^{42}\)

While all of these passages mark timbre as a primary means of identifying an unknown player, each quotation reveals different nuances of how the listener is observing, evaluating, and discussing it. Coltrane's recognition of Chris Potter's sound during the head\(^{43}\) of the tune suggests one reason for timbre's importance: in many standardized bop contexts, where solos are preceded by an interpretation of the head, a player's timbral characteristics emerge before his or her other improvisational identifiers.\(^{44}\) For Bellson, the player's timbre also emerges as the initial cue ("first of all"), and gains its significance from its impact on the aesthetic experience of the recording (his "very beautiful, delicate sound"). Gordon, on the other hand, frames timbre's importance in terms of its individuality and identifiability.

Because timbre—unlike harmony or rhythm—lacks a shared terminology of accepted linguistic labels, listeners' discussions of timbre rely instead on varied descriptive approaches. Some listeners respond with technical specificity related to particular, articulable dimensions; James Carter for instance, first notices in David Murray's playing "the airflow and the vibrato he uses, particularly in the lower register."\(^{45}\) Alternatively, listeners deploy qualitative descriptions, such as Bellson's description of the cymbal and drum sound as "beautiful" and "delicate.

In a similar vein, Andrew Cyrille relies on metaphor to convey the timbral cues that he picks up from a drummer's cymbal sound:

That's my man, Billy Higgins. That's one cat that I really love to listen to. You know, he has such a blend between his left and right hand, and the sound that he gets out

---

\(^{42}\) Porter, “Blindfold Test: Ravi Coltrane.”
\(^{43}\) For jazz musicians and listeners, the head refers to the composed melody of the piece, typically played one or two times at both the beginning and end of the performance.
\(^{44}\) Empirical studies of listener responses to "thin slices" of music support the primacy of timbre, even for very short time-scales. See Gjerdingen and Perrott, "Scanning the Dial: The Rapid Recognition of Music Genres."
of the snare drums, and the sound that he gets from the cymbal—it’s almost like it’s ensconced in velvet.\textsuperscript{46}

This metaphorical and figurative language comes closest to a shared lexicon of timbral description. Listeners frequently refer to the size of a player’s sound,\textsuperscript{47} its shape,\textsuperscript{48} or its texture (often using binary tactile descriptors like "hard"/"soft" or "rough"/"smooth").\textsuperscript{49} In addition to abstract metaphorical descriptions, listeners describe timbral features with respect to other musical examples. Wild Bill Davis’s assessment of Shirley Scott’s organ sound as "sort of clarinetish," for instance, repurposes existing musical knowledge (the timbral qualities of a clarinet) to describe the sound of Scott’s organ.\textsuperscript{50} Similarly, Christopher Hollyday describes saxophonist Arthur Blythe’s timbre as "that kazoo-type tone."\textsuperscript{51}

For some listeners, timbre serves as the central means to identify players. John Zorn’s 1985 blindfold test revolves almost entirely around such timbral observations of saxophonists:

- "Well, right off we know this guy’s into Roscoe [Mitchell]—oh, that sounds more like the real Roscoe than anybody else. It’s got the sound of his curved soprano, a tender, fragile sound; the worst thing he ever did was change to that straight soprano. Every note Roscoe plays is different—its attack, vibrato, the amount of air he puts into the horn. He shapes each note, and that’s really affected me, that every note is important."

- "Wow—this guy’s got tone, that beautiful Earl Bostic kind of sound. […] It sounds like Bostic—fat, greasy tone, short tunes, a corny \textit{La Cucuracha}"\textsuperscript{52}

In the first quotation, Zorn shows his nuanced interest in timbre, which serves as the central pillar around which he builds his entire response. Even in the second passage, in which

\textsuperscript{48} James Carter, for example, says: “This is definitely Joe Henderson. […] Joe’s tone was immediately identifiable. There was a roundness in it […]” Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: James Carter.”
\textsuperscript{50} Feather, “Blindfold Test: Wild Bill Davis.”
other criteria are invoked, timbre remains the priority, as Zorn immediately mentions "tone" and then repeatedly brings up the issue ("Earl Bostic kind of sound," "fat, greasy tone"). For listeners like Zorn, then, perhaps the non-timbral features are less important to stylistic identification. This fixation on timbre occurs especially frequently with listeners attuned to the timbral qualities of a particular instrument—such as musicians who play that instrument. In these cases, especially, timbre can serve as a central identifier. Steve Turre, for instance, attends to other trombonists’ timbral features in order to identify them:

- "That’s gotta be Jimmy Cleveland: the finesse and control in the upper register, the gorgeous sound. Trademarks are the way he ends a note with a personal vibrato and that lip slur up an octave."

- "Every jazz trombonist is different. You use mouth and tongue to articulate each note, and everybody’s mouth is different. You don’t sound quite like anyone else unless you’re making a conscious effort to mimic somebody. J.J. tongues everything, Mangelsdorff pops notes with his lips, Frank combines. Classical players are trained to tongue exactly the same: they don’t want individuality in an orchestra."

- "Who’s this? That walkin’ on eggshell breathiness—that’s Vic! Even with a straight mute. [ . . . ] Without question: Vic Dickenson—pure feeling."53

As evidenced by the examples above, the blindfold tests are replete with timbral observations, and listeners respond not only to "sound" or "tone" in general, but also to attack, release, vibrato, breath, articulation, and other specific timbral features.

But timbre is by no means the sole criteria for recognition. Benadon acknowledges that different listeners likely apply different strategies for recognize a given performer.54 Even when listeners primarily use timbre for their identifications, their statements often belie the importance of other musical criteria. Don Pullen suggests that, for certain players, his identification comes almost entirely from timbral cues: "McCoy [Tyner] comes to mind: that’s his sound, and the power he plays with. What’s identifiable is not necessarily what he plays, but his touch; that’s something that comes with maturity and experience."55 In separating what is played

---

from the pianist’s "touch," Pullen implicitly acknowledges that, with other pianists, "touch" is less significant to the stylistic identification than what is played.

Listeners like Pullen frequently differentiate between "sound" and "style," attempting to separate what is played (non-timbral features) from how it is played (timbral features). Often, this emerges implicitly, when a listener chooses to include both terms in an observation about the player’s identifiability, saying that "Louie Bellson has such a distinctive style and sound" or "I can’t recognize the trumpeter by his style or sound." Other times, the issue arises when the two components seem to pull in opposing directions. One listener identifies the baritone saxophonist Gerry Mulligan, but is disoriented by the unusual instrumentation:

"[Laughs] I know this style, but not on this instrument! I’m going to put my career on the line for this one. This is unmistakably Gerry Mulligan playing soprano saxophone, and having written that tune. I listened to the solo for a while and thought, gee, I know the style, but the instrument isn’t right! I thought a while more and figured it must be Gerry Mulligan’s Miami band that I’ve heard about." Hearing Mulligan on soprano saxophone disrupts—but by no means prevents—the listener’s identification. Timbre, it seems, cannot tell the entire story. Another listener similarly identifies a player by stylistic means, after a bad recording that obscures the instrument’s timbre: "Clifford Brown. The recording doesn’t capture his sound. There’s only a few hints of his sound, but it’s his notes, his way of playing." In each of these cases, the unknown player’s "sound" grates against his "style": once because of a multi-instrumentalist on an unfamiliar instrument and once because of recording problems.

This sound-style division seems to emerge from a familiar analogy between music and speech: the distinction between the "voice"—the vocal qualities of the speaker—and the "con-
tent” of what is being said.60 In his blindfold test, saxophonist Charles McPherson invokes this metaphor:

This is Jackie McLean on alto. I know Jackie’s style and his sound. Everyone has a sound, just like everyone has a recognizable voice. Someone calls you on the phone, you answer and you know who it is by the voice. That’s the way Jackie was with his saxophone.61

Unlike many other approaches to style in the arts, which typically label style as a surface phenomenon existing above deeper abstract structures (as, for example, in the commonsense division between “substance” and “style”), jazz listeners’ division between sound and style emphasizes style as a content-based conception.62 The fact that listeners often feel obliged to separate the domain of timbral features from non-timbral features suggests that, for many, these categories operate relatively independently in the stylistic identification process.63 And while timbre may be an important aspect of recognizing an unknown player, it should not be regarded as the only marker of identifiability in jazz.

60 Blake Wilson, George J. Buelow, and Peter A. Hoyt, “Rhetoric and music,” in Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online. (Oxford University Press), accessed December 17, 2014. This partitioning of timbral and non-timbral features also taps into a long history of applying the Cartesian split between mind and body to music. Even in jazz, in which no written score usually exists, this division persists and is tied fundamentally to deep ideological rifts within the jazz community. In his reading of Amiri Baraka, Benjamin Givan has suggested that Baraka’s premise “that music ought to be judged by its intellectual content as opposed to its physical execution—represents the nearest thing to a consensus among Monk’s devotees” (414) and that the embrace of such a dualism by Baraka and others can be seen as an attempt to “undercut longstanding primitivist stereotypes of black culture as body-oriented” (416). Although some jazz listeners may adhere to the aims of elevating the abstract aspects of jazz performance, many others simply absorb this dualistic perspective through talking to musicians and other players, reading jazz criticism and being exposed to precepts of jazz pedagogy. See Ingrid Monson, “Doubtless and Jazz Improvisation: Irony, Parody, and Ethnomusicology,” Critical Inquiry 20, no. 2 (1994): 283; Gabriel Solis, “‘A Unique Chunk of Jazz Reality’: Authorship, Musical Work Concepts, and Thelonious Monk’s Live Recordings from the Five Spot, 1958,” Ethnomusicology 48, no. 3 (2004): 315–347.


62 Some aesthetic theorists have emphasized that these distinctions between form and content (the “how” and the “what”) are false, and that instead any functional conception of style must embrace both dimensions. Stephanie Ross, “Style in Art,” in The Oxford Handbook of Aesthetics, ed. Jerrold Levinson (Oxford University Press, 2005), 228–244.

63 This is not always the case. In one of his blindfold tests, Joe Lovano says that players should seek unity between these two domains, and specifically describes the live experience as central to this realization: “Sounds like Charlie Rouse. His tone, rhythm, and articulation . . . he really plays everything so clearly and his phrasing is so fine. Rouse was one of my real heroes. And to come to New York and be in the same room with the sound you grew up listening to really inspired me to try and develop my own sound, really capture that concept. Not just playing notes, trying to really have a personality. Have your ideas and your sound be one thing. And players like Rouse really had that.” Bill Milkowski, “Blindfold Test: Joe Lovano,” Down Beat (December 1990): 53.
In this project, I suggest that a thorough understanding of stylistic identification requires us to look beyond timbre. Timbre does not always serve as a functional cue; in many cases timbral features can contradict other identifying features, impeding the stylistic identification. In these cases, a myopic focus on timbre can act as an inadvertent smokescreen, obscuring a player’s identity with timbral similarities to someone else. Bassist Will Lee summarizes in a characteristic example: "It’s funny, because when he first started playing, I was thinking, ‘God, that sounds like Jaco [Pastorius].’ That’s the problem with fretless [bass]. Anytime you play one, everybody immediately goes, ‘Jaco!’" Lee, who was in fact listening to Victor Bailey rather than Pastorius, failed to identify the correct player because of the overwhelming cue of the fretless bass, resulting a kind of perceptual blindness. Even in less outright cases, listeners can have difficulty distinguishing which instrument is playing. Saxophonists (most frequently alto and tenor saxophone players) using the extreme registers of their instruments can approximate the sound of a different member of the saxophone family, and this can impede a listener’s identification.

In addition to Lee’s example, other blindfold test scenarios suggest that timbre can serve as a red herring rather than as a significant stylistic cue:

1. Multi-instrumentalists

65 Perceptual blindness, (also called inattentional blindness or, in the case of music, inattentional deafness) describes the phenomenon whereby a viewer or listener can fail to notice even glaringly obvious features of a given stimuli when focusing on a specific task. In the most well-known example, subjects were asked to count the number of times a basketball was passed between the individuals onscreen. A significant percentage of these participants failed to notice a man in a gorilla suit walking through the center of the screen. Daniel J. Simons and Christopher F. Chabris, “Gorillas in Our Midst: Sustained Inattentional Blindness for Dynamic Events,” *Perception* 28, no. 9 (1999): 1059–74. For a recent analogous study of inattentional deafness in music, see Sabrina Koreimann, Bartosz Gula, and Oliver Vitouch, “Inattentional Deafness in Music,” *Psychological Research* 78, no. 3 (2014): 304–12.
As previously mentioned, multi-instrumentalists disrupt traditional expectations about a given player’s timbre. Multi-instrumentalism is common in jazz. Saxophonists, for instance, frequently play several instruments in the saxophone family and sometimes double on flute and/or clarinet. In these cases, apparent sonic cues can obscure stylistic familiarity, and listeners have to rely on alternative criteria:

I was puzzled there for the first few bars; I couldn’t figure out who it was. Then I heard a couple of characteristic phrases and . . . it’s gotta be Zoot Sims. I never heard Zoot on the soprano; I know he’s been playing it for the last couple of years. But he plays Zoot, and he’s a total individualist.

I think he’s been very successful in transferring his style from the heavier instrument to the smaller one without losing the character of his playing.67

2. "Inexpressive" instruments

Other listeners complain that certain instruments lack timbral expressivity. Certain equipment setups limit the timbral options at the player’s disposal. According to Pat Metheny,

On a solid body guitar put through an amplifier, turned way up, it’s very difficult to distinguish one player from the next. The same problem is true of a Rhodes piano; you’re dealing with a highly electronic sound and the only things that can make it distinctive are the note choices and the phrasing.68

Metheny’s opinions are shared by other blindfold test participants. The electric Rhodes piano, in the words of one listener, "mask[s] a lot of the stylistic elements that a piano player brings to the instrument."69 Others echo this sentiment. To Toshiko Akiyoshi, "the pianists who have this equipment all sound pretty much the same to me,"70 and for Kenny Barron, the electric piano obscures the crucial identifier of touch, forcing him to use other criteria: "This reminds me technically of Ahmad Jamal, whom I’ve heard the last few summers in Europe. But—this is electric piano, which I’ve never heard him play. You can’t identify anybody’s touch [on it], so I have to rely on his style and concept."71

---

3. Recording/playback problems

As Patrice Rushen says, "sometimes on records the sound can be deceiving." Problems with the recording, mixing, or unusual live settings can distort the timbral qualities of a player. In these situations, listeners necessarily respond to other criteria like melodic concept, harmony, and/or rhythm. In one blindfold test, one listener notes that the recording’s balance obscures the pianist’s sound: "George Shearing used to have a little brighter sound. It was difficult to recognize at first, but he was playing chords I recognized." In addition to the problems on the recording end, playback challenges can impact the listener’s ability to distinguish timbre. One blindfold test mentions that the audio setup is subpar because interviewee Roy Haynes "needs a new needle and cartridge, if not a turntable." Despite this impediment, and only "hearing one channel of stereo, he still knew players young and old almost immediately."

4. Changing equipment and/or technique

Finally, timbre is especially dependent on changes in equipment or technique. For almost any musician, day-to-day alterations to an instrument or setup (or changes to a player’s technique) can radically shift the resulting sound, making the timbre difficult to place or entirely unrecognizable:

- Horace Silver: "I think that was Hank Mobley on tenor, though the tone was slightly heavier than usual—could’ve been his reed."
- Arthur Blythe: "This is an album with Jackie McLean. […] He’s got a bad reed on, though. Hear that catch there?"

---

78 Ibid.
Ralph Peterson: "I have always been able to identify [Andrew] Cyrille through his cymbal sound, which is very clear, and its absence is what threw me."^81

Russell Malone: "Ah, Jim Hall. He was picking toward the bridge, which makes the guitar tone more brittle, which isn’t how I’m used to hearing him."^82

The variability of saxophonists’ reeds, changing drum setups, or alterations to guitarists’ picking can disrupt a listener attempting to recognize a player solely using his or her timbre. Even a player’s physiological features (for instance, embouchure), which change over time, can impact the nuances of timbre. In cases in which a player’s timbre undergoes stark changes, listeners must resort to alternative means of stylistic identification.^83

Prioritizing timbre’s role in aural identification—at the exclusion of other parameters—has sometimes given scholars cause to avoid probing the issue more thoroughly. Because timbral qualities generally lack the shared lexicon of pitch- and rhythm-based musical analysis, relegating stylistic recognition to the realm of timbre often seems an excuse to concede the point entirely. Just as a doctor of internal medicine might suggest that a patient’s pain is "psychological," and thereby throw her hands up, a jazz scholar is able to label stylistic identification as primarily a question of timbre, and therefore discuss it only in general terms or elide the issue entirely.

Working against the assumption that stylistic identification occurs through any one path or using any one type of musical cue, I would like to look at stylistic identification through an

^83 Alternatively, a listener must make finer gradations in their appraisal of a player’s tone. Then, listeners use their knowledge about a player’s changing timbre to specify the specific era in which the record was made. Ravi Coltrane, for instance, says: "That’s late Gene Ammons. His tone is much harder here than his earlier sound, but got into some things with tone and phrasing that made me know it was him." Panken, “Blindfold Test: Ravi Coltrane.” Similarly, John Handy uses his knowledge of Sonny Rollins’ recent equipment changes to place the unknown recording more precisely within Rollins’ oeuvre: "This sounds like a recent recording [of Sonny Rollins] because he’s playing with a soft reed, so that he gets a more piercing sound that sounds like it could squeak at any moment." Dan Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: John Handy,” *Down Beat* (January 2006): 98. See further discussion in section 1.1.3.
expansive lens. Instead of focusing solely on one parameter, I will use the remainder of this section to explore several potential domains in which listeners might identify an unknown player. As these explorations continue, I will show the substantial extent to which all of these parameters become intertwined in the blindfold tests.

Harmony

Unlike timbre, harmony has an accepted vocabulary, allowing listeners to provide details of harmonic cues that extend beyond implicit observations like "the chords sound like what Bill Evans would do," or "sounds like George Benson comping back there." Chord qualities, harmonic substitutions, and identifiable voicings used by a keyboard instrument or guitar can help to clue in a listener. A statement by Jason Moran provides a rich example:

That’s Jaki Byard. […] At the beginning of this piece, in that 15-second intro, he played a chord that is an old chord. It’s more than notes. It takes a certain touch. He hits a I-VII-flat9 [I7(b9)], but it’s also where he put it in the register. Younger players don’t play down there, so anyone who goes down there understands that region of the piano. It’s Jaki playing old chords […] Moran’s comments reveal the subtle ways in which a stylistic cue can operate. It is not solely Byard’s voicing that reveals him, but also its placement in a particular register of the piano. At the same time, Moran’s description of the "old chord" reflects an underlying concern for history and an engagement with some conception of instrumental lineage—a preoccupation that concerns many jazz musicians and listeners.

84 Mandel, “Blindfold Test: Don Pullen.”
86 Harmonic observations are by no means limited to chordal instrumentalists. James Carter recognizes saxophonist Coleman Hawkins’ playing by the "harmonic conception," noting Hawkins’ particular "way of going through the passing chords." (Larry Birnbaum, “Blindfold Test: James Carter,” Down Beat [September 1995]: 62) In many cases, however, observations of underlying harmonic features in a melodic solo are subsumed within greater discussions of melody or the interrelated term "melodic conception" (see section 1.1.2).
87 Dan Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Jason Moran,” Down Beat (May 2006): 138, 134. In the written transcription of Moran’s comment ("one seven flat nine"), the interviewer mistakenly interprets the utterance as "I-VII-flat9"—an assemblage of Roman numeral designations and chord alterations meaningless in the context of the musical example—rather than "I7(b9)."
Other times, a general harmonic approach serves as an identifier. For one listener, the identification of an unknown player relies on "how this pianist obscured the harmony—sometimes he'd play only two notes with the left hand, or little clusters where it's hard to identify the voicing on first listening."\(^{88}\) Myra Melford's recognition of Geri Allen, likewise, relates to a series of unadorned chord voicings: "And there were not a lot of extensions in the beginning—something about that says Geri Allen to me."\(^{89}\) Especially because jazz musicians' training often focuses on harmonic understanding, the blindfold tests' comments frequently reveal harmony as a significant identifier of a player's style. Chucho Valdés, for instance, notes how he learned a particular stylistic cue from careful study: "Keith [Jarrett] almost fooled me. At first I thought this could be Bud Powell, but I heard a chord and I knew it was him. I've studied his harmonic secrets, and that's how I figured it out. He plays a substitution that's unique in today's music."\(^{90}\)

In most cases, however, listeners do not respond to a single feature in isolation; rather, most identifications rely on complexes of features cobbled together from all aspects of their listening experience. In his identification of Bill Evans, Fred Hersch says that he "knew it was Bill from the first few bars with the voicing of the chords and the tune choice: a waltz. There's also a certain way that he played the lines with a buoyancy to his time feel that's unmistakeable."\(^{91}\) Hersch simultaneously appraises numerous features—both improvisational and compositional—in order to come up with his guess of Bill Evans.

*Rhythm*

Rhythm, while certainly an important domain for listeners' stylistic identification, remains relatively infrequently discussed in the blindfold tests. Although there are some exceptions,\(^{92}\)
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92 See, for example, Andrew Cyrille’s comments attempting to identify the drummer Sid Catlett: "To me, the way that sock cymbal was being played—the dotted eighths and sixteenths—sounds the way Jo Jones plays.” Although
many listeners confine their observations about rhythm to statements that are vague or very
general. Danilo Perez, for instance, notes that "the rhythmic language reminds" him of a par-
ticular pianist, while, in a different blindfold test, Harold Mabern says, "I hear a lot of Phineas
[Newborn] influence in the right hand with the triplets." Instead, rhythmic observations are
often subsumed under discussions of "licks" or the player’s rhythmic feel.

Rhythmic feel (referred to by listeners under various euphemisms including "swing," "groove,"
"time," or "strut"), on the other hand, reappears as one of the most insistent markers of indi-
vidual style. Although some disagreement exists as to an exact definition, rhythmic feel refers
roughly to the microrhythmic relationship between downbeat and upbeat, most typically con-
ceived in terms of jazz’s standard eighth-note subdivisions. In addition, it subsumes aspects
of how players place the beat with respect to the other members of the ensemble. Unsurpris-
ingly, drummers most frequently invoke this criterion:

- Peter Erskine: "What makes one drummer’s beat sound different from another
is the space between the notes. It doesn’t have to do with technique or sticking,
it’s just the shape between the notes."

- Jeff Hamilton: "This is tough because there’s a whole school of drummers that
have come from that "Bernard" [Pudie] feel. A lot of them have gotten very
close to his fatness with the beat. When you listen to a guy play time like this
on this kind of groove, and do it consistently, then it’s probably going to be
Bernard."

- Joey Baron: "Mr. [Art] Blakey. You know from his very first hit, from his time
feel, the very wide beat—he’s so sure and deliberate about everything—and
what his left foot did, juxtaposing odd figures or unusual rhythms when most
of the drummers were just using it to mark the two and four."

Cyrille misidentifies the player, his primary resemblance criterion is the rhythmic pattern of the drummer’s
groove. Jeske, "Blindfold Test: Andrew Cyrille." For further discussion of distinctive groove patterns and their
associated meanings, see Ingrid Monson, "What’s Sound Got to Do With It?: Jazz, Poststructuralism, and the
Construction of Cultural Meaning," in Creativity in Performance, ed. R. Keith Sawyer (Greenwich, CT: Ablex,
1997), 95–112.

93 For recent treatments of rhythmic feel in jazz, see Fernando Benadon, “Slicing the Beat: Jazz Eighth-Notes as Ex-

94 Stewart, "Blindfold Test: Peter Erskine."


Other instrumentalists, however, also bear recognizable time feels. Donny McCaslin notes how saxophonist Dexter Gordon "stretches the time and then lays back on the time," and Mulgrew Miller cites "the way he plays time" in identifying pianist Monty Alexander. As in many of these cases, no one resemblance criterion prevails. Rather, Miller processes a range of different criteria simultaneously, including the rhythmic feel, but also "the strong Jamaican roots in that tune," "the happy, joyous things in his playing," and "the way he deals with chord substitutions."

Scales and macroharmony

In some instances, listeners respond to the scalar collections that players deploy. Chucho Valdés identifies pianist Danilo Perez through "his language" of "atonal scales" and "polytonalisms." In his identification of saxophonist Sam Rivers, James Newton notes that "Sam’s playing is very identifiable from the very beginning, because his approach to modes and scales is very unique," which causes "his lines stick out immediately." As with the other types of resemblance criteria, it is rarely the scale alone that signals who is playing. In the case of Newton’s identification, for example, it’s the way Rivers melodically uses the scales (in his "lines") that marks it as "Rivers-like." Similarly, Bobby Hutcherson’s identification of fellow vibist Lionel Hampton relies on the scales Hampton uses, but also the way he interacts with the rest of the ensemble and the rhythmic features of his approach: "Hamp can’t help but sketch out these little underlying things while the rest of the ensemble plays. [ . . . ] Hamp plays with a lot of whole tone scales on several chords. And he rolls a lot of triplets into a whole tone." These

---

98 Birnbaum, “Blindfold Test: Mulgrew Miller.”
100 Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Chucho Valdés.”
kinds of resemblance complexes, which combine various parameters, are discussed further in Chapter 2.

Melody

Melodic features are frequently cited as potent identifiers in the blindfold tests; this is particularly unsurprising, given jazz soloists’ overwhelming focus on shaping and cultivating tools of melodic improvisation. Many listeners recognize a player’s recurrent melodic formulae, but often different listeners will segment and parse the melody in divergent ways. For some, individual intervals serve as resemblance criteria. In one of his blindfold tests, Chucho Valdés notes that, despite his doubts that it is Thelonious Monk, he can hear “the world of Monk” because "you can hear those classic minor seconds in there.”103 For Valdés, therefore, the appearance (or repetition) of this particular interval is not only Monkesque, it’s "classic" to Monk’s style. In attaining this "classic" status, this particular resemblance criterion is so solidly connected to Monk’s style that, for Valdés, it can be used by other players, paradoxically, without losing its Monkesque status. (This issue will be brought up again later in the chapter, and treated in greater depth in Chapter 5). Other listeners, too, draw on individual intervals. First collecting contextual clues to help him corral his guesses, Ben Allison cites a recurrent interval as one among several clues helping him identify an unknown bass player:

> Well, here’s another one I don’t recognize. I hear a ‘70s sound that’s amplified, and the bass player is doing a lot of slides and pull-offs—what we call hiccups. He’s also playing a lot of tenths. When I think of that style, I think of Ron Carter, especially. So Ron is going to be my guess.104

Once again, no single resemblance criterion predominates. Allison does not merely hear tenths and identify Ron Carter. Instead, the process of identification emerges smoothly out of gradual contextualization. Allison’s observation about the recording quality and amplified timbre of

---
103 Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Chucho Valdés.”
the bass cannot be regarded as fundamentally different than his observation about the bassist’s "hiccup" or the recurrence of tenths.

For other listeners, certain intervals only become identifiable through the ways in which a player rhetorically marks them. Through the player’s articulation or some other means, certain intervallic leaps become highlighted. Yusef Lateef suggests that he identifies Dizzy Gillespie through the intervallic makeup of his solos: "And those large intervals that he plays—that’s kind of unique too. He slurs those large intervals, like major sevenths or flat nine intervals, which has a lot to do with the originality of his playing."⁹⁵ Lateef makes a point of the fact that Gillespie’s recognizability emerges not only from the intervals themselves, but how Gillespie smoothly slurs these leaps rather than tonguing them individually. In a similar description, David Sanchez notes that the rhetorical shaping of individual intervals can serve him as an identifier of a player’s sound: "The saxophone player sounds a lot like Michael Brecker. A lot of people try to copy Mike, but when Mike plays a phrase I know it’s him because he plays certain intervals with a certain attitude."⁹⁶ Although Sanchez does not specify how this "attitude" is achieved, the way in which he pairs an implicit timbral cue with a more traditional melodic observation speaks to the integrated nature of stylistic identification.

On a larger scale, some listeners respond to particular interval chains. Although explicit mention of this is relatively rare in the blindfold tests—when discussing longer melodic segments, listeners typically identify a "lick" without dissecting its intervallic makeup—some listeners call out particular repeating sequences of intervals. Jaki Byard, in a 1981 test, identifies Randy Weston in such a way, noting "that cyclic thing, up a fourth, down a fifth, up a fourth, down a fifth is typical of him."⁹⁷

Recurrent melodic ideas—most frequently called "licks"—serve many listeners as a primary means of identifying a particular player’s style. Although "lick," "formula," or "cliché" sometimes imply a negative connotation, this is not always the case. One listener, for example, notes: "I can tell Freddie Hubbard now, because he has a few little tricks that he does on his horn which nobody does but him. I can identify him by those little cliches he does, which is fantastic—he’s a fantastic trumpeter." John McLaughlin acknowledges the same thing: "We’ve all got our stock phrases. As soon as you play them, you betray yourself. That’s not a criticism. It’s just the way it is." In these cases, the lick becomes an extension of the individual and listeners will discuss it as an almost independent entity, existing outside of the individual or the solo:

- "[immediately] Ron Carter. [...] Ron has gotten to the place where you expect Ronisms, and only he can do them. It’s fresh because you’re hearing him do things that he developed."
- "It’s Steep. That’s what they call Branford [Marsalis]. He comes from that lineage of soprano saxophone players like [Johnny] Hodges, [Sydney] Bechet, Trane—the cats you can immediately identify. Branford is also quite emulated. At the beginning of this song, it threw me a little, but once we got deeper into it, I could hear those Branfordisms like those little tails he plays."

While melodic formulae are often called "licks" by jazz insiders, the range of terminology is quite wide, including "tricks," "signatures," "innuendos," or "mannerisms." More generally, listeners refer to melodic segments as "lines," "runs," "phrases," "ideas," or "concepts." Although these terms do not specifically suggest a recurrent melodic fragment, this repetition is often conveyed through its contextual use, as in "I heard some Charlie Christian lines" by Leonard Feather, "Blindfold Test: George Benson," Down Beat (March 23, 1978): 31. Sometimes players refer to a collective grouping of such recurrent phrases as a "lexicon" or "vocabulary," building out of a pervasive "music as language" metaphor shared among many jazz listeners. Even references to the a player’s "stuff" implies a repetition of musical material (usually melody) defined by a player’s identity: "The flute player at first reminded me of some of the stuff that Jimmy Heath would do"; "When the first guitarist started playing nylon string, I heard some Pat Metheny stuff." Leonard Feather, "Blindfold Test: Jeff Lorber," Down Beat (November 1979): 61; Panken, "Blindfold Test: Bill Frisell." Licks also need not be melodic, in the traditional sense. See, for example: "The drummer was playing real kind of straight eighth-note rhythm. My guess would be that it was Roy Haynes, especially in the way that he was playing on the fours, and the tonality he was getting on the drums. The vocabulary on the fours was real Roy Haynes stuff, and there was a certain kind of exuberance and loose ‘go-for-broke, what-the-hell, hit-the-tom-toms’ that Roy Haynes does that’s great." Lee Jeske, "Blindfold Test: Peter Erskine," Down Beat (June 1983): 47.

Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: James Carter.”
In some cases, listeners instead respond to a broader concept of melody, citing similarities in how a player constructs his or her melodic lines rather than specifically identifying the lines themselves. In one example, Lionel Loueke suggests that an unidentified guitar player "has a big Pat Metheny influence, but not cliched, not doing Pat’s licks. I can hear the melodic sense." Similarly, Ravi Coltrane assesses the general melodic features of an unknown player: "The tenor player sounds somewhat influenced by Branford; the shape of his lines sounds like some things Branford played." Rather than citing specific familiar melodic formulae, listeners like Loueke and Coltrane connect to a player’s "melodic sense" or "melodic conception." Paul Berliner defines "melodic conception" as a meta-signifier encompassing contour, phrasing, rhythmic features, and timbral characteristics—another complex of features.

Different listeners, different criteria

Every listener is different. In the case of the majority of the blindfold tests, the participating listener is a professional musician with extensive familiarity with one or more instruments. Even within the community of blindfold test participants that are proficient jazz players with musical training, every listener has a different background, a different listening history with familiar and unfamiliar recordings, and a different areas of expertise.

Absolute pitch or or expertise with a given instrument can impact which cues are relevant to stylistic identification. In one test, a listener suggests that "the tenor player sounds like Ralph Bowen, who has that honing quality when he gets up to those high E’s." Other cases merely use absolute pitch designations as referential markers in identifying other relevant resemblance criteria. Phil Wilson, for example, notes that the unknown player "sounds a little like Vic [Dickenson] the way he bent around that F"; it remains unclear whether or not the F itself is a pertinent criterion, or merely a discursive marker in order to label the note with

---

114 Panken, “Blindfold Test: Ravi Coltrane.”
115 Berliner, *Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation*, 182.
the characteristic articulation.\textsuperscript{117} Even for listeners without absolute pitch, certain pitches can be timbrally identifiable (see section 2.5 for further discussion). Alongside other criteria, Ricky Ford cites the timbre of a particular note as a significant resemblance criterion: "Sounds like Joe Henderson. [. . . ] The giveaway is his tone—the timbre of his high G, his very identifiable altissimo register, a couple of trills here and there."\textsuperscript{118}

Likewise, instrumental expertise can allow listeners to distinguish musical features with greater specificity, as well as provide them with the vocabulary to articulate their observations. Drummers—who have spent time listening to and shaping their own drum sounds—often comment on specifics of a drummer’s setup (such as the tuning of the drumheads) or the particular techniques that he or she uses.\textsuperscript{119}

Even for a single listener, different cues might trigger different identifications. One listener, for instance, cites timbre to identify the trumpet player and harmonic features to identify the pianist: "Definitely Kenny Dorham—I can tell by the sound of his horn—with Joe Henderson and McCoy Tyner. I can tell it’s McCoy by his chording and his comps."\textsuperscript{120} The appearance of a certain rhythmic motive might suggest a particular tenor saxophonist while the tuning and timbre of the drums implies who the drummer is.

\textit{Dissolution of context/text division}

In short, listeners respond to everything. Any musical feature that could serve as a point of attention could potentially serve as a stylistic marker. Even the distinction between musical and non-musical observations functionally erodes when looking through the comments of blindfoldees. Pianist Keith Jarrett is frequently identified by the vocalizations that accompany his playing: "Well, it’s definitely Keith Jarrett [ . . . ] Of course, the telltale sign is his voice";

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
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"This must be Keith, but [...] he usually doesn’t only hum, he howls and does all kinds of things”; "I think it was Keith, I think I heard a little yell like he does too, when he’s playing.”\(^{121}\)

While Jarrett’s vocal additions are an apparent, identifiable part of his recordings, they are not what an analyst would typically regard as musical parameters. Few, if any, would include Jarrett’s yelling and humming in a notated transcription. Yet to many listeners this criterion remains a central part of Jarrett’s identifiability.

In the same vein, listeners often assess aspects of the recording setup, even going as far as identifying particular recording engineers and studio locations.\(^{122}\) ECM and Blue Note recordings, in particular, are frequently associated with specific sonic qualities.\(^{123}\) ECM recordings’ identifiability, often based on reverb or a sonic openness, eschews criteria traditionally thought of as "musical." Yet such observations of the ECM sound are crucial to a listener’s musical experience, and are so ubiquitous that one listener says, "I’m trying to stay away from saying stereotypical things, like ‘This sounds like an ECM date.’”\(^{124}\)

In the cases of identifiable recording setups by ECM or Blue Note, listeners construct categories of associated features much as they would for an individual player’s style. When hearing various Blue Note recordings by recording engineer Rudy Van Gelder, two listeners may recognize the setup using different criteria. Peter Erskine, for instance, identifies a Blue Note record by the bass sound, because "there’s a direct sound to it, the direct signal of the acoustic


122 This attention to recording qualities in the blindfold tests likely relates to the fact that most of the listeners are professional musicians, who are accustomed to listening to their own recordings with a nuanced ear for balance and setup.


124 Panken, “Blindfold Test: David Weiss.”
bass. It has a presence to it.”\textsuperscript{125} For Horace Silver, he can "tell the sound of [Van Gelder’s] studio and the way he records drums," which help to produce "that Blue Note sound."\textsuperscript{126} Ravi Coltrane, by contrast, recognizes sound of the piano from Van Gelder’s studio, and in a separate blindfold test, Roy Hargrove seconds this assessment, saying that Van Gelder’s piano "had a certain sound, whether Herbie [Hancock] or McCoy [Tyner] played it.”\textsuperscript{127}

In these scenarios, the boundary between contextualization and identification appears to dissolve. Consider the following comments from an onstage blindfold test by Fred Hersch:

> I can’t identify who this is, but I have a few observations. It’s the pianist’s date because the pianist has more choruses than anyone else. The tune has the same changes as Coltrane’s “Afro Blue,” and it’s recorded in a kind of head-in and head-out, Blue Note-styled date that probably took place in an afternoon. […] If it is a Blue Note side with those easy chord changes and style of arrangement, I’d guess it could have been Horace Silver.\textsuperscript{128}

Hersch’s guess is correct: it is Horace Silver. But his slow, deductive process incorporates evidence from the composition (the changes), the arrangement (the "head-in and head-out, Blue Note-styled date"), and the expected social and musical hierarchies of a recording session ("the pianist has more choruses than anyone else"). In addition to the features outlined in his explicit statement, Hersch is evaluating additional details of the musical structures he hears as well as the circumstances in which he is hearing the recording. The fact that Hersch is hearing the recording played in a blindfold test, for instance, likewise shapes his expectations about what is being played—as do the responses of the audience in front of him, what he knows of person administering the test, and innumerable other contextual criteria. In Hersch’s response, therefore, no division can exist between musical and non-musical criteria.

Chapter 2 expands this discussion, examining the differing ways in which listeners might cast resemblance between two similar-sounding moments. What musical features might different listeners respond to, and how do their interpretations impact how similar or dissimilar two

\textsuperscript{125} Bourne, “Blindfold Test: Peter Erskine.”
\textsuperscript{126} Bouchard, “Blindfold Test: Horace Silver.”
\textsuperscript{127} Panken, “Blindfold Test: Ravi Coltrane”; Bouchard, “Blindfold Test: Roy Hargrove.”
\textsuperscript{128} Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Fred Hersch.”
1.1 Down Beat’s “blindfold test”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>→  &quot;He’s playing some standard jazz guitar licks&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Idiom     | →  "That’s Oscar Peterson."
| Intraopus Style | →  "I didn’t like this track so much […] he had this one motif he kept repeating"

Table 1.1: Levels of style in Meyer

| Individual | →  "Ain’t nobody can play like that except Freddie Hubbard"
| Ensemble   | →  "It sounds like the Bill Evans Trio"
| Generation | →  "I would say it’s an older trumpet player"
| City       | →  "Sounds like the Chicago school of tenor saxophone"
| Region     | →  "It’s by someone from Central America"
| Genre      | →  "It doesn’t sound like he’s playing bebop. That’s hard blues."

Table 1.2: Potential levels of style in the Down Beat blindfold tests

musical passages seem? Examining these one-to-one stylistic comparisons provides an initial window into how listeners construct ideas of style.

1.1.3 How do listeners regard style?

As they participate in stylistic identification, how do listeners talk about style? How do they conceptualize stylistic groupings? First, listeners seem to simultaneously view style operating in numerous arenas and at multiple levels. Just as Leonard Meyer conceived of multiple levels of style (dialect, idiom, intraopus style; see section 1), jazz listeners move between various stylistic groupings, sometimes arranged with a specific hierarchy, but often in overlapping, partially nesting categories that obey no specific order.

Tables 1.1 and 1.2 show two alternative sets of stylistic groupings. Table 1.1 shows Meyer’s tripartite division of dialect (shared among several individuals), idiom (used by one individual), and intraopus style (within a single work), with correlating comments from the blindfold tests. Meyer’s system is only one possible way to arrange stylistic groupings, however, and Table 1.2 shows a number of different organizational categories present in listener comments.

on the pages of *Down Beat*. None of these levels precludes the others; it is perfectly valid to say that a recording sounds like an older player (generation) and that it sounds like Doc Cheatham (individual).

In addition, these levels are *perceived*, but not necessarily existing for all other listeners. Emerging from subjectively generated priorities, these stylistic groupings can also be problematic. Listeners, for instance, might group individuals via ethnic- or gender-based categories—the very stylistic categories that Feather sought to dismantle with the blindfold test. One listener’s blindfold test categorizes an unknown player as female, based on a set of stylistic preconceptions about female musicians: "Is that a lady playing? A very gentle approach."¹³⁸ The player, who is in fact Bill Evans, is labeled as a woman because of the listener’s notion—culturally-constructed, perhaps—that a musician’s gender would mark his or her playing in a particular, stylistically recognizable way. Cultural or moral problems aside, in this case the stylistic grouping that the listener invoked (the "female musicians have a gentle approach" paradigm) proves ineffective at helping identify who is playing.

For many situations, the boundaries between different stylistic groupings are porous, with a nebulous division between one player and another. One arena in which this issue continually recurs is discussions of influence. Jazz listeners are preoccupied by historical lineage (to be discussed further the following section), and because of this blindfold test subjects frequently identify someone with an influence-related caveat: "It’s X or someone influenced by X." In his 1997 blindfold test, John Abercrombie vacillates between guessing George Benson or "one of his clones."¹³⁹ Similar markers of hesitation appear throughout the blindfold tests as listeners come to grips with overlapping stylistic groupings. Encountering a player that sounds like Steve Lacy in some ways but not in others, Wayne Shorter concludes that "whoever was playing

---

the soprano I think likes Steve Lacy.” Drummer Charli Persip’s blindfold test reveals the tenuous boundary between influencer and influencee:

Drummers who Jo Jones influenced came to mind—in a couple of spots, it actually sounded like the influencer. […] In some of the other spots, it sounded like some of the drummers he influenced. A couple of spots it even sounded like Louie, but basically it sounded a little too heavy for Louie Bellson. For a minute it sounded like Grady Tate, but some of the licks I don’t think Grady would play.

Persip jumps from guess to guess, highlighting components that seem to fit within what he knows of a particular player’s style and then accounting for features that contradict his expectations of that style. Using moment-to-moment evaluations about what successfully meshes with his understanding of Jones’s, Bellson’s, or Tate’s styles, Persip is able to traverse a landscape of neighboring styles in hopes of finding the correct player. In some cases, listeners incorrectly identify the player as a disciple when it is the influencer. Other times, listeners are able to make fine distinctions in order to determine whether the recording contains an original or an influencee. In some cases, influence can even serve as a means to identify an unknown player. A listener picking up on something Bud Powell-esque might guess Barry Harris, something Thelonious Monk-esque might point toward Randy Weston, and someone who sounds like Dizzy Gillespie might signal Jon Faddis. Each case indicates a tenuous gap between one stylistic category and another. These conceptions of style suggest that style operates flexibly, and point toward an analytical apparatus of prototypical categorization that frames the second half of the dissertation (particularly Chapters 3 and 4).

144 Feather, “Blindfold Test: Monty Alexander”; Milkowski, “Blindfold Test: Christopher Hollyday.”
1.1.4 *Process of familiarization*

As mentioned above (section 1), stylistic identification requires two different processes: the long-range process of familiarization and the short-range process of stylistic analysis. Although the blindfold tests mostly focus on the real-time, in-the-moment process of stylistic analysis, some listeners drop hints as to how they gained familiarity with a player’s sound.

Listeners attain stylistic knowledge through various avenues. In addition to musical observation, many listeners also draw on social knowledge—who plays with whom, where certain individuals or ensembles are based—in order to build stylistic categories. In many cases, listeners deploy this social awareness alongside musical insight in order to identify players. In one case, a dual blindfold test\(^\text{146}\) with Kenny Barron and Mulgrew Miller begins with a number of different kinds of stylistic categories. According to Barron,

> The minute I heard this I could tell that this was someone who liked Bud Powell, and it sounded like someone from Detroit. I was thinking Barry Harris, but Mulgrew said no because it sounded like the rhythm section of Peter Washington and Lewis Nash. That being the case, I thought it must be Tommy Flanagan, my hero.\(^\text{147}\)

Barron invokes a series of different stylistic categories based on both musical and social knowledge. First, Barron references a player (Bud Powell), then a city (Detroit). Here, the "Detroit" stylistic category includes more than one player from Detroit. Next, Barron takes a guess from this broader category, hypothesizing that the player might be Barry Harris, a pianist from Detroit. He then refines it through dialogue with Miller, whose stylistic assessment of the rhythm section forces Barron to amend his guess. Because of the affiliation between bassist Peter Washington, drummer Lewis Nash, and pianist Tommy Flanagan (also from Detroit), Barron settles on Flanagan. Combining the musical cues that led him to think of Bud Powell and players from

\(^{146}\) In multiple-listener blindfold test, we can observe different processes of dialogic memory at play. In addition, these two-, three-, or four-person blindfold tests reveal how stylistic identification might embed itself in day-to-day discourses of jazz listeners (see the section on "Style in discourse," below).

Detroit with the social knowledge of various relationships between musicians allows Barron to reach an accurate identification. Miller’s account of his stylistic identification, it should be noted, is far more one-sided. He references only musical resemblance criteria:

I thought of Tommy right away, playing ‘How High the Moon.’ I recognized his touch and that unique kind of language, vocabulary in his playing. What always gives Tommy away for me is his left hand, which is a kind of legato left hand as opposed to a rhythmic left hand. Tommy plays these sustained chords with his left hand.148

Comparing Miller’s and Barron’s differing approaches to the same recording, we once again face the deeply subjective nature of the stylistic identification process. Even if two listeners agree on who is playing, they can easily differ on why they agree.

For many musicians, knowledge of another player’s style comes from experience playing together with him or her. Paquito D’Rivera, for example, recognizes a fellow Cuban jazz musician through their past collaboration: "It sounds like it could be Arturo Sandoval. It is? We’ve played together for so long that I recognize the way he sounds."149 In other cases, familiarity with a particular style comes from close study of a player’s recordings. Berliner notes that this type of familiarization is common in developing jazz musicians and is connected to deep cultural interest in engaging with jazz history.150 Charlie Hunter summarizes the need to closely study one’s predecessors in his own identification of a fellow guitarist:

Joe Pass. This is off that virtuoso [sic] solo guitar record. Right on, man. If you want to be a jazz guitarist, you have to listen to him. If you study science, you have to learn the table of elements. If you study carpentry, you need to learn how to make a good joint. If you want to be a mechanic, you’ve gotta learn how to tune up a car. If you want to be a jazz guitarist, you have to listen to Joe Pass. It’s like bread and butter. I studied the shit out of him when I was 20 years old.152

148 Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Kenny Barron & Mulgrew Miller.”
150 Berliner, Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation, particularly pp. 95-119.
With Hunter, as with many musicians, learning to play an instrument requires stylistic familiarity with its forebears. Although he does not mention the specifics of his study of Pass’s solo guitar style, Hunter’s familiarity could have come from a number of approaches: repeated listening, written transcription, or playing along with records (a frequent kind of "aural transcription"). In other cases, aspects of stylistic familiarity can be taught. In identifying bassist Oscar Pettiford, Christian McBride makes use of his mentor’s observations about Pettiford:

Something Ray Brown told me about Oscar is that he really liked to play short notes, whereas most bass players after a certain time period, around the '50s, the bass notes became more resonant. The full value of the note was actually played most of the time whereas Oscar played real short notes [scats]. Like real staccato sounding, which really gave it a great effect for those beautiful lines he played.

Brown’s observation about Pettiford’s articulation reflects, yet again, the ways in which stylistic identification is not merely a peripheral aspect of listening but instead occupies a significant position in cultures of jazz listening and performance. Among jazz listeners, identifying style is a central component of communicating with others; style is something worth recognizing, discussing, and sharing.

Following these different paths toward stylistic familiarity, we might ask: does the way in which a listener initially builds a stylistic category matter? One listener might transcribe a solo, poring over every detail and hearing the player’s improvisation repeated over and over.

Another might learn a player’s style solely from live performances, never hearing a single im-

153 Tony Williams, for instance, notes how he used listen to Philly Joe Jones "all day and night." Robin Tolleson, “Blindfold Test: Tony Williams,” Down Beat (June 1986): 46.
154 Hiram Bullock’s familiarity with Joe Pass’s solo guitar style came from transcription: "At one point in my sketchy musical education I had to transcribe some of those solo things off his Virtuoso record, which is why I recognized him: there’s a certain style he has to his solo playing." Gene Santoro, “Blindfold Test: Hiram Bullock,” Down Beat (March 1988): 43.
155 Christopher Hollyday relays this common experience among jazz musicians: "I know this one. This is one of the tunes I learned to play my horn on, playing along with this record. This is "Del Sasser," Cannonball Adderley Quartet. Ball, I didn’t get into him until I was a sophomore in high school but he was my main man for a while. I remember walking on cold days to school, checking out his solos on a Walkman. [. . .] [Hums along with solo, note for note]." Milkowski, “Blindfold Test: Christopher Hollyday.”
provisation more than once. In the following excerpts, for example, each listener’s familiarity implies a different origin for the stylistic categories he has built:

- Scott Henderson: “I know this tune by heart. *(He hums part of the head.)* I’ve played this tune a million times. That’s one of my all-time favorite Michael Brecker tunes. The playing on the whole record is great. And this is my favorite Pat Metheny solo on this album.”¹⁵⁷

- Branford Marsalis: "You can turn it off; I knew what that was from the first beat, and I can sing it all note for note."¹⁵⁸

- Dave Liebman: "The thing about McCoy is to hear him stretch out over a long period, because he does a lot of the same things over and over again, but after a few minutes he would go somewhere else, and you never kind of get that chance."¹⁵⁹

- Greg Osby: "That’s Eric Dolphy […] He’d play the same licks in different contexts over different chord changes. […] There’s one Dolphy solo: on Oliver Nelson’s *Blues And The Abstract Truth*, where he used the same sequence over 25 times."¹⁶⁰

- Chico Hamilton: "He’s playing his ass off. He’s got lots of chops, but he’s very repetitive also. Played the same licks over and over again, regardless of what drum he was playing them on. It got very predictable for me. A lot of eighth notes and 16th notes."¹⁶¹

- James Carter: "The staccato passage sounds Newkish, but Newk doesn’t use altissimo in that range. […] *(after)* He did a high C that could have tipped me off, especially when considering "Hog Callin’ Blues."¹⁶²

We will return to these quotations later, when these issues of stylistic familiarization are discussed further in Chapter 3.

****

Throughout the blindfold tests, the dynamic nature of the stylistic identification continually re-emerges. Especially when faced with difficult identifications, listeners jump from one guess

---

¹⁶⁰ Whitehead, “Blindfold Test: Greg Osby.”
¹⁶² Ted Panken, “Blindfold Test: James Carter,” *Down Beat* (August 2002): 82. In the source, the title contains an incorrect hyphen(“Hog-Callin’ Blues”), but it has been corrected to match the accurate spelling of the track on the referenced album.
to another, continually testing their hypotheses. The guess-and-check process in Woody Herman’s response is typical: “That’s just lovely. I wish I could identify the players. There were times I’d think it was one person playing; then it sounded like somebody else.”\textsuperscript{163} Although many of the blindfold tests reveal little about the particular musical characteristics that make a particular cue identifiable, the manner in which listeners discuss stylistic markers reveals important traces of the dynamic identification process. First, hearing a familiar lick often marks a particular moment of recognition. Upon hearing a known lick, the listener may transition from measured to assured language: "Let’s see…fretless bass. Okay, that one lick gave it away…Jaco!”\textsuperscript{164}; "I was puzzled there for the first few bars; I couldn’t figure out who it was. Then I heard a couple of characteristic phrases and…it’s gotta be Zoot Sims.”\textsuperscript{165}

The ability to recognize a player on an unknown recording emerges from countless mis-identifications and changing categories. Even in the mis-identifications, listeners show categories that gradually change and evolve. Peter Erskine’s identification of Bill Stewart, for example, shows the ways in which certain resemblance criteria can be superseded. After immediately recognizing Stewart based on his distinctive rim shot, Erskine notes that this resemblance criterion may be retired soon, noting that “last time I heard him live he was toning down the rim shots.”\textsuperscript{166} The ways in which a listener’s stylistic categories shift and re-configure themselves is taken up and explored in Chapter 4.

1.1.5 \textit{Style in discourse}

Even when they are not engaged in stylistic identifications, style occupies a central role as a discursive currency among listeners. Style is a \textit{lingua franca}; listeners invoke individual players’

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Bill Milkowski, “Blindfold Test: Lonnie Plaxico,” \textit{Down Beat} (March 1990): 48.}
\footnote{Feather, “Blindfold Test: Bob Wilber.”}
\footnote{Stewart, “Blindfold Test: Peter Erskine.”}
\end{footnotes}
styles to express musical observations and parse out stylistic mixtures, saying that the guitarist has "got a little Grant Green in there," or that the pianist is "playing it kind of Monkish." These kind of statements, which call upon a player’s style to express an otherwise inchoate musical observation, seem to suggest that, for listeners, individual styles serve as a means of communicating with one another about what is heard. Even after he has already identified pianist Monty Alexander, for instance, Mulgrew Miller continues to discuss Alexander’s playing in terms of other stylistic pillars:

I think it’s Monty Alexander. [...] Monty is rooted in the jazz-trio tradition, but he’s very expansive beyond that; so it’s sometimes like listening to sort of a modern-day Oscar Peterson or Ahmad Jamal crossed with some of the more contemporary players—Wynton Kelly or even further beyond—because of the way he deals with chord substitutions and things like that.

Similarly, even when listeners have acknowledged that they cannot identify the player, their musical observations often rely on previous stylistic categories. Tom Scott’s 1979 blindfold test repeatedly invokes known styles to describe an unknown player:

I have no idea who that is, but whoever it is has one of the oddest mixtures of styles. It sounds like a combination of Guy Lombardo’s lead alto player—who was that, his brother? Carmen Lombardo, I believe—and a little bit of Archie Shepp. A very, very odd mixture of elements. And there’s one bar, about four bars before they go back to the melody, where he plays a real honest-to-God bebop, Charlie Parker-type lick—one, in the whole record!

For Scott, the ability to articulate the stylistic mixture of the unknown player relies on the stylistic knowledge he has developed for other soloists.

As certain cues becomes associated with particular players, a paradox emerges. Stylistic cues are both tied to a particular player and simultaneously mobile; the same feature that serves as an identifier of one player can be used by someone else, or even become a meaningless cliché. Jeff Watts seems wholly unperturbed to observe features of one drummer used by another:

167 Panken, "Blindfold Test: Joey DeFrancesco."
169 Birnbaum, "Blindfold Test: Mulgrew Miller."
"It just seemed an interspersing of quasi-bebop things, little Philly Joe things with the rims, a couple of little Elvin-ish rolls." To listeners, players routinely enact other players’ styles, so that a statement like James Carter’s involves no internal contradiction:

Sounds like Newk [Sonny Rollins]. And then it doesn’t. I like the drive on it. It’s a relaxed drive, a quiet intensity. The conviction’s there. This is not Newk, but there’s some Newkisms in there. He’s Newking; he’s got the microwave oven on, whoever it is.

Carter’s observation of another player "Newking"—consciously or unconsciously evoking Sonny Rollins’s style (to Carter, at least)—reflects the ways in which individualistic stylistic markers are picked up by other musicians. Similarly, a stylistic cue subjectively generated by a listener can eventually enter a language shared among a community fellow listeners. Chapter 5 addresses the ways in which subjective stylistic categories can be transformed and shared intersubjectively, both by listeners and musicians.

1.2 WHY STYLISTIC IDENTIFICATION IS IMPORTANT TO JAZZ LISTENERS

This chapter has argued that style (and stylistic identification) occupy significant roles in the practices of jazz listeners and musicians. But why is this so? Throughout the chapter I have hinted at possible answers, both from the performers’ and listeners’ perspectives. The importance of individuality and self-expression among jazz musicians, the economic need to distinguish oneself in a crowded marketplace, the interest in orienting players within a historical lineage, and the role of the blindfold test itself—all contribute to a listening culture of stylistic identification. These details, however, reveal an incomplete picture. Practices of stylistic recognition apply to all genres of recorded music, and yet they have become endemic to jazz to an extent rarely seen elsewhere. In the final section of this chapter, I will explore some possible

172 Birnbaum, “Blindfold Test: James Carter.”
reasons for its continued significance among jazz listeners. Centrally, jazz’s individualistic orientation, paired with a recording system in which the performers’ identities are not always immediately apparent, together propagate a culture that encourages listeners to develop skills of stylistic recognition.

As many commentators have noted, jazz exhibits a tension between individual and collective modes of expression—what Ralph Ellison called the "cruel contradiction implicit in the art form itself." While the collective aspect of jazz performance is often cast in terms of an egalitarian social parallel, the individualistic component is commonly connected to a self expression framed by the player’s recognizability. As part of his ideologically freighted goal to elevate jazz as "America’s classical music," Grover Sales suggests that

> It is child’s play for an experienced jazz listener to tell Louis Armstrong and Dizzy Gillespie from all other trumpet players, or Johnny Hodges and Charlie Parker from all other alto saxophonists, just as it is routine for a steady concertgoer to recognize the work of Beethoven and Bartók, for an art connoisseur to distinguish El Greco from Rembrandt, or for a rock fan to identify the Beatles and the Rolling Stones.

Sales’ discussion of stylistic recognition aims to elevate jazz musicians (or perhaps, certain jazz "greats") to the status of canonized Western composers and artists. With this gesture, Sales relies centrally on an implied narrative that equates stylistic individuality with greatness, but in doing so also emphasizes the audience and the nuanced aural skills of the jazz listener. Jazz, for Sales, requires comparably sensitive ears as those developed by devotees of the Western art music tradition. Although problematic, Sales’ elevation of one genre in terms of the aesthetic standards of another highlights the dominance of individual recognizability within discourses of jazz.

---

And yet why would a listener be forced to develop a nuanced ear that can recognize Louis Armstrong or Dizzy Gillespie? Jazz is performed in clubs, where the listener can easily see who is playing. The answer relates to the intricacies of jazz’s recording culture. To a large extent, jazz developed coterminously with radio and phonograph recordings, and, accordingly, recording technology continues to occupy a central position in jazz cultures. Recordings impact jazz musicians financially, socially, and artistically, and are tied to the ways in which critics, listeners, and scholars understand jazz history and analysis.176 As these recordings are disseminated, whether through the radio, a physical album, online streaming services, or digital files, listeners often encounter an audible performer without immediate access to who is playing.

Jazz, unlike many other popular genres, is largely instrumental. Even recordings with vocalists often include long instrumental sections of improvisational material. For listeners, therefore, to identify a player on a recording or on the radio often requires criteria beyond the distinctive vocal features that humans are evolutionarily adapted to recognize without much effort.177 Blindfold test subjects frequently identify vocalists immediately and without thought, while listeners often only recognize instrumentalists after appraising other elements of the musical context. Although listeners sometimes make the analogy between identifying an instrumental sound and recognizing a familiar voice (see discussion of sound and style on p. 31), the highly instrumental nature of jazz performance—as opposed to many of the other, vocally oriented popular musics of the 20th and 21st centuries—encourages listeners to develop
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A nuanced ear for stylistic recognition. In other words, without a voice to quickly demonstrate who is playing, a listener must find other features to orient him- or herself.

In addition, jazz musicians often operate in a highly flexible social environment, in which an individual musician might play with different groups on a day-to-day basis. Recordings, too, can reflect this dynamic setting. In a not-atypical two-week span (September 15-30, 1957), pianist Wynton Kelly participated in four recording sessions, each with a different set of musicians (see Table 1.3). Within this landscape of ever-changing ensemble personnel, listeners are understandably interested in individual as well as ensemble sound. With some notable exceptions, jazz recordings are often recorded by an array of different instrumentalists (the sidemen), but released under the name of only one (the leader). In the case of big band recordings, there may be twenty or more musicians, with multiple players on certain instruments. Even if a listener is holding the album and poring over a set of detailed liner notes, he or she may not be able to tell which band member is playing at any given moment without relying on skills of stylistic recognition.

Even in smaller ensembles, listeners often use stylistic knowledge to determine who is playing at a given time. In order to determine, for instance, who is soloing on Johnny Griffin’s *A Blowin’ Session*, an album that features three tenor saxophonists (John Coltrane, Hank Mobley, and Griffin), a listener would need to be familiar with the individual players’ styles.\(^\text{178}\)

---

Table 1.3: Wynton Kelly recording sessions, September 15-30, 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernie Henry (alto)</td>
<td>A.K. Salim (director)</td>
<td>Sonny Rollins (tenor)</td>
<td>Ernie Henry (alto)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDEMEN</td>
<td>Kenny Dorham (trumpet)</td>
<td>Buster Cooper (trombone)</td>
<td>Johnny Griffin (tenor)</td>
<td>Wynton Kelly (piano)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benny Golson (tenor)</td>
<td>Johnny Griffin (tenor)</td>
<td>Pepper Adams (bs, ts)</td>
<td>Doug Watkins (bass)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cecil Payne (bari)</td>
<td>Wynton Kelly (piano)</td>
<td>Paul Chambers (bass)</td>
<td>Philly Joe Jones (drums)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wynton Kelly (piano)</td>
<td>Wynton Kelly (piano)</td>
<td>Max Roach (drums)</td>
<td>Chano Pozo (congas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Chambers (bass)</td>
<td>Paul Chambers (bass)</td>
<td>Wilbur Ware (bass)</td>
<td>Wilbur Ware (bass)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philly Joe Jones (drums)</td>
<td>Chano Pozo (congas)</td>
<td>Philly Joe Jones (drums)</td>
<td>Philly Joe Jones (drums)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{178}\) Johnny Griffin, *A Blowin’ Session*, recorded 1957, Blue Note 1559.
fin’s record are far from rare. Instrumental "summits" or tributes to a particular player, which afford musicians the opportunity to engage directly with the historical lineage of their instrument in a semi-competitive setting akin to the cutting contest,\footnote{The cutting contest refers to the practice of two instrumentalists competing virtuosically to outdo one another onstage.} frequently involve tracks where several players of the same instrument perform together.

Lastly, one might ask why listeners must rely on stylistic recognition rather than on simple recall. Some blindfold tests attest to listeners’ thorough knowledge of a particular player’s recordings,\footnote{See, for instance, Jon Faddis’s response to a Dizzy Gillespie track in Nolan, “Blindfold Test: Jon Faddis.”} but jazz listeners largely face record catalogs that are too extensive to remember each and every track. As is evident in Kelly’s recording schedule above, jazz musicians can often produce enormous volumes of records in minimal time. In the same year, for example, Kelly participated in 32 recording sessions that yielded at least 25 different albums. Because of extensive emphasis on improvisation and standard repertoire, jazz musicians produce a lot of records and, accordingly, jazz listeners must rely on stylistic recognition.

To summarize, jazz listeners are encouraged to develop skills of stylistic recognition because of a wide array of cultural factors. First, jazz listeners are interested in which individual musicians are playing. Second, this knowledge is not always immediately apparent, because of the instrumental nature of jazz and the ways in which jazz recordings are produced and disseminated. Third, the enormous body of jazz recordings (which continue to expand as previously undiscovered tapes are released\footnote{For a recent example, see Gabriel Solis’s discussion of the 2005 release of a 1957 Carnegie Hall concert featuring Thelonious Monk and John Coltrane. Gabriel Solis, Thelonious Monk Quartet with John Coltrane at Carnegie Hall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).}) encourages listeners to develop generalizable skills beyond simple recall of known tracks. Finally, the blindfold test itself has helped to perpetuate stylistic recognition among jazz listeners.
Once again, we open with a pickup. Two tracks by guitarist Grant Green begin with similar scalar runs, shown in Figure 2.1.\footnote{Grant Green, “Street of Dreams,” recorded 1964, on Street of Dreams, Blue Note 4253; Grant Green, “I Wish You Love,” recorded 1964, on Street of Dreams, Blue Note 4253.} The opening notes of the two tracks, recorded on the same album, Street of Dreams, (1964), reflect a recognizable feature that a listener might use to identify Green. Yet although the passages’ similarities are evident aurally in the recording (and visually in my transcription), interpreting the exact nature of this similarity requires closer examination.

To begin, the two passages contain different numbers of notes: six in “Street of Dreams” and eight in “I Wish You Love.” In “I Wish You Love,” the D♭-Eb-F-G♭-A♭-B♭ run perfectly transposes...
"Street of Dreams," scale degrees \( \hat{5} \hat{6} \hat{7} \hat{1} \hat{2} \hat{3} \)
"I Wish You Love," scale degrees \( \hat{5} \flat \hat{6} \flat \hat{7} \hat{1} \hat{2} \flat \hat{3} 4 5 \)
"Street of Dreams," intervals 2 2 1 2 2
"I Wish You Love," intervals 1 2 2 1 2 2

Table 2.1: Correspondences between pickups to "Street of Dreams" and "I Wish You Love"

Figure 2.2: Grant Green, "Street of Dreams" and "I Wish You Love" pickups, correspondences via scale-degree (solid line) and intervallic (dotted line) relationships

the pickup of "Street of Dreams" (D-E-F\(_\#\)-G-A-B), lowering it by a half step. This observation, however, involves an unusual segmentation of the melody, ignoring the first two pitches of "I Wish You Love" in order to highlight the shared interval content of the two pickups. Focusing on the phrases' endings also draws attention to the two passages' similar registers, which becomes especially apparent when comparing the neighboring B and B\(_\flat\) that conclude the pickups in "Street of Dreams" and "I Wish You Love," respectively.

Omitting the last two notes of the "I Wish You Love," by contrast, highlights the pickups' respective relationships to their underlying keys; "Street of Dreams" outlines scale degrees \( \hat{5} \hat{6} \hat{7} \hat{1} \hat{2} \hat{3} \) in G major while the second pickup outlines \( \hat{5} \flat \hat{6} \flat \hat{7} \hat{1} \hat{2} \flat \hat{3} 4 5 \) in E\(_\flat\) minor. Although the two passages' modal inflections differ, the two introductory lines outline the same scale degrees \( \hat{5} \hat{6} \hat{7} \hat{1} \hat{2} \hat{3} \). Despite their conflicting segmentations of the passage, these two divergent interpretations work together to unify "Street of Dreams" with "I Wish You Love." Table 2.1 illustrates these two differing segmentations and their resulting interpretations. If the beginnings of the two passages align, then their scale degrees correspond with one another, and
if the ends of the two passages align, then their intervals correspond with one another (Figure 2.2). An assemblage of seemingly contradictory musical factors interweave the two recordings together. At the same time, the listener prioritizes certain musical parameters over others; here, intervallic content, scale degree, and rhythm unify the grouping, allowing the two passages’ differing lengths and tempo to be ignored.

2.1 Resemblance Criteria

Any conception of style relies fundamentally upon repetition. Returning to the discussion in section 1, I define style with a two-pronged formulation. First, via Leonard Meyer, style is the "replication of patterning, whether in human behavior or in the artifacts produced by human behavior, that results from a series of choices made within some set of constraints." Second, this patterning is apprehended—and, in some sense, created—by some active recipient. Musical style, therefore, is forged not only by performers, but also by listeners. This definition situates itself around a listener who recognizes certain features as sounding similar to one another, and constructs networks of from these resemblances.

As discussed in Chapter 1 (particularly section 1.1.2), jazz listeners use a diverse range of different aural criteria to identify players. In the Down Beat blindfold tests, listeners cite all manner of musical and non-musical features in order to identify who is playing. These observations rely on the listener’s gradual familiarization with a given player’s style. This chapter explores a first step in this path toward familiarization: the varied ways in which listeners

---

2 In addition, the appearance of these two passages as opening pickups to composed melodies gives them a shared syntactic function in the formal layout of the piece.
4 This definition resonates with various analytical approaches to associative meaning in music, such as J. Peter Burkholder, “A Simple Model for Associative Musical Meaning,” in Approaches to Meaning in Music, ed. Byron Almén and Edward Pearsall (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 76–106. For analytical approaches to resemblance, see Adam Ockelford, Repetition in Music: Theoretical and Metatheoretical Perspectives (London: Ashgate, 2005); Dora A. Hanninen, A Theory of Music Analysis: On Segmentation and Associative Organization (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2012).
might draw similarities between two resonant musical moments. By examining one-to-one correspondences between different musical passages, I explore how an initial "guess" at who is playing (e.g., "This sounds like Grant Green.") might rely on a fundamental observation about two musical passages (e.g., "The beginning of ‘Street of Dreams’ sounds like the beginning of ‘I Wish You Love.’"). Although the approaches developed here will be expanded to larger stylistic categories in Chapters 3 and 4, I see this chapter’s explorations of resemblance as a necessary initial step in discussing how listeners identify style.5

Rather than directly reproducing musical observations made in the *Down Beat* blindfold tests—which would be a difficult, if not impossible task—the chapter’s analytical examples of resemblance criteria emerge from hypothetical pathways of how listeners *might* process style.6

As outlined in the introduction’s discussion of methodology (reflected in Figure 0.3), I generate these hypothetical scenarios from general trends across three interrelated spheres: comments in the *Down Beat* blindfold tests, my conversations with jazz listeners and musicians, and my own individualized responses to these recordings.

With this approach, this chapter also confronts the challenges of developing a music-theoretical model of listening that embraces the plurality of different listeners’ experiences. Deployed insensitively, a music-analytical apparatus runs the risk of crystallizing one particular hearing of

5 Despite the linearity of the stylistic recognition process as I have outlined it here, I must clarify that the recognition of salient features, assessments about resemblance, and the formation of larger categories of musical objects are all inextricably entangled with one another. Emilos Cambouropoulos writes: "It is not simply the case that one starts with an accurate description of entities and properties, then finds pairwise similarities between them and, finally, groups the most similar ones together into categories . . . It seems more plausible that as humans organize their knowledge of the world, they alter their representations of entities concurrently with emerging categorizations and similarity judgments" (355-356). Emilos Cambouropoulos, “Melodic Cue Abstraction, Similarity, and Category Formation: A Formal Model,” *Music Perception* 18, no. 3 (2001): 347–370. In my attempt to present this entangled process in a clear, straightforward manner, however, I have opted to begin by presenting some of the music-theoretical materials with somewhat simplified examples, however artificial their simplification may seem.

6 In almost all of the blindfold tests, the transcribed comments present few clues as to the particular moments being described on the tracks. Even if I were able to pinpoint the passage under discussion, interpreting the exact nature of the musical resemblance (and how it relates to a listener’s previous conceptions of the player’s style) would still require hypothesized leaps. Despite these challenges, a few rare examples of traceable observations from the blindfold tests appear in this chapter; see Jason Moran’s identification of Jaki Byard in section 2.4 and James Carter’s identification of Rahsaan Roland Kirk in section 2.5.
a musical text that was previously interpretively rich. David Lewin refers to this as "falsely con-
straining our musical perceptions by implicitly asserting that there is one phenomenological
object," rather than several different perceptual structures that can be simultaneously evoked
in a single musical moment.7 Even the act of enshrining a recording in a written transcription
affixes it, privileging one hearing over another. As shown in the preceding chapter, listeners
approaching the same recording with a shared aim of stylistic identification will likely notice
different features. In one of the dual blindfold tests from Chapter 1 (appearing on p. 51), even
two experienced jazz listeners can cite different criteria while identifying a player. Although
both Mulgrew Miller and Kenny Barron agree that the unknown pianist is Tommy Flanagan,
Barron invokes an entirely different set of identifying features than Miller. Similarly, in iden-
tifications of McCoy Tyner, one listener might recognize the pianist’s rhythmic drive,8 while
another might identify his chordal voicings.9 Still another listener might identify Tyner by the
scales and modes he uses,10 or by an abstract improvisational strategy he deploys.11

Listeners’ individual resemblances between two passages are equally complex. Expanding
the multivalent approach applied to the two Grant Green pickups, the chapter examines and
re-examines different resonant musical moments, constructing alternative ways to regard the
resemblance between them. In this section, I reiterate again several of the points made in the
preceding chapter:

- Listeners’ resemblance criteria are diverse and dynamic. An individual listener will often
  respond to different features upon the fourth hearing as opposed to the first.

- For different listeners, resemblance criteria can operate at different levels of specificity
  and scope. Listeners have unique backgrounds and differing familiarities with styles,
techniques, and repertoires. These factors guide not only which features a listener will respond to, but also how musical objects are conceptualized.

- It is difficult to isolate resemblance criteria in one particular domain or another. Rather, resemblance criteria emerge holistically and coalesce in resemblance complexes. As illustrated in the Green example at the chapter’s opening, these resemblance complexes can emerge from conflicting interpretive trajectories. A single resemblance between two passages can therefore reflect a broad simultaneity of listening experiences and interpretations.

In all of these, resemblance exists as a fluid construct negotiated in the interplay between a listener and an array of musical texts.

2.2 FLEXIBILITY (HORACE SILVER)

This necessity for flexibility emerges in even the simplest examples. Similarities in rhythm—a parameter that some might consider straightforward to evaluate—can often reflect a nuanced simultaneity of several different resemblances. Figure 2.3 shows two rhythmically identical comping patterns played by pianist Horace Silver. The similarities are clear: the distinctive

---

12 This holistic emergence is not to say that certain musical features will not be deemed more salient than others. I am advocating neither an atomistic, single-feature-based stylistic analysis, nor a wholly inclusive holistic approach that refuses to acknowledge the isolation of any musical parameters. Rather, I am emphasizing flexibility; listeners respond flexibly to particular sets of musical features deemed significant. For more discussion, see section 2.7.

13 Horace Silver, “Song For My Father,” recorded 1964, on Song For My Father, Blue Note 4185; Horace Silver, “Bonita,” recorded 1965, on The Cape Verdean Blues, Blue Note 4220.
2.2 Flexibility

Syncopated \( \text{\textsuperscript{3} \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \text{\textsuperscript{1}}} \) rhythm appears identically in Silver’s chordal accompaniment in both passages. Even in this basic case, however, the resemblance between the two passages can be nuanced. At the rhythm’s introduction, one passage appears with an eighth-note pickup (“Bonita”), while the other immediately introduces the rhythm without preamble (“Song For My Father”). Even more noticeable is the repetition of the \( \text{\textsuperscript{3} \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \text{\textsuperscript{1}}} \) rhythm; it appears three times in the two-bar phrase from “Song For My Father,” while Silver repeats the rhythmic cell six times in a four-measure arc in “Bonita.”

A listener who regards these two passages as identical—which, from an “objective” standpoint, they are not—implicitly invokes some features to value and others to ignore. For a listener connecting the two passages from Figure 2.3, the addition or subtraction of iterations (at least within a certain scope) does not impact the identity of the phrase.\(^\text{15}\) This resemblance property, a kind of additive and subtractive symmetry, means that the two versions can contain different numbers of statements of the \( \text{\textsuperscript{3} \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \text{\textsuperscript{1}}} \) rhythmic cell without obscuring the perceived connections between the two versions. This acceptance of additive or subtractive alterations may not hold as easily for other examples. For repetitions that cross metric lines, for instance, the precise number of iterations may be important to two passages’ resemblance. In many cases, however, additive and subtractive symmetry reflects an important feature that immediately challenges strict, inflexible approaches to similarity.

2.2.1 Difference

It may seem as if I am harping on trivial points, but these kinds of alterations can appreciably affect listeners’ resemblance criteria and, in turn, how they evaluate style. Repetition itself can

\(^{\text{14}}\) For argument’s sake, let us put aside the subjective choices that went into the selection and transcription of these examples.

\(^{\text{15}}\) One may only traverse this hypothetical avenue for so far, of course, before it begins to stretch perceptual credulity; a 20-minute vamp repeating the same rhythm over and over might not easily bear a resemblance to an iteration played only once.
serve as a stylistic marker. Consider one blindfold test from 2012, in which a listener attempts to identify an unknown pianist: "I like the touch, the warm sound, the two-handed harmonies. As it moved along, it sounded like Keith Jarrett, which would explain the beautiful touch. I heard some Herbie Hancock, but certain things happened too many times for it to be Herbie" (emphasis added). This last observation points to the importance of repetition in stylistic identification. The listener encounters a cue that signifies Hancock, but this signification dissolves as the pianist passes a certain threshold of repetition.

As quotations like this reveal, listeners identify performers based not only on what they play, but also what they fail to play. Tentative stylistic identifications can be interrupted by uncharacteristic cues, and listeners can likewise rework a guess when the musician does not play something that the listener finds typical of his or her style. A listener might abandon an initial identification of trumpeter Roy Eldridge because "he wouldn’t tail off at the end like that," or because "he was playing some kind of half-out thing that I didn’t connect with him." Similarly, a listener might doubt an initial suggestion of Freddie Hubbard because "Freddie normally does all those incredible runs and things a little bit more than what I heard." Listeners engaged in stylistic identification are constantly judging an unknown player based on expectations of his or her style. This includes what kind of cues a performer is likely to play, but also what he or she is not likely to play. Many blindfold tests reveal traces of this kind of definition by negation. Although often implicit, these kinds of "inverse cues" can function like any other stylistic marker; a listener might identify a player based on rhythmic feel, a recognizable melodic lick, and a lack of arpeggiated chord tones. This last observation serves as a cue just as easily as the first two. Stylistic markers—and resemblance criteria—can arise in any form.

16 Panken, “Blindfold Test: David Hazeltine.”
18 Jeske, “Blindfold Test: Ted Curson.”
2.2.2 Large-scale features

Although in the Silver examples I focus on the rhythmic criteria linking together each pair of passages, one could also invoke large-scale, formal markers that contribute to the passages’ similarities. Even if a listener is only consciously attending to one or two features linking together a set of passages, other connections could subtly contribute to a perceived resemblance. In the Horace Silver excerpts, both appearances of the \[\text{comping rhythm} \] comping rhythm appear at the end of the song’s form, where one harmonic cycle finishes and the buildup to the next chorus begins. (In the preceding transcriptions, I have designated the start of a new chorus with a double barline). With a harmonic return to the tonic, Silver concludes the form and prepares the new chorus that follows with the distinctive comping rhythm; a listener could easily integrate this formal association with the rhythmic relationship between the two passages.\textsuperscript{20}

The surrounding context can also encourage or discourage a potential connection. For the comping rhythm heard in "Song For My Father" and "Bonita," the musical materials around the excerpts share much in common. Aside from the rhythm’s placement at the end of the song’s form, both tracks are Silver compositions in a Latin feel at similar tempos. "Bonita" and "Song For My Father" both feature similar ensembles, with the same saxophonist (Joe Henderson), drummer (Roger Humphries), and, of course, pianist (Horace Silver). Associating the comping rhythm from "Bonita" with the similar rhythm in "Song For My Father" benefits from these other similarities. Even before the rhythm appears, the pump has been primed, and the listener’s connection between these two moments emerges seamlessly from a holistic listening experience.

\textsuperscript{20} In this respect, the poietic concerns of the performer can bleed into the esthetic realm. If an improviser is drawn to play a particular cue in certain harmonic or formal or stylistic contexts—for example, playing a certain lick in a particular key or at a particular moment in the form—a listener might integrate these correspondences into the stylistic category that he or she builds.
Every musical resemblance relies on a listener subjectively parsing the materials he or she encounters. Resemblances, accordingly, can often be reinterpreted and reconfigured by different listeners—or even the same listener at different times. Furthermore, musical resemblance can involve simultaneous reinterpretation; as illustrated by the Grant Green pickups that opened this chapter, one might notice two different resemblance criteria that seem to preclude one another and yet overlap in the listening experience.

### 2.3.1 Interpreting rhythm and rhythmic feel (Joe Henderson)

Like the Horace Silver comping rhythm, Figure 2.4 shows an example of two moments united by a similar rhythmic cell. In these excerpts from "Idle Moments" and "Mirrors," saxophonist Joe Henderson flips the swing rhythm from long-short to short-long; this extended reversal of the usual metric structure provides a distinctive kinship between the two passages. As before, the resemblance between the two excerpts relies on the listener highlighting particular features and not others. Certain listeners might find intervallic similarities at the introduction of the rhythm, particularly because the phrasing in both examples strongly suggests two-
note groupings for the melody. Like the previous example, the resemblance might assume some level of additive/subtractive symmetry, since the short rhythmic cell occurs a different number of times in each version. Likewise, other features, like rhythmic pace or melodic shape are ignored—at least as far as the resemblance is concerned.

Despite the passages’ rhythmic similarities, however, the ways in which Henderson accents the rhythm suggests two distinct metric interpretations. The accentuation of the longer notes in "Idle Moments" suggests a displaced anacrusis-downbeat relationship; it is almost as if Henderson is playing so far behind the beat that the notes’ attacks land a third of the way into each next beat. In "Mirrors," by contrast, Henderson’s stress on the short note for each beat presents a true reversal of the typical swing feel. This interpretation reveals a twist of irony: Henderson’s lick in "Idle Moments" exhibits a certain rhythmic "idleness," with its behind-the-beat rhythmic feel, while Henderson’s approach in "Mirrors" presents a mirrored reflection of the typical swing rhythm. For a listener, both interpretations can coexist and yet the passages’ rhythms can still be heard as resembling one another.

Like the Silver examples, these Joe Henderson excerpts also exhibit contextual affinities that extend beyond the specific rhythmic lick. The passages from "Idle Moments" and "Mirrors" both appear in slow ballads at similar tempos. With these two tracks, the ensembles are identical, with "Idle Moments" recorded for a Grant Green-led album and "Mirrors" recorded for a Bobby Hutcherson-led date in the same studio only six weeks later. Given these factors, the fact that Joe Henderson plays a similar sounding melodic line is unsurprising; for an improviser encountering very similar social and musical circumstances, one might expect the recurrence of similar musical ideas. But it is important to note that some of the same conditions that may have brought out a similar sounding musical moment for the improviser also contribute to the listener’s experience. A listener who has heard "Idle Moments" might be reminded of this

---

22 The dominance of one of these interpretations over the other, however, can impact how a listener processes unfamiliar music. If a listener has heard "Idle Moments" repeatedly and memorized the solo, it may be difficult to hear a downbeat-upbeat relationship when the same rhythm appears in "Mirrors." These discussions of hierarchical relationships between similar musical moments will be expanded further in Chapter 3.
moment when hearing the similar line in "Mirrors," or vice versa. This scenario highlights how poietic conditions impact the esthetic realm.

2.3.2 The "ghost note" (Pat Metheny)

In these discussions, it becomes apparent that even a case of straightforward rhythmic similarity between two musical passages can involve significant interpretive contributions by a listener. Even the notes themselves can be reinterpreted and reconfigured. Nicholas Cook has argued that imagination plays a significant role in listening, filling in the gaps between the discrete, unconnected sounds the ear experiences and the idealized sonic realm that the imagination creates.\(^\text{23}\)

The perceptual, psychological, and imaginative division between note and "ghost note," for instance, reflects the listener’s role in shaping what is heard. The "ghost note," an elusive concept pervasive in jazz discourse, has been defined as a note "you can hardly hear,"\(^\text{24}\) "more implied than actually played"\(^\text{25}\) or, to use Paul Berliner’s designation, "more felt than heard."\(^\text{26}\) All of these definitions orient themselves, in some respect, around the listening experience. Peter Winkler has suggested that responding to ghost notes is a central component of the listening process, and that ghost notes reflect an almost insurmountable challenge to the act of transcription itself. As he attempts to transcribe Aretha Franklin’s "I Never Loved a Man," Winkler reaches a quandary:

A moment particularly troubling to my ears is beat three of measure 22. I keep thinking I hear some sort of glissando, a descending cascade of notes from a high B-flat. It is not a sound I can satisfactorily duplicate on the piano. I’m not always

---

\(^{23}\) Cook, *Music, Imagination, and Culture*.


\(^{26}\) Berliner, *Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation*, 67.
Sure I hear it: the "phantom glissando" disappears when I modify the playback in some ways (for example, slowing the speed) but reappears under some other modifications (using the time stretcher). It might be some sort of complex resonance or other acoustical quirk, but why then does it sound like a cascade of notes rather than a single sound? After agonizing over this moment for hours, I conclude that the "phantom glissando" must be an illusion: not something that Aretha actually played but something that my ears persist in constructing out of ambiguous audio signals.\textsuperscript{27}

Winkler’s honest assessment of his transcription process focuses in on the often-overlooked experiential dimension of a ghost note. While much listening eschews Winkler’s brand of conscious, self-reflective inquiry, the aural intangibility that he describes can occur at various levels throughout the listening process.

Two passages by guitarist Pat Metheny (Figure 2.5) illustrate this tenuous gap between note and ghost note.\textsuperscript{28} Figure 2.5 shows, once again, two similar sounding passages drawn together by a set of interrelated rhythmic motives. Here, however, we encounter a wrinkle. Metheny’s phrasing in this passage drifts between ghost notes and pitches that are more corporeal. Because of this, the attacks on the fourth note of each grouping (sixteenth notes in "All the Things You Are"; thirty-second notes in "Summer Day") exist in a liminal space between aural presence and absence; a listener might hear them as fully articulated notes, ghost notes, some mixture of the two, or neither. Figure 2.5a and 2.5b show two possible interpretations of this passage, each of which wholly reconfigures Metheny’s rhythm. In the first version (Figure 2.5a), the fourth note in the grouping is ignored entirely, and a galloping \(\frac{3}{4}\) rhythm emerges from the musical texture. Alternatively, the second transcription (Figure 2.5b) shows a version that regards each of these notes as fully realized and structurally significant.

Admittedly, both of these interpretations are extreme. Few, if any, would hear the passage solely in terms of one of these versions; my experience has settled somewhere in the middle, with an evaluation that regards some of the groupings as clearly following one rhythmic

\textsuperscript{27} Winkler, “Writing Ghost Notes: The Poetics and Politics of Transcription,” 180.
\textsuperscript{28} Jim Hall and Pat Metheny, “All the Things You Are,” recorded 1998, on Jim Hall & Pat Metheny, Telarc 83442; Pat Metheny and Brad Mehldau, “Summer Day,” recorded 2006, on Metheny Mehldau, Nonesuch 79964.
2.3 Listener Interpretation

Figure 2.5: Pat Metheny, two interpretations of resemblance in "All the Things You Are" and "Summer Day"
2.3 Listener Interpretation

My transcriptions of the two excerpts, like Winkler’s struggles with the “phantom glissando” in “I Never Loved a Man,” encountered challenging moments. A note that I was hearing would disappear upon hearing it again, or it would be revealed as a percussive, non-pitched attack that I was assigning pitch because of my expectations about how the improvisation should interact with the song’s harmonic framework or how the passage’s compound melody should behave. If I was relatively unfamiliar with the harmonic form of the standard “All the Things You Are,” for example, I might be unlikely to assign a particular pitch to a ghost note. As it is, however, the melodic paraphrase outlined in the excerpt encourages a listener to interpret the passage in terms of the song’s harmonic progression. Existing between these two versions, one could envision a transcription that includes some of the ghost notes and not others, or one that includes articulation or phrasing designations to illustrate perceived hierarchical relationships between the notes.

In terms of their resemblance, these two interpretations hold distinct ramifications. The rhythmic similarity between the two passages relies, in some part, on a listener interpreting the rhythmic motives in parallel ways. Pairing the “All the Things You Are” from Figure 2.5a with “Summer Day” from Figure 2.5b, or vice versa, might occlude a potential relationship. At the same time, hearing one of these excerpts in terms of one rhythmic interpretation may impact how a listener evaluates the other: the listener’s evaluation, to a greater or lesser extent, has been molded by the previous experience.

Additionally, the resemblance between the two passages endures a fair amount of rhythmic variation. The start of the third measure of “Summer Day” shows one alteration to the central motive. (For clarity’s sake, I will focus on the version in Figure 2.5a, but the same observations could be made of the excerpt in Figure 2.5b). In the opening of this measure, the tied note from the first grouping could potentially obscure the rhythm that appears on the second eighth note of the measure. Although the skeletal rhythm remains, the rhythmic similarities rely on contextual factors for their similarity; the rhythm remains noticeable largely
because of the repetitions that surround it. As the variation recurs on the third beat and then again in measure five, the altered version is absorbed into the prevalent \( \frac{5}{4} \) rhythmic framework. Frequently, musical resemblance relies on this kind of similarity that is forged both by structural features (the skeletal \( \frac{5}{4} \) rhythm), as well as the surrounding context (the passage’s repetitions of the rhythmic motive).

2.4 **SCOPE AND SPECIFICITY (JAKI BYARD, KENNY BARRON, MCCOY TYNER)**

As shown in chapter 1, listener background and expertise can guide the recognition of musical features. In particular, the scope and specificity of a musical observation relate centrally to a listener’s previous knowledge and familiarities. Returning to the statement made by Jason Moran as he was attempting to identify a pianist on an unknown recording (seen in Chapter 1 on page 37), we see that Moran’s harmonic observations are guided centrally by his extensive background as a pianist:

> That’s Jaki Byard. […] At the beginning of this piece, in that 15-second intro, he played a chord that is an old chord. It’s more than notes. It takes a certain touch. He hits a I-VII-flats9 [I7(♭9)], but it’s also where he put it in the register. Younger players don’t play down there, so anyone who goes down there understands that region of the piano. It’s Jaki playing old chords […]

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Moran’s recognition of the "old" I7(♭9) chord relies on his experience at the piano. Figure 2.6 shows a transcription of the passage. The I7(♭9) chord that Moran mentions appears twice in the introduction: once at the end of measure three, and once at the end of measure five directly before the start of the melody in the following measure.\(^{30}\) I have spelled the chord as a B major triad over the left hand’s F-C dyad, due to the consistent texture of parallel triads played over the bass pedal notes; alternatively, one could

\(^{29}\) Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Jason Moran.”

respell the chord as F-C-B♮-E♭-G♭ to reflect a hearing as an altered I7 chord with respect to an underlying F major key.

Moran might interpret the chord in numerous ways, reflecting an array of different levels of specificity. He could evaluate it simply as exhibiting a dominant seventh chord quality, or he could have interpreted it as an altered dominant. Slightly more specifically, he could identify the chord quality and the alteration in the highest voice, hearing the chord as a dominant seventh with a flatted ninth. If he was attending to the inner voices, he might notice another altered extension, the ♯11. In addition, he could recognize the chord’s placement in a particular register. Each of these interpretations, which appear schematized in Figure 2.7, reflects a different way of hearing the chord; these various pathways lead to different sets of resemblances that would, in turn, link the excerpt to different resonant passages.

---

31 In most jazz harmony, an altered dominant may be played with a number of altered chord tones, most typically a raised or lowered fifth and ninth.

32 Despite some similarities in appearance and subject matter, this chart does not follow Lawrence Zbikowski’s schematizations of his conceptual models in Lawrence M. Zbikowski, Conceptualizing Music: Cognitive Structure, Theory, And Analysis (Oxford University Press, 2002).
Figure 2.7, of course, does not reflect every possible interpretation of the chord, and the schematic orientation of the graphic obscures the fact that these levels are not mutually exclusive; a listener may hear the chord with more than one of these interpretations simultaneously. In the graphic, I make no mention of key, despite the fact that Moran identifies the chord with respect to the underlying F tonic as a I\(^7\)(b9). Likewise, the levels in Figure 2.7 do not indicate that the chord is lacking a third. Neither do they mention any absolute pitch designations; one could imagine a listener with perfect pitch for whom it is important to distinguish that it is an F altered dominant.\(^{33}\) Similarly, I fail to mention the musical texture (adjacent right hand triads over a root-fifth pedal in the left hand) that precedes the chord. This context informs my

\(^{33}\) This issue will be discussed shortly in section 2.5.
transcription, in which I spell the chord as a B major triad over a pedal bass rather than as an F7(♭9♯11). Any of these interpretive distinctions could be incorporated into the figure, expanding the right side of the graphic further. The point that I am making, however, is that listening involves a highly variable interpretive dimension in which listeners can regard musical objects with varying lenses and scopes.

These interpretations shape how a listener casts resemblance with other musical moments. A rolled chord taken from a solo piano introduction by Kenny Barron appears in Figure 2.8. Like Byard’s "old chord" in his introduction to "My One and Only Love," this chord is an altered dominant and includes the ♭9 scale degree in the top voice. While I cannot say whether Jason Moran would label this as the same kind of "old chord," or organically draw a connection between the excerpts by Byard and Barron, the similarities exist at some levels of specificity and not others. For a listener with certain kinds of harmonic expertise, therefore, this resemblance might leap out, while a listener without knowledge of common jazz chord extensions might hear no resemblance, or only a very general similarity between the passages.

Although Moran’s comments reveal highly specialized harmonic knowledge, I do not intend to prioritize this type of listening over other ways of hearing. Different backgrounds and different preferences elicit different listening experiences. A listener connecting two passages

---

34 This relationship is far from causal. A similarity to another musical moment may also encourage a listener to recognize a different interpretation of a given musical passage.

by McCoy Tyner (Figure 2.9) might notice their similar melodic intervals (particularly at the beginning), or their similar rhythmic framework. A listener with perfect pitch might notice the same pitches appear in the F-A♭-B♭-C melodic line at the start of both phrases, or may recognize both as A♭ pentatonic scales played over B♭7 chords. Alternatively, someone might recognize similarities in the passages’ surroundings: both appear in blues. Or, a listener could respond more generally to a "pentatonic sound" in the two passages, or make a musical observation rooted in metaphor ("it sounds pretty busy"). A listener could make all or none of these observations. Regardless of this listener’s areas of musical expertise, the resemblance criteria he or she chooses shape the subsequent conception of Tyner’s style.

2.5 AN EXCURSION INTO ABSOLUTE PITCH (JACKIE MCLEAN, BENNY GOLSON, RAHSAN ROLAND KIRK, JOE HENDERSON)

Several times in the last two chapters, I have speculated about how a listener with perfect pitch might assess a particular stylistic cue. To a listener with perfect pitch, a certain melodic lick might be indexically tied to a particular key or the particular pitch that starts or ends the phrase. In these circumstances, a melodic lick might gain added recognizability (at least in

36 Wayne Shorter, “Charcoal Blues,” recorded 1964, on Night Dreamer, Blue Note 84173; Lee Morgan, “Tom Cat,” recorded 1964, on Tom Cat, Blue Note 37764.

37 These harmonies are functionally distinct in the two examples. In “Charcoal Blues,” which is in F, the B♭7 serves as a IV chord, while it is a tonic in “Tom Cat.”
part) when repeated on the same pitches. The Jackie McLean lick appearing in Figure 2.10a ("I’ll Take Romance")—although not particularly distinctive within the melodic language of the bop idiom—gains distinctiveness through its resemblance with similar melodic passages appearing at the same pitch height and in the same key. To a listener with perfect pitch, the scalar ascent from C to B♭ in Figure 2.10b ("I Remember You") might resonate with "I’ll Take Romance" just as it does with the similar passage in 2.10c ("The Lion and the Wolff").

The shared key, harmonic context, starting pitch in "I’ll Take Romance" and "I Remember You" may add an extra dimension to the resemblance between the two passages for a listener with perfect pitch.

Yet even without absolute pitch, a listener might recognize a lick based on its placement in a particular key or on a particular pitch. On many instruments—horns especially—certain notes have distinctive timbral signatures. These notes can be so distinctive that they might even serve as stylistic markers on their own, able to be recognized without the cue of one surrounding lick or another. Even though I do not have perfect pitch, I find myself recognizing saxophonist

---

Jackie McLean, “I’ll Take Romance,” recorded 1959, on Swing, Swing, Swingin’, Blue Note 4024; Jackie McLean, “I Remember You,” recorded 1959, on Swing, Swing, Swingin’, Blue Note 4024; Lee Morgan, “The Lion and the Wolff,” recorded 1960, on Leeway, Blue Note 4034.
Benny Golson based on the distinctive inflections of one particular high note. Every time I heard his high G (concert F5) (at least in a circumscribed era of recordings), the strong timbral change screams Golson; Figure 2.11 shows two passages with the distinctive F5 in varied improvised contexts on the Jazz Messengers’ album Moanin’. Although the adjacent pitches may similarly evoke some of the distinctive features of Golson’s upper register, the F is sonically marked, especially because it exists in the timbrally rich registral space that hovers above the saxophone’s normal range (which ends at E♭ concert). The altissimo register, which begins at E concert on most saxophones, requires idiosyncratic fingerings that allow a player to produce upper partials of pitches in the instrument’s normal range. In part because of its highly specialized technical origins, this marked F can appear in various contexts while still strongly suggesting Golson.

I am not alone in finding particular pitches to serve as timbrally distinctive markers of a player’s identity. In the first chapter, I referenced a similar observation in a Down Beat blindfold test by saxophonist James Carter. After failing to identify an unknown saxophonist, the interviewer reveals to Carter that it is Rahsaan Roland Kirk. Carter remarks that he should have known that it was Kirk: “He did a high C that could have tipped me off, especially when

---

39 Art Blakey and the Jazz Messengers, “Are You Real?,” recorded 1958, on Moanin’, Blue Note 4003; Art Blakey and the Jazz Messengers, “Moanin’,” recorded 1958, on Moanin’, Blue Note 4003.
40 My thanks to John O’Meara for this observation.
considering "Hog Callin' Blues.""Hog Callin' Blues," a recording by Charles Mingus on the 1962 album Mingus, Oh Yeah!, features a long solo by Kirk in which the saxophonist repeatedly hits a high C (concert B♭5) in the altissimo range. Referring to this track, Carter retroactively ascribes the high, timbrally rich pitch with a distinctive "Kirk-ness." Figure 2.12 shows several transcribed excerpts of Kirk’s solo on "Hog Callin' Blues." Although the transcription cannot hope to capture the complex timbral effects Kirk produces, it reveals one way in which a specific pitch can come to signify a particular player. Kirk drills the altissimo B♭5 over and over, marking the notes as significant for a listener, and concludes his solo with a pair of incredibly long, sustained B♭5s.

As in most of the musical associations explored in this chapter, similarity emerges from an array of interconnected resemblance criteria. In Figure 2.13, we encounter another set of resonant phrases by saxophonist Joe Henderson. Both passages show three-note groupings

---

41 Panken, "Blindfold Test: James Carter."
42 Charles Mingus, "Hog Callin' Blues," recorded 1961, on Oh Yeah!, Atlantic 1377.
43 Joe Henderson, "Granted," recorded 1966, on Mode For Joe, Blue Note 4227; Silver, "Bonita."
that unevenly divide the octave. Like the McLean examples above, however, the passages’ similarities also rely on their shared key (C minor) and the outer pitches in the groupings (C₄ and C₅). These pitch-specific similarities, which are accentuated by Henderson’s use of multiphonics in both passages, shape the resemblance between the excerpts from "Granted" and "Bonita." Even for a listener without perfect pitch, the perceived resemblance between the two moments likely relies (at least in part) on Henderson beginning the melody on C₄.

2.6 CONTOUR (THE "IRISH WASHERWOMAN," BENNY GOLSON, AND ART BLAKEY)

Throughout this chapter, I have emphasized the flexibility of listeners’ resemblance criteria, and the prevalence of complexes of interconnected resemblance features. Despite the varied ways in which listeners construct resemblance, certain resemblance complexes seem to recur frequently across different listeners and different examples.

Melodic contour acts as one such resemblance complex. Although sometimes this is overt, with jazz listeners recognizing a player by "the shape of his lines," contour often embeds itself in how a lick is conceptualized. Encountering melodic variants where intervals contract and expand according to different harmonic circumstances, listeners are encouraged by the musical

---

Panken, “Blindfold Test: Ravi Coltrane.”
language to orient themselves toward rhythm and contour as relatively stable resemblance criteria.

Musical quotations—a frequently discussed expressive dimension of jazz improvisation—rely on a melodic language that permits the distortion and transformation of familiar melodies without fully obscuring the resemblance for jazz listeners. When hearing two different quotations of the folk song "The Irish Washerwoman" (Figure 2.14), one can easily hear that these are references to the same song, despite the fact that one is sung on untexted scat syllables by a singer (Ella Fitzgerald) and the other is played by a tenor saxophonist (Joe Henderson). Adapting the quotation to widely divergent harmonic contexts, Fitzgerald and Henderson retain certain characteristic features—most notably, perhaps, the two quotations’ extended triplet rhythm and the intervallic content of the beginning. After the melody’s pickup, Fitzgerald and Henderson each repeat the two-bar phrase in a sequence, but the sequence occurs at different levels. In Fitzgerald’s version, the second iteration appears up four semitones, reflecting the harmonic shift from Bmaj7 to E♭m7. Henderson, by contrast, radically reconfigures the melodic line of "The Irish Washerwoman," leaping downward then upward by major thirds.

---


as he outlines an augmented triad. Centrally, however, Henderson retains the contour of certain melodic fragments. Although the first half of the measure reorients to fit the symmetric chord that Henderson arpeggiates, the melodic turnaround in the second half of the phrase (3-1-3-5-4-3) retains the song’s familiar contour. Even as he strips the melody of many of its tonal implications, Henderson’s continuation of the recognizable rhythm and contour enable the listener (and his fellow musicians) to identify and respond to the quotation.

For jazz listeners, the shared significance of rhythm and contour relate centrally to the idiom’s musical language. As in any tonally inflected music, listeners encounter melodies appearing in a shifting harmonic context. Replete with transformed melodies, the repertoire of jazz standards inculcates listeners with the expectation that melodic motives will be varied intervallically, but will frequently retain their resemblance in terms of rhythm and contour. In the Jerome Kern and Dorothy Fields composition ”A Fine Romance,” which Figure 2.15 shows reproduced in the illegal Real Book fake book, the song’s first eight bars consist of repetitions of the same four-note motive (Figure 2.16). With the exception of the whole step descent that ends the motive (bracketed on the figure), the other intervals expand and contract for each subsequent iteration while rhythm and contour remain largely intact.

In addition, the prevalence of short, localized tonics in the bop idioms also suggests a framework in which melodies are expected to be harmonically sequenced and varied intervallically. In Figure 2.17, Wes Montgomery adapts the same melodic line to various harmonic settings. A listener recognizing this thematic manipulation must use rhythm and contour as the resemblance criteria between different iterations of the motive.

Contour need not be conceived solely in terms of melody. Figure 2.18 shows two similar licks played by drummer Art Blakey. Although a listener might regard the phrase as a “rhythmic lick” because of its instrumentation, Blakey’s phrase follows a consistent downward contour. In

---

48 Wes Montgomery, ”Besame Mucho (take 2),” recorded 1963, on The Alternative Wes Montgomery, Milestones 47065.
49 Hank Mobley, ”Don’t Walk,” recorded 1957, on Hank Mobley and His All Stars, Blue Note 1544; Grant Green, ”The Song Is You,” recorded 1962, on The Complete Quartets with Sonny Clark, Blue Note 57194, released 1997.
Figure 2.15: "A Fine Romance," from The Real Book
Figure 2.16: Repetitions of the four-note motive in the A section of "A Fine Romance"

Figure 2.17: Wes Montgomery, sequenced motive in "Besame Mucho" (take 2) [2:31]

each excerpt, Blakey plays a similar sequence of four eighth-note attacks that tonally descend in the drums’ tunings: snare to high tom-tom to low tom-tom to bass drum. (Note that because of the peculiarities of standard drum notation, this contour is not reflected in the staff notation). Despite the differing surroundings and the slight variations between the phrases, the two passages’ similar contour unites them.50

2.7 WHY FEATURES?

This chapter provides a brief glimpse at the wide range of musical criteria listeners use to evaluate resemblance. Whether resemblance relies on individualized observation or shared perceptual focal points, resemblance is often multilayered, reflecting a concatenation of different interpretive moves.

Yet in all of these discussions, I have assumed musical features to be the fundamental building blocks of stylistic knowledge. By suggesting ways in which listeners respond to rhythms,

50 In addition, the two excerpts from "Don’t Walk" and "The Song Is You," like the Silver and Henderson examples from earlier in the chapter, are also united by formal markers; both four-bar Blakey passages come from exchanges when the drummer is "trading fours" with one or more melodic soloists.
harmonies, and melodies, I unavoidably reify these parameters as distinct and independent musical objects. At the same time, however, I have emphasized that these musical features do not exist in a vacuum. The resemblance between the two Horace Silver passages at the start of this chapter may rely on structural similarities, but it also taps into the deeper contextual affinities between the two tracks, "Song for My Father" and "Bonita."

As we unravel the division between text and context, perhaps it would help to step back and ask another question: why focus on features at all? Does a listener apprehend a melody in terms of its constituent features, like individual pitches or rhythmic attacks? Or is a melody recognized as an indivisible whole? Psychologists have sometimes suggested that the former, analytic mode of listening is more prevalent in trained adults while the latter, holistic mode of listening appears more in children, although these two modes of processing seem to exist in a complex and dynamic interplay.\(^5^1\)

Despite these questions, I believe that feature-based analysis remains a valid path. While I have challenged the prevalence of any one musical parameter in stylistic recognition, listeners often respond to several parameters at once in complexes of musical features. In addition, stylistic identification acts as a particular type of active listening—one that is inherently analytic. Listeners attempting to identify who is playing must engage analytically with the music they

---

hear. For performers, this stylistic analysis is part of their musical training, and for listeners it serves as a cultural currency for discourse. In order to do so, listeners often engage with music consciously and analytically.
So far, we have introduced the importance of stylistic identification within discourses of jazz musicians and fans (Chapter 1), and explored the diverse ways in which a listener can deploy networks of resemblance criteria in order to draw connections between similar musical moments (Chapter 2). And yet this tells an incomplete story. Style does not operate in one-to-one comparisons, but rather in webs of interconnected musical texts.

By examining the ways in which stylistic categories are formed and transformed, Chapters 3 and 4 expand the scope of resemblance criteria and resemblance complexes to larger groups of similar musical objects. In the last forty years, models of categorization informed by cognitive theory have challenged "classical" notions of sameness and difference. As such, non-classical "prototypical" categories exhibit features such as family resemblance, centrality, and gradients of membership and/or centrality.¹

Because of a shared interest in modeling experiential meaning as it accrues over time, theories of categorization provide a useful lens through which to examine improvisational formu-

---

Just as a category grows out of processing, interpreting, and grouping ideas and concepts together, a musical formula emerges through a listener evaluating a musical landscape and clustering certain resonant moments with one another. Musical style, one could argue, can be thought of as a field of categories. Within this field, categories range in size and complexity: some expansive categories, for example, designate broad stylistic features (e.g., a genre like “rock”) while other more focused categories might point to an individual player or a particular section of a particular piece. These categories may not be discrete; indeed, most meaningful musical experiences rely on a listener’s overlapping, ambiguous, and ever-transforming categories.

In this chapter, we can begin to explore some of the unanswered questions introduced in the examination of the "Blindfold Test" in Chapter 1 (section 1.1.4). Consider again three of the musicians’ comments (each responding to different recordings) that illustrate differing relationships to the player’s style:

- Branford Marsalis, 5/87: "You can turn it off; I knew what that was from the first beat, and I can sing it all note for note."\(^2\)
- Greg Osby, 4/90: "That’s Eric Dolphy [. . .] There’s one Dolphy solo: on Oliver Nelson’s Blues And The Abstract Truth, where he used the same sequence over 25 times."\(^3\)
- James Carter, 8/02: "[After revealing the performer:] He did a high C that could have tipped me off, especially when considering "Hog Callin’ Blues."\(^4\)

Does the way in which a listener gains familiarity with a player’s style impact how it is conceptualized? All three musicians show an awareness of their respective recordings, but each account highlights something different. Marsalis’s intimate knowledge of the player’s recorded solo differs both from Carter’s observation of a particularly striking musical feature and Osby’s recollection of a repeated phrase. Each of these scenarios, I argue, could lead to diverging conceptions of a player’s style.

---

2 Feather, “Blindfold Test: Branford Marsalis.”
3 Whitehead, “Blindfold Test: Greg Osby.”
4 Panken, “Blindfold Test: James Carter.” As mentioned previously, the title appears in hyphenated in the Down Beat source (“Hog-Callin’ Blues”), but it has been corrected to match the spelling on the referenced album.
3.1 CATEGORIZATION

If stylistic familiarity occurs through a process of categorization, as I suggest it does, categorization itself requires further discussion. This chapter probes what a category is and how it is formed, while the fourth chapter engages with the dynamic aspect of categorization by considering the ways in which categories are continually re-configured by listeners.

3.1.1 Classical and prototypical categories

The usual view regards categorization as the sorting of objects into distinct, individual cubby holes. A categorizer appraises an object, testing whether or not it adheres to a set of criteria, and arranges it accordingly. In this commonsense estimation, categories are regarded as ways of logically organizing the external world. The so-called "classical" category emerged from this viewpoint as a rule-based model for how humans make sense of the world.5

---

Despite their theoretical elegance, classical categories offer challenges for modeling listening practices. Modeled on mathematical sets, classical categories have strict boundaries with an essentially binary setup: either an object is included or it is not. Musical quotations of "Salt Peanuts" might reflect this kind of strict musical grouping; the recognizable "Salt Peanuts" lick (Figure 3.1a) can often be boiled down to an accented rhythmic pattern (Figure 3.1b), in which it is easy to tell what references "Salt Peanut" and what does not. Yet listening to music rarely requires such strict evaluations; hearing the thematic development of a melody, for example, asks the listener to make subtler judgements when relating different musical passages to one another. (As we shall see in section 5.1, even the ways in which listeners categorize quotations of "Salt Peanuts" can reflect differing interpretations).

In contrast to the rigid, rule-based entry into classical categories, prototypical categories exhibit porous boundaries and internal asymmetries. Rather than police the category’s boundary with certain logical criteria for an object’s entry—what Lawrence Zbikowski calls "individually necessary and jointly sufficient conditions"—the theory of prototypical categories suggests that as human beings group conceptual objects together, certain objects are regarded as more typical and others less typical. Likewise, similarity is often guided by a system of family resemblances in which an array of optional traits connect objects, with no single trait regarded as essential to the category’s identity. For example, a category of what constitutes a "bird" has strong, central prototypes. Most people agree that small, flying birds like sparrows or robins are more "birdlike" than flightless birds like ostriches. To some, penguins or bats—which exhibit some "birdlike" features but not others—might lie on the fringes of the category.

---

6 Although "classical" is the most common term, some scholars refer to classical categories as "monothetic" (as opposed to "polythetic" categories) or "Type 2" (as opposed to "Type 1" categories).
7 Zbikowski, Conceptualizing Music: Cognitive Structure, Theory, And Analysis, 40.
Extending these principles to musical style allows a melodic formula and its variations to be evaluated as members of a flexible category. Within a player’s style, certain iterations of a formula may seem more standard than others, and other versions may lie along the style’s border, at times suggesting one player’s style and at other times suggesting another. By thinking about families of formulae in terms of their category features—things like prototypes and boundaries for entry—we can uncover how some musical judgments may be based in how a lick was originally constructed.

Figure 3.2 shows one such family. Quelled from eight different recordings spanning from 1957 to 1980, these transcribed examples highlight an improvisational formula used by the tenor saxophonist Hank Mobley. Each melody shares a similar contour, with large leaps upward from the bottom of the saxophone’s register to the top.

In order to interpret these independent passages as varied iterations of a single "Hank Mobleyism," however, an ontological leap is necessary. What unites these different passages? Although their aural similarities might be immediately recognizable, the different passages reflect a range of resemblance criteria that loosely group the motives together. One marked feature is an inflected high note appearing in "On the Bright Side" and "Don’t Walk." Other


Figure 3.2: Hank Mobley, ascending formula
resemblance criteria include repetition at half-step intervals, a \( \frac{1}{4} \)\( \frac{1}{4} \)\( \frac{1}{4} \) rhythm,\(^{11}\) an opening ascent by perfect fifth and perfect fourth, a starting note of \( B_\flat 3 \), and a key of \( B_\flat \).\(^{12}\)

Although a listener might identify many potential connections between these motives, an initial array of resemblance criteria and their corresponding appearances in the eight examples (shown in Table 3.1) provide a starting point for discussion. No single criterion guides all eight of the examples, and no one example shares all six criteria. Some passages only exhibit a single feature ("Ace Deuce Trey"; "House on Maple Street"), while others have three or four ("On the Bright Side," "This I Dig of You," "Autumn Leaves").\(^{13}\) Thus, a network of interrelated traits groups the motives together as a family.

The use of many different resemblance criteria, and the network of family resemblances that results, allows for a blurring of the category’s boundaries. Even an individual feature can suggest graded standards for inclusion. For example, the "starting pitch" criterion seems

\[\text{Table 3.1: Hank Mobley, chart of resemblance criteria for ascending formula}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inflected high note</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>OTBS</th>
<th>TIDOY</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G &amp; J</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>DW</th>
<th>HOMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetition at half-step intervals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begins with P(_5) - P(_4) upward</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starts on B(_3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key of B(_3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) The rhythm also bears a resemblance to several formulas that Thomas Owens cites in his study of Charlie Parker: M23B and M52 (apparently a Lester Young "favorite"). Owens, "Charlie Parker: Techniques of Improvisation."

\(^{12}\) Some may object to my inclusion of absolute pitch designations as resemblance criteria. I suggest that absolute pitch designations are significant, even for listeners without perfect pitch, because the timbral qualities of the instrument (particularly horns) accentuates certain notes. In the hands of a particular player, even a single note can serve as a resemblance criteria (see discussion of Benny Golson’s F\(_5\) in section 2.1). Additionally, the register in which a passage begins and ends can serve as a powerful cue of musical similarity, and there exists no clear way for me to label a cutoff for these kinds of designations. So, for the purposes of this project, I sometimes use resemblance criteria like "starts on A\(_3\)," "starts near A\(_3\)," "starts in a low register," relying on contextual information provided by the listener and reader. For further discussion of these issues, see section 2.1.

\(^{13}\) The listener may not regard these traits as equal in their significance, and may therefore weight these features as they pertain to the lick. Some of these issues of internal hierarchies within a category will be discussed further in Chapter 5.
at first to designate a clear boundary for entry: either a phrase begins on B♭3 or it does not. But because pitch lies on a continuous spectrum and jazz players’ notes often slip between the benchmarks of the equal-tempered system, evaluating whether or not the phrase begins on B♭3 requires flexibility.14 “House on Maple Street” begins a quarter-tone below B♭3. In the context of the tritone leaping ascent that follows, a listener would likely “correct” this flat pitch to B♭3 without thinking. Its opening pitch may, however, seem slightly different than the four other examples that begin on B♭3 (“On the Bright Side,” “This I Dig of You,” “Smokin’,” “Gettin’ and Jettin’,”) yet not as different as those beginning a half-step up on B3 (“Autumn Leaves,” “Don’t Walk”) or a whole-step down on A3. As he interprets a version of the lick, the listener’s observations allow for gradients, both in how typical the passage is and in whether or not it is admitted to the category.

3.2 CATEGORY FORMATION: 3 SCENARIOS

How does a listener generate a category? At what point do a series of independent melodic lines become a single formula? This chapter outlines three different paths to category formation. Although approaching the same repertoire, each scenario traverses a wholly different route that fundamentally shapes how the category is structured. Which musical materials are selected and grouped together? What are the internal relationships between category members? Are some examples regarded as more central or typical than others? What is the relationship between the "insiders" and "outsiders" in the category? Over what time-span does the initial categorization occur? And how does the way something is categorized affect subsequent listening?

14 George Lakoff has suggested that evaluating the truthfulness of any statement requires some “fuzziness.” Lakoff, “Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts.”
To be clear: these paths are not meant as typologies, nor are they intended to exclude other potential approaches. Rather, I aim to show three different scenarios—several musical situations among many possibilities—that might encourage the development of a new category. Although each set of circumstances unfolds differently, all three show combinations of the same essential ingredients of salience and repetition. Yet the differences between the three scenarios propagate significant changes in musical experience. These divergences are rooted in the nature of the initial category formation, including the time-scale of the initial categorization and the array of resemblance criteria deemed important.

3.2.1 Repeated cue

Perhaps the clearest example of category formation comes from motivic repetition, in which the continued invocation of a similar cell encourages the listener to hear the passages as variants of one another. As Gabriel Solis notes, repetition is "elemental" to music’s comprehensibility; even the most basic syntactic understanding of music requires the listener to acknowledg-
edge repetition of materials.\textsuperscript{15} Among musicologists, music theorists, and music psychologists, therefore, it is unsurprising that the repetition of a single musical idea serves as the most familiar scenario of category formation. In most studies, the cue is a melodic motive repeated over the course of a single piece.\textsuperscript{16} Likewise, numerous studies illustrate the role of motivic organicism within jazz improvisation.\textsuperscript{17} Although the repetition of a particular musical cue over the course of a work merely reflects a feature central to all music, a category formed from a repeated cue can exhibit features significantly different from other categorization scenarios.

Figure 3.3 shows a graphical representation of this type of category development. The first gray bar signifies a single solo interspersed with a repeated cue. As the listener hears the performer’s improvisation, the similar-sounding passages connect to one another, forming a stylistic category. This category can then re-emerge in subsequent listening experiences (represented by the second gray bar); when a different solo features a similar moment, the listener might call upon his previous knowledge of this cue.

\textit{Milt Jackson, "Delilah (Take 4)"}

Milt Jackson’s solo on "Delilah (Take 4)" (for the complete transcription, see Appendix I, Figure A.2) provides an example upon which to model this scenario of category formation. Jackson repeatedly uses a rhythmic figure of superimposed triplets beginning on the anacrusis (e.g., \textsuperscript{18} The rhythm opens the solo, appearing twice within the first three bars and

\textsuperscript{15} For more on repetition in jazz, see Solis, \textit{Thelonious Monk Quartet with John Coltrane at Carnegie Hall}, particularly the introduction (pp. 3-22).


\textsuperscript{18} Milt Jackson and Wes Montgomery, “Delilah (Take 4),” recorded 1962, on \textit{Bags Meets Wes!}, Riverside 9407.
Figure 3.4: Milt Jackson, triplet formula in "Delilah" (tempo approximately 174 bpm throughout)
3.2 Category Formation: 3 Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhythm (beats 1, 2, and 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scalar ascent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-4♭5-4♭2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descent by major 2nd after peak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Resemblance complex in Milt Jackson, "Delilah"

thirteen times in the entire two-chorus solo. By sheer repetition, it seems, the motive achieves the status of a formula. Figure 3.4 shows the thirteen appearances of the motive.¹⁹

The category relies not only on the rhythm and its variations (beat displacements and additive/subtractive symmetry), however, but also on a complex of resemblance criteria (see Table 3.2).²⁰ As illustrated earlier, these resemblance criteria do not appear in every example, but are tied together over the course of the solo through their repeated permutations. Table 3.3 shows that the rhythm appears in all thirteen passages (although displaced to different metric positions). Other resemblance criteria, however, only appear at the exclusion of one another. The scalar ascent version (heard in the pickup measure, A15, A25, A31, B5, B7, B19, and B23) and the "blues" variant (emerging in A2, A7, A27, A29, and B31), for instance, clearly disallow one another; the blues variant’s 1-3-4♭5-4♭2-1 melodic line disrupts the steadily rising contour of the scalar ascent. Yet these passages are united by the other resemblance criteria in the category—particularly the triplet rhythm—and together form a repeated cue. The rhythm’s significance is twofold: not only does it appear in all of the examples, uniting them as a group, but the quasi-12/8 feel of the motives also serves as a point of contrast against the backdrop of the largely eighth-note rhythmic subdivisions throughout the rest of the solo.

¹⁹ I have notated the measure numbers as a letter and a number: the letter refers to the chorus in which the soloist is playing ("A" = first chorus, "B" = second chorus, etc.), and the number refers to the measure number within that chorus. In Figure 3.4, for example, B5 refers to the fifth bar of the second chorus.

²⁰ As mentioned in earlier examples, these are just several of the possible criteria that a listener could select. See Chapter 2 for further discussion. For more on additive/subtractive symmetry, see section 2.2.
After hearing the repeated variations on the same melodic idea, the listener links these passages together and labels them as characteristic of Milt Jackson.\textsuperscript{21} Then, on a subsequent hearing of another solo by an \textit{unidentified} vibraphone player, the appearance of this formula could help a listener identify the player as Jackson. "Ultra Marine," for example, a track from a 1957 Hank Mobley-led album, \textit{Hank Mobley and His All Stars}, includes a passage in which a vibraphone player "trades fours,"\textsuperscript{22} alternating with Mobley and the drummer (Art Blakey).\textsuperscript{23} Here, the listener encounters the same formula again (Figure 3.5), processes it with the previously developed category, and identifies the vibist as Milt Jackson.\textsuperscript{24}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting measure</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A7</th>
<th>A15</th>
<th>A25</th>
<th>A27</th>
<th>A29</th>
<th>A31</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B7</th>
<th>B19</th>
<th>B23</th>
<th>B31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm (beat 1)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm (beat 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm (beat 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalar ascent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blues version</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 descent @ peak</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-93 descent @ end</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Resemblance criteria in different iterations of formula in Milt Jackson, "Delilah"
Figure 3.5: Milt Jackson, "Ultra Marine," triplet lick [8:13]

Figure 3.6: Wynton Kelly, first chorus of solo on "Gettin’ and Jettin’" [4:14]
Wynton Kelly, "Gettin' and Jettin'"

Another repeated cue emerges in Wynton Kelly’s solo on "Gettin' and Jettin'" (Figure 3.6 shows the first chorus; for the complete transcription, see Appendix I, Figure A.3). At the endings of phrases, Kelly continually returns to a rhythm, which recurs in various forms over the course of the solo (see Figure 3.7). While retaining the same skeletal form throughout, the rhythm sometimes appears embellished (A9, A15, A23, B21, B27, C31).

A listener could also label them as characteristic of the tune, "Delilah," especially since the 3-against-2 polyrhythm that marks the triplet rhythm appears throughout the head of the tune as well in the form of quarter-note triplets. Given the cultures of stylistic listening outlined in Chapter 1 and the context (Jackson’s solo is one in a series of contrasting improvisations by different players), however, it would not be surprising for a listener to label the formula with respect to Jackson, rather than with respect to Victor Young’s composition "Delilah."

Jazz musicians frequently “trade fours,” improvising back and forth in alternating four-measure segments. Typically, one or more melodic soloists trades fours with the drummer, often after the other instrumentalists’ solos.

Hank Mobley, “Ultra Marine,” recorded 1957, on Hank Mobley and His All Stars, Blue Note 1544. Notice that I have referred to a listening chronology that contradicts the historical sequence of the recordings: "Delilah" was recorded in 1962, while "Ultra Marine" was recorded in 1957. This rhetorical gesture is a purposeful attempt, yet again, to distance my approach from poietic-oriented theories of improvisation. "Out-of-order," transhistorical listening is common for jazz and, because of the dissemination of jazz recordings listeners routinely gain familiarity with newer, more easily accessible albums before hearing earlier works. For a brief discussion of transhistorical listening, see Michael L. Klein, Intertextuality in Western Art Music (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 98-99.

"Ultra Marine" contains several variations of this same motive earlier in Jackson’s solo at timecodes [1:18], [1:25], [1:34], [1:50], and [3:13]. For the purposes of this example, I have only included one passage as a transcription.

Mobley, "Gettin' and Jettin'"
Unlike the Milt Jackson example, Kelly’s repetition of a solitary rhythmic cell provides a single, focused resemblance criterion rather than a diffusive set of many resemblance criteria. In both cases, the effect of the repeated cue "path" to category formation remains the same. The stylistic category remains flexible, containing versions of the motives with different placement within phrases, different intervals, different numbers of notes, different contours, different registers, and different versions of a basic skeletal rhythm.

**Implications**

Despite the widespread acceptance of repetition-based category formation, some of the nuances of this scenario merit further exploration. Because the repeated cue centers around intraopus style, the category forms in a relatively short time-span: over the course of listening to a single solo, rather than over the course of hearing several different solos.

Due in a large part to this short-range time scale, stylistic categories initially formed from a repeated cue seem likely to exhibit a certain degree of flexibility. This flexibility shows up in a number of different arenas, but is primarily seen in the category’s variability—the diversity of category members with respect to one another—and the length of the cue.

When emerging from a repeated cue, the resulting category is likely to be relatively diverse. Variants are immediately introduced, even while the earlier examples remain fresh in the listener’s ear. The members of the category, therefore, may occupy a relatively wide expanse, with significant divergences within the category. In the Milt Jackson example, for instance, the triplet rhythm appears with various lengths (ranging from only four triplets in A31 to ten triplets in the pickup measure, A7, A15, A29, B23, and B31). Likewise, the lick occurs at three different metric displacements and with two contour variants (ascending scalar passage versus

---

26 As mentioned in the introduction, Leonard Meyer terms the level of style concerned with recurrences within a single work to be "intraopus style." While "intraopus" may be a less than ideal way to refer to jazz recordings, the distinction between short-range and long-range listening processes is an important one to make: a category formed during a single recording (or perhaps an album) versus a category formed from comparing different recordings in a longer-range intertextual listening process. Meyer, *Style and Music: Theory, History, and Ideology.*
"bluesy" ascent and descent). The Wynton Kelly lick, too, shows a wide range of rhythmic and intervallic diversity, with the inclusion of alternative versions of the central rhythmic figure (A9, A15, B27, and particularly A23, B21, and C31) and versions with varied contour and relatively significant intervallic divergence. Although variations will occur within any category, the short-range nature of the repeated cue category formation often encourages—from the category’s inception—a wider range of variation than other forms of category formation.

These divergences also relate to the perspective by which the listener views these materials. Drawing on work by philosopher Ruth Millikan, Dora Hanninen has suggested that conceiving of categorization in terms of "reidentification" models a type of real-time analysis that listeners engage themselves in. With this outlook, individual members of a musical category are perceived as multiple encounters with the same musical "substance." Reidentification supports a framework in which a listener recognizes passages as subsequent iterations of some essential substance (similarity) while also emphasizing the transformations that this essence undergoes (variability). This kind of conceptual framework, while possible with any type of category formation, seems most likely to initially occur in the repeated cue scenario.

In part because of this variability, this scenario also enables shorter cues to become stylistic markers. In the case of the Kelly example, the ability to segment a three- or four-note phrase ending from what preceded it relies on having similar passages surrounding it. A listener would be far less likely to link two short passages if there were 30 days intervening between iterations rather than 30 seconds. It is this potential for shorter cues that sets this scenario apart from the other two paths outlined in this chapter—particularly the idealized cue scenario.

Because the salience of the musical cue is drawn from its similarity to nearby passages, the category formed may also draw on less distinctive material: a melodic motive that, for instance,

---

27 Hanninen, “Associative Sets, Categories, and Music Analysis.” This perspective on musical categorization is one of several outlined by Hanninen. See 4.6 for further discussion.

28 This may seem counterintuitive to some. Wouldn’t the short-range nature of repeated cue category formation suggest that longer licks would be grouped together? While this can certainly happen, I would argue that the repetition of similar materials in close proximity conceptually emphasizes these passages as fragments, and encourages listeners to separate them from their surrounding textures.
sounds relatively similar to the surrounding texture. In either example outlined above, another listener might regard the formula as simply an idiomatic gesture. The central \( \frac{3}{4} \) rhythm in the Milt Jackson solo and the \( \frac{3}{4} \) rhythm in the Wynton Kelly solo are both relatively common within bop styles. For the purposes of stylistic identification, therefore, repeated cue category formation might elicit some "false positives": materials categorized as unique to a particular performer that later are regarded as simply clichés. These issues will be explored further in Chapter 4.

### 3.2.2 Marked cue

In contrast to the internal repetition that characterized the first scenario, the marked cue scenario traffics in strongly differentiated musical moments.\(^{29}\) As he hears a solo, a listener appraises the musical landscape, providing a stylistic horizon against which a certain passage differentiates itself.\(^{30}\) As before, a graphical representation summarizes this path toward cat-

---

\(^{29}\) In the blindfold tests, certain linguistic traces of this scenario appear. One listener, after jumping between different musical observations and guessing vaguely at whom those observations might point to, says ”Now that’s an Albert Ayler kind of thing.” This statement strongly implies that stylistic identification relies on certain marked moments, rather than the process being distributed evenly across a piece of music. Birnbaum, “Blindfold Test: Javon Jackson.”

\(^{30}\) The idea of a stylistic horizon plays a part in any appraisal of style, and this issue will be discussed further at the start of Chapter 4.
3.2 CATEGORY FORMATION: 3 SCENARIOS

Figure 3.9: James Spaulding, "Minor League" [1:54]

gory formation. Figure 3.8 shows a series of different recordings represented as gray bars. Within each gray bar, the red section marks a particularly salient passage. Over the course of subsequent exposure to similar passages, reappearances of this marked cue become connected with one another, gradually forming the basis for a stylistic category. In these subsequent passages, the phrase need not be marked from the surrounding texture as it was in the first. While any segmentation requires some element of markedness, the mere presence of the first iteration (formed, perhaps, into some initial, nascent, proto-category) highlights the resonant passage in the second.

*James Spaulding, "Minor League"; Eric Dolphy, "Teenie's Blues"

In a solo by alto saxophonist James Spaulding on "Minor League", the use of alternative fingerings of the same pitch results in a unique and distinctive passage—microtonal and timbral inflections of the same note.31 Figure 3.9 shows the excerpt from this solo, designating the alternative fingerings with "+" markings above the staff. Amidst largely tonal and smooth-timbred surroundings (both in Spaulding’s solo and those of other musicians in the session), this passage’s timbral irregularities becomes distinctive and marked as a sign of Spaulding’s individual style. Its location at the end of the solo marks the passage even further, offering another moment of disjuncture as Spaulding’s solo ends and guitarist Grant Green’s solo begins.

---

31 Grant Green, “Minor League,” recorded 1964, on *Solid*, Blue Note LT 990, released 1979.
Once this passage becomes marked, any subsequent listening experiences that sound similar might end up reminding the listener of this passage, and thereby James Spaulding. Another track, "Jodo," which shows a similar triplet passage with alternatively fingered notes at the start of the saxophone solo, might trigger an intertextual leap to the passage from "Minor League" (Figure 3.10).\(^{32}\) Because of drummer Pete LaRoca’s shifting metric feels during this section, Spaulding’s rhythmic fluidity, and the extreme tempo, my transcription illustrates a rhythmless version, while still retaining the phrase groupings that Spaulding uses.\(^{33}\) The two phrases point to each other, and help to "confirm" the lick as characteristic of James Spaulding’s improvisational style.

The markedness of this timbral effect relies on its dissimilarity from the surrounding texture, as well as its differences from the styles of the other improvisers. By contrast, an effect like Spaulding’s might receive little attention embedded in Eric Dolphy’s solo on "Teenie’s Blues." Against the stylistic horizon of Dolphy’s jagged playing, a light-hearted, tonally straightforward quotation of "Camptown Races" (see Figure 3.11, mm. 9-10) becomes marked instead.\(^{34}\) Once again, the extreme importance of context sensitivity in listening underscores the subtlety of the stylistic identification process; no single rule guides the categorization of musical materials.
Figure 3.11: Eric Dolphy, solo on "Teenie's Blues," 2nd chorus [1:47]
Figure 3.12: Larry Young, 18th (R) and 19th (S) chorus of solo on "Talkin' About J.C." [8:06] (tempo approximately 240 bpm throughout); marked octatonic passage appearing at beginning of 19th chorus (S1)
Larry Young, “Talkin’ About J.C.”

In organist Larry Young’s solo on “Talkin’ About J.C.,” an octatonic scale run at the start of the 19th chorus marks a distinctive change in the musical texture (Figure 3.12). In contrast to the angular, leaping arpeggios that precede and succeed it, the octatonic run moves with a smooth contour in stepwise motion upward. The passage is also marked by its sudden leap to a low register. As with the Spaulding and Dolphy examples (section 3.2.2), the selection of these features as resemblance criteria—the octatonic collection, beginning in a low register, and smooth rising contour—reflect the passage’s divergences from the surrounding improvisation. This lick will be reconsidered in section 4.3.

Implications

The formation of a category based on an initial marked cue diametrically opposes the central tenet of the repeated cue scenario. While thematic repetition provides a musical cue with salience because of its similarity to surrounding material, the marked cue scenario draws its salience from its difference from the immediate environment. This suggests that the musical cues categorized through this process may tend toward more idiosyncratic and unique passages, as seen in the James Spaulding examples. This generalization, however, cannot be stated unequivocally; the Eric Dolphy and Larry Young examples counter this claim by presenting material that is stylistically unusual within the context of the solo, but relatively generic within a wider idiomatic viewpoint. While I would claim that this categorization scenario tends toward more idiosyncratic musical materials, the relativity of terms like “unusual” and “idiosyncratic” requires constant reminder.

33 For further discussion of transcription-related challenges, see Appendix A.
35 Grant Green, “Talkin’ About J.C.,” recorded 1964, on Talkin’ About, Blue Note 4183.
36 For more on the importance of stylistic context, see Benjamin Givan’s analysis of formulae in Sonny Rollins’ “Blue 7.” Givan, “Gunther Schuller and the Challenge of Sonny Rollins: Stylistic Context, Intentionality, and Jazz Analysis.”
Like the repeated cue categorization, the grouping of marked cues often suggests a resulting category with greater variability among its members. In this case, however, the diversity of the category members emerges for a different reason. While the motivic recurrence of the repeated cue scenario immediately exposes several variants in a short timespan, the intertextual linking of marked cues relies on long-range timespans. During the intervening hours (or days, months, or years, as the case may be), misrememberings occur; the first passage becomes reconfigured with each new musical experience. In this chaotic process, a wider array of variants may be admitted to the listener’s category.

Significantly, what musical features the listener chooses to prioritize and remember will likely relate to the features that first differentiated it from the surrounding musical texture. As music is processed and categorized in the listener’s experience, the object becomes a reduction; certain parameters act as "summaries" of the passage while others are ignored. In the case of James Spaulding’s excerpt from "Minor League," the timbral features distinguished it from the rest of the solo. In the later hearing of "Jodo," therefore, these timbral characteristics might take precedence as a primary point of attention.

3.2.3 Idealized cue

In many cases, categories form neither from motivic repetition within a single solo (as in the repeated cue scenario) nor from intertextual leaps between marked, idiosyncratic passages (as in the marked cue scenario). With certain, well-known recordings, a listener might hear the same improvisation over and over. An improvisation, once recorded, can be listened to repeatedly and internalized by listeners. Although this internalization can be a deeply personal process, often it is shared with other listeners; commercially popular recordings or repeated airing on the radio, television, or other media can easily familiarize a listener with a particular
solo. Through this process, the solo’s improvisational status retreats; the notes, with their particular inflections, become immanent and inevitable.37

A listener’s categorization of materials in an often-heard and familiar solo, I argue, differs from other cases. Just like in the other two scenarios, a listener still hears similar-sounding moments and groups them together with one another. In this case, however, these selected cues are not merely similar—they are identical. Because of this, an improvisation’s iconic status may shift the way a listener forms categories. A well-known, oft-repeated solo might provoke a listener to create a series of strong, idealized stylistic prototypes against which other musical passages are judged as variants or even deformations.

This third scenario attempts to model this intimate relationship between a listener and a recorded improvisation, the ways in which it impacts category formation, and how it colors subsequent musical experiences. Once again, a graphical representation shows how the category emerges (Figure 3.13). The gray bars on the left represent recorded solos once more, but this time they show the same solo heard repeatedly. As the listener absorbs the same passages, the different musical features (represented as different colored sections) become grouped with one another, forming a strong prototype. This prototype, in turn, frames subsequent listening experiences; the rightmost bars represent reappearances of cues in later recordings.
Lee Morgan, "Moanin’"

The 1958 recording of "Moanin’" by Art Blakey and the Jazz Messengers looms large among jazz recordings. Within jazz pedagogy, "Moanin’" often serves as a central exemplar of hard bop, and the album (also named Moanin’) consistently appears on lists of "greatest jazz albums." Trumpet player Lee Morgan’s two-chorus improvisation (Figure 3.14 shows the first

---

37 Through this process, certain solos become iconic, and this status, in turn, impacts subsequent performances. A performer’s inflections and interpretations of a tune become canonized. Peter Elsdon has shown how Coltrane’s live recordings of “Chasin’ the Trane” reflect an evolving ontology of the work, in which each subsequent recording of the tune absorbs and responds to changes in the previous recordings. In a similar vein, see Paul Berliner’s discussion of jazz arrangements of "Round Midnight." Elsdon, “Jazz Recordings and the Capturing of Performance”, Berliner, Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation, 88. In other cases, later performers will repeat iconic solos verbatim; this is often related to the phenomenon of jazz tributes. One recording by saxophonist David Murray includes octet arrangements of several choruses of John Coltrane’s solo on "Giant Steps" played polyphonically over one another. David Murray Octet, “Giant Steps,” recorded 1999, on Octet Plays Trane, Justin Time JUST 131.

38 Blakey and Jazz Messengers, “Moanin’.”

39 In his textbook on jazz history, Ted Gioia describes the album as remaining “one of the defining statements of the hard-bop idiom” (289). Ted Gioia, The History of Jazz (Oxford University Press, 2011). For an example of Moanin'
Figure 3.14: Lee Morgan, first chorus of solo on "Moanin" [0:59]
chorus), which begins the solos, has a similarly iconic status; the solo is frequently transcribed by students and cited in books on jazz pedagogy.

Throughout this process of repeated listening, a listener might group together a series of "Lee Morgan-ish" cues that occur over the course of the solo. If we consider only the first chorus, a listener could respond to a number of different features, based on how he segments the 32-bar chorus. For our purposes, consider the following five cues, which roughly map onto the formal AABA layout of the piece:

- The descending D diminished arpeggio and its variations that begin the chorus (mm. 1-7)
- The quick, "pickup articulations" in the second A section (mm. 9-16)
- The ending lick that finished the double-time passage in the B section (m. 21)
- The half-valve muted sound while repeating a single pitch in the beginning of the last A section (mm. 25-27)
- The repeating B-C-C pattern in triplets at the end of the chorus (mm. 31-32)

Each of these features might serve as a Lee Morgan identifier. For a listener whose familiarity comes from repeated listening, each cue centers around a strong, single prototype: the recorded version that has been heard repeatedly.

Morgan himself seems to have treated his recorded solo as iconic, as well, by merging some of the originally improvisational elements into the song's arrangement. See Berliner, *Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation*, 385.

In the *Down Beat* blindfold tests discussed in Chapter 1, listeners repeatedly mention this feature as a potent identifier of Morgan's style. Claudio Roditi says: "Of course it's Lee Morgan—the sound, the articulation, the phrasing; and then there's the obvious stuff like the half-valves he did so beautifully and in such a personal way. [...] I've always felt closest to Lee's approach and also transcribed Lee's solos"; Michael Bourne, "Blindfold Test: Claudio Roditi," *Down Beat* (June 1991): 51. Roy Hargrove, likewise, notes that "Lee does a lot of half-valve things, plays with a lot of blues influence, a fiery sound"; Bouchard, "Blindfold Test: Roy Hargrove." Notice how Roditi acknowledges his familiarity comes from transcription, which is another means by which jazz listeners might form an idealized-cue-based category.

One could justifiably argue that, even when hearing the same recording over and over, a listener's memory gaps and changing listening contexts could impact the way he heard. I would wholeheartedly agree. This scenario, however, seeks to model an extreme of listening in order to explore the ramifications of such a practice. Even if misrememberings and other variables somewhat destabilize the category formed, this kind of hearing still differs from the previous scenarios.
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Implications

Because the listener’s familiarity emerges from repeated listening to identical recordings, several significant consequences arise: stricter entry criteria, broader resemblance complexes, longer licks, and strong prototypes.

In the case of the idealized cue scenario, the resemblance criteria policing the borders of the category become strict. Hearing a particular phrase repeated identically over and over encourages the listener to absorb delicate nuances, which, in turn, allows for sharper divisions between inside and outside of the category. For the Lee Morgan "pickup articulations," for instance, one might expect a listener to connect the dots between a the prototype in "Moanin’" and another passage in "Tom Cat" (Figure 3.15). Despite the evident similarities of the two passages’ pickup articulations, a listener who has internalized the "Moanin’" solo could easily overlook the connection based on the differences between the two, such as the changes to the material between the quick articulations or the accelerating pace of the lick that appears in "Moanin’."
Similarly, for the idealized cue scenario, the criteria tying together different category members can encompass a wider set of musical features. For example, if we compare the Wynton Kelly lick (defined by a single \(\frac{3}{4}\) rhythm) to the phrase that opens Lee Morgan’s solo on "Moanin’" (defined by a rhythm, articulation, and pitch relationships), the robust set of resemblance criteria in the latter can be attributed to the increased familiarity and strong prototypes engineered by the idealized cue. Similarly, idealized cues exhibit longer lengths, as appears in a comparison of the Kelly and Morgan examples. Each passage has been heard repeatedly, allowing for the listener to remember longer passages and accurately predict what is coming. This leads to longer-range and more detailed conceptions of the musical materials.

David Huron’s discussion of veridical memories reinforces this observation. Veridical expectation "arise[s] from past knowledge of a familiar sequence of events—such as familiarity with a particular musical work."\(^{43}\) Huron notes that

> Listeners are highly sensitive to the slightest changes from familiar renditions. For a listener familiar with a particular recording of some musical work, recordings of the work by a different performer—or even different recordings by the same performer—often disappoint. The most minuscule changes of performance nuance leap out as deviations from a personal "norm."\(^{44}\)

Although his study focuses on art music (and follows some of the related conceptions of music as a fixed work), Huron’s observations stand for any recorded music. Through the familiarity that repeated hearing engineers, a listener can establish a personal norm against which other versions are judged as "deviations."

**CONCLUSION**

In all three scenarios, these consequences reinforce one another. When there are fewer musical features tying together different passages, there will probably be more variability within a

---


\(^{44}\) Ibid., 241.
category and looser standards for entry into the category. Conversely, in a category with strong prototypes, there are likely to be larger complexes of interrelated musical features linked to these prototypes. Table 3.4 illustrates some of these corollaries.

While it is difficult to generalize about something as subjective as listening, considering how a listener might construct a stylistic category can shed light on what musical ideas we regard as stylistically recognizable. A marked cue’s reliance on disjunction from its surroundings highlights different kinds of licks than a repeated cue’s reliance on similarity to other nearby musical materials. In the same way, the categorical strictness that an idealized cue inflicts produces a vastly different effect than the repeated cue’s flexibility. Thoughtful analysis of jazz requires embracing subjective experiences—our individual ears, our musical intuitions, and our musical pasts. By embracing these pasts, we can begin to dive beneath surface observations and investigate how our analyses are shaped by strong undercurrents in our listening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fewer resemblance criteria</th>
<th>Larger resemblance complexes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More variability within category</td>
<td>Strong prototypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looser criteria for category entry</td>
<td>Stricter criteria for category entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter licks</td>
<td>Longer licks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: Corollaries of category properties
4.1 INTERLUDE: THE STYLISTIC "HORIZON"

These discussions of category formation often rely on an implicit idea of a stylistic "horizon" against which a category can be formed. For a cue to become marked (section 3.2.2), it has to have something to be marked against. Similarly, a stylistic marker’s usefulness—its effectiveness at helping a listener identify who is playing—relies on a horizon against which the marker becomes distinctive. As detailed in Chapter 2, this marker can rely on any type of musical parameter that the listener deems significant, from an abstract conceptual or linguistic apparatus to tiny features of a player’s microrhythm.

Microrhythmic features like swing feel, in fact, often serve as stylistic markers. Swing feel refers to the underlying relationship between downbeats to upbeats in a player’s rhythmic subdivisions (typically eighth notes), and it can also encompass aspects of how the player interacts with the beat divisions that other ensemble members convey (e.g., playing "behind the beat"). In section 1.1.2, I presented a wide range of blindfold test excerpts that draw upon rhythmic signifiers like swing feel. Drummer Peter Erskine, for example, implicitly invokes these microrhythmic features: "What makes one drummer’s beat sound different from another
is the space between the notes. It doesn’t have to do with technique or sticking, it’s just the shape between the notes.”

In the *Down Beat* blindfold tests, listeners almost always identify trombonist Curtis Fuller immediately; fellow trombonist Steve Turre, among others, singles out Fuller’s distinctive use of rhythm as one of his most identifiable traits. In his study of microrhythm and expression in jazz recordings, Fernando Benadon, too, recognizes Fuller’s swing feel as a dominant marker distinguishing the trombonist. Comparing Fuller’s feel with the other soloists on an alternate take of "Sonny’s Crib," Benadon writes:

In the same way that different jazz performers bring their own melodic harmonic, timbral, and rhythmic conceptions to a given performance, the blending of their unique microrhythmic approaches contributes to the musical richness of an ensemble performance. In the blues ‘Sonny’s Crib,’ for instance, Curtis Fuller’s high BURs stand in sharp contrast to the other three soloists’ more even subdivisions.

Benadon regards swing feel, alongside features like timbre and melodic formulae, as a central channel conveying a player’s individuality.

Fuller’s strong swing feel—quantified by Benadon through the metric of the Beat-Upbeat Ratio (BUR)—diverges markedly from the more even-eighth feels of John Coltrane, Donald

---

1 Stewart, “Blindfold Test: Peter Erskine.”
3 Sonny Clark, “Sonny’s Crib (alternate take),” recorded 1958, on *Sonny’s Crib*, Blue Note 1576.
5 Benadon cites a quote by jazz critic Martin Williams, who suggests that “each of the great players has found his [sic] own way of pronouncing the [swing] triplet, expressed or implied—and Roy Eldridge’s triplet doesn’t sound like Louis Armstrong’s; Miles Davis didn’t sound like Dizzy Gillespie’s; Lester Young’s triplet was unlike Coleman Hawkins’; and Stan Getz’s is unlike Lester Young’s.” Quoted in ibid., 86.
6 Used in various studies of microrhythm, BUR is a ratio obtained by measuring the temporal span of the downbeat and dividing it by the temporal span of the following upbeat. With this metric, “even eighths” have a BUR of 1.0, since the downbeat and upbeat each last for the same amount of time. The “swinging triplet” feel—a historiographic preoccupation of jazz scholars that Benadon thoroughly dismantles—has a downbeat-to-upbeat ratio of 2:1, with a BUR of 2.0. Benadon, “Slicing the Beat: Jazz Eighth-Notes as Expressive Microrhythm.” Matthew Butterfield has proposed an additional measure, the Upbeat-Beat Ratio (UBR), an index obtained by dividing the timespan of the upbeat by the following downbeat. In theoretical terms, it might seem as if this metric is merely the inverse of the BUR and therefore trivial, but in practical terms the different way that UBR is measured—with
Byrd, and Sonny Clark. Benadon’s graph (Figure 4.1) illustrates this division between Fuller and the other instrumentalists; while the BURs of Byrd, Clark, and Coltrane circle around 1.2, Fuller’s BUR centers on 1.6.7 Fuller’s high BUR on "Sonny’s Crib" is not an outlier. In many other passages, in fact, Fuller’s swing feel is even stronger.8 Examinations of several other passages (Figure 4.2, selected for their strong, identifiable "Curtis-Fuller-ness") suggest a pattern.9 In these examples, the markedness of Fuller’s rhythmic feel relies on an implicit comparison to those of his fellow musicians.

Although Benadon only highlights microrhythm’s role in helping the listener distinguish Fuller’s playing from that of other instrumentalists on the same track, microrhythm could certainly also serve as a resemblance criterion for a listener engaging in stylistic identification across multiple tracks. Viewed through the lens of stylistic identification, the type of stylistic marker that Benadon asserts seems relatively trivial; distinguishing Fuller from the other soloists on requires only to be able to tell the difference between trumpet, trombone, sax-

7 Although Benadon notes that there is a great deal of variation in BURs, the difference between Fuller’s swing and the other soloists remains easily distinguishable by a listener; at an approximate tempo of 170 beats per minute, a gap of 1.2 BUR to 1.6 BUR equates to approximately 25 milliseconds.

8 Swing feel varies significantly over the course of a solo. These selections represent some sampling of the highly recognizable upper limit of Fuller’s swing feel.

9 Although I am not following every tenet of Benadon’s selection criteria, I am loosely basing my approach on his. His criteria include: the phrase contains at least eight consecutive eighth notes; the recording is good quality; the tempo is slower than 250 beats per minute; double-time phrases and non-straight-ahead styles are avoided; the time signature is 4/4; and phrases with ghost notes, scoops, and other blurred attacks are avoided. Benadon also repeatedly states that his examples are chosen randomly and clarifies that the excerpts need not make up a complete phrase. For my excerpts, I have not limited myself to consecutive eighth-note passages. In addition, my selection process is not entirely random; I began by randomly selecting tracks to listen to, and then I selected and transcribed excerpts based on my own subjective analytical goals—primarily seeking the identification of the soloist. When I found a passage that served as a stylistic “clue,” I marked down the timecode and transcribed it. These passages from Curtis Fuller, to me, sound like one another primarily because of Fuller’s recognizable swing feel. The Curtis Fuller Jazztet with Benny Golson, “Wheatleigh Hall,” recorded 1959, on The Curtis Fuller Jazztet with Benny Golson, Savoy MG 12143; Lee Morgan, “Tom Cat,” recorded 1964, on Tom Cat, Blue Note 37764; Art Blakey and the Jazz Messengers, “On the Ginza,” recorded 1963, on Ugetsu, Riverside 464.
4.1 Interlude: The Stylistic "Horizon"

**Figure 4.1**: Graph of BURs in "Sonny’s Crib" (alternate take); Example 10a from Benadon, 2006

**Figure 4.2**: Curtis Fuller, distinctive swing feel with high BUR in: "Wheatleith Hall," "Tom Cat," and "On the Ginza"
ophone, and piano. If an unknown trombonist appeared, however, a listener might tacitly compare the soloist’s swing feel to other known trombonists to identify the player.

4.2 CATEGORY TRANSFORMATION

Listeners hear with a past; the implicit comparisons they make reflect listening histories, biases, aesthetic preferences, and dynamic interplay between ever-nascent stylistic categories. As a listener begins to categorize Curtis Fuller’s distinctive swing feel, this category always remains provisional. The usefulness of a listener’s stylistic category relies on its continued ability to pinpoint the musician playing. If Fuller began changing his swing feel, or a listener started noticing counterexamples that contradict this assessment, this category could begin to shift and reconfigure itself.

In the preceding discussions, I discuss categories of musical licks as complex systems with overlapping sets of rules dictating their content (the music is being categorized) as well as their internal structure (the relationships and hierarchies between musical examples). This view, while pointing to the complexities of how categories are structured, perhaps undervalues the dynamic nature of categorization. Even past their initial construction, categories are not crystalline objects fully solidified and frozen in a single form. A listener never affixes a category; as he or she hears more music, the musical groupings constantly change and fluctuate, adapting to continually contextualize new musical stimuli and recontextualize previous musical understandings.

Given the fluidity of musical categories, in what ways might a category transform over time? In this chapter, I turn to analysis once again in order to consider various answers to this question. Taking up one of the newly formed categories outlined in Chapter 3, I explore the impact of a growing intertextual web of musical resonances.
In the "marked cue" scenario (section 3.2.2), a listener notes a particularly distinctive cue, and then notices its reemergence in new examples, gradually constructing a stylistic category from these occurrences. Re-examining a series of passages by organist Larry Young, this section illustrates the fluidity of this categorization process. I gradually add resonant musical moments, in order to model a fully intertextual process in which a listener draws together several different recordings over a long timespan. But how does one analyze intertextual resonances in music? Michael Klein offers a functional methodology distilled from Claude Lévi-Strauss’s work on myth. The approach

reads a first myth in light of a second one, and brings to bear upon this pair a third myth, and a fourth, etc., until each myth becomes a relational event among all of the others... The analyst must proceed as if the myths in question were similar in meaning, with the assumption, once again, that the real object of inquiry is the structure of the mind.\(^\text{10}\)

This gradually widening aperture provides a useful lens through which to survey the categorization process, particularly how a process of categorization shapes and re-shapes the musical objects it considers.

Using Lévi-Strauss’s method, I will begin by considering an initial musical passage with respect to a second passage, and then another, gradually forming an ever-widening web of intertextual connections. At the same time, I will continually re-examine the emergent intertext, evaluating and re-evaluating the varied criteria for these intertextual connections and the phenomenological transformations of the "texts" towards which they point.

\(^{10}\) Klein, *Intertextuality in Western Art Music*, 30. Grappling with the idea of musical structure in music-theoretical discourse, Klein uses Lévi-Strauss’s method to explore the intertextual ramifications of the term: "Faced with the chaotic musical surface, the theorist pursues a structure as the result of bringing a text within the context of a second, and third, text. A musical structure is a relational event among texts. A musical structure is an intertextuality." (31) If, as Klein argues, "musical structure" must be regarded as fundamentally intertextual, then improvisational "formulae"—which, by definition, emerge from repetition across different contexts—certainly are as well. While Lévi-Strauss’s structuralist method seeks universality amid relational events, my analyses, like Klein’s, assume no such basis. Instead, I use Lévi-Strauss’s approach as a starting point for suggesting various models of imaginative stylistic hearing that may or may not be present in a listener’s formation of an intertext.
In this process, I hope to show three things. First, as more and more music is added to the category, there is a tendency toward generality, as resemblance criteria become "fuzzier." Second, the category perpetuates itself; the very act of categorizing music causes the listener to recognize new member-objects. Third, as each object is added to the category, the listener must reconfigure and reinterpret the music previously categorized.

In organist Larry Young’s solo on "Talkin’ About J.C.,” an octatonic scale run at the start of the 19th chorus marks a distinctive change in the musical texture (Figure 4.3 reproduces the transcription first seen in the preceding chapter on page 113).\(^{11}\) In contrast to the angular leaping arpeggiated melodies that precede and succeed it, the octatonic run moves with a smooth contour in stepwise motion upward. The passage is also marked by its sudden leap to a low register. As with the Spaulding and Dolphy examples, the selection of these features as resemblance criteria—the octatonic collection, beginning in a low register, and smooth rising contour—reflect the passage’s divergences from the surrounding improvisation.

When a similar octatonic scale run appears in "Bags’ Groove"\(^{12}\) (Figure 4.5), the listener may be reminded of the earlier passage. The two moments share a strong resemblance; not only are they both upward octatonic scale runs, they both begin on the same "side" of the scale (starting with a half-step upward), in the same low register, with the same rhythmic character (upbeat beginning followed by consistent subdivision pace), and both appear in a blues form. Despite these (and other) evident parallels, the two passages diverge in other respects (standard feel vs. double-time feel, different keys, etc.). In drawing a connection between the two passages, a listener develops a hierarchy, however tentative, between different musical observations. Here, pitch collection and rhythm become primary unifying factors, while the relationship between rhythm and an underlying pulse is regarded as less relevant.

\(^{11}\) Grant Green, “Talkin’ About J.C.,” recorded 1964, on Talkin’ About, Blue Note 4183.
\(^{12}\) Jimmy Forrest, “Bags’ Groove,” recorded 1960, on Forrest Fire, Prestige 8250.
Figure 4.3: Larry Young, 18th (R) and 19th (S) chorus of solo on “Talkin’ About J.C.” [8:06] (tempo approximately 240 bpm throughout); marked octatonic passage appearing at beginning of 19th chorus (S1)

Figure 4.4: Larry Young, “Talkin’ About J.C.” [8:17]
From these two examples, a listener might be reminded of the end of "Monk's Dream," where another octatonic-like passage can be heard. After playing the last head, Young and Elvin Jones, the drummer, cease a consistent pulse as Young plays a rapid scalar run that, while not strictly octatonic, might be grouped alongside the first two passages. Figure 4.6 shows a rhythmless transcription of the passage.

Young begins playing an octatonic collection in the lower register, deviates from it (with repeated D#s and inconsistent interval sequences), and then returns to the same collection in the upper register. Despite the internal deviation from the octatonic collection, the passage’s octatonic "framing" is significant; to a listener hearing 56 notes in the span of six seconds, a passage beginning and ending with an octatonic sound will likely be heard as octatonic. Additionally, the lack of a consistent macroharmony in the middle helps to solidify the passage's perceived octatonicism. If the middle of the scalar run played a familiar, recognizable scale (for example, a major scale), the significance of the octatonic boundaries might be lessened (although probably not overwhelmed).

From the three passages, a listener might experience an "emergent" formula, in which a family of features unifies these moments across different recordings. Without a consistent pulse, "Monk’s Dream" does not seem to follow the same rhythm as "Talkin’ About J.C." or "Bags’

---

13 Larry Young, “Monk’s Dream,” recorded 1965, on *Unity*, Blue Note 4221.

14 Additionally, the lack of a consistent macroharmony in the middle helps to solidify the passage’s perceived octatonicism. If the middle of the scalar run played a familiar, recognizable scale (for example, a major scale), the significance of the octatonic boundaries might be lessened (although probably not overwhelmed).

15 For ease of discussion, I will sometimes mention the name of a composition to serve as a representative title for the formula it contains.
Groove," and a new set of continuities arises to connect these three passages. The repeated evocation of the octatonic macroharmony, although inexact, seems to act as a primary criterion for resemblance. In addition, all three examples begin in the organ’s low register and follow the same upwards contour.

In "Falling in Love with Love," another similar passage re-appears (Figure 4.7).16 With this addition to the category, the centrality of the characteristic rhythm seen in "Talkin’ About J.C." and "Bags’ Groove" is re-confirmed alongside the low-register beginning and upward contour. As the category grows, some resemblance criteria may be discarded and others may be tentatively added. With the especially close relationship between the passages in "Bags’ Groove" and "Falling in Love with Love," for example, a listener with absolute pitch may be tempted add a new resemblance criteria to the category, prioritizing the particular octatonic collection (OCT$_{12}$) or starting note (C♯) that both excerpts use.

By now, the existence of a category of several similar-sounding objects heard in Larry Young’s improvisation actually solicits a listener to process recordings of the organist through this structure. In other words, the conscious or subconscious grouping of "Bags’ Groove," "Falling in Love with Love," "Monk’s Dream," and "Talkin’ About J.C." provides a salient "recognizability" to passages meeting these resemblance criteria. Upon hearing the passage in

---

16 Larry Young, “Falling in Love with Love,” recorded 1960, on Testifying, Prestige 8249.
Figure 4.9: Larry Young, "Monk’s Dream," rhythmically interpreted [5:27]

"Backup" (Figure 4.8), a listener might immediately group it alongside the other examples.\textsuperscript{17} Once again, the differences between this passage and the others (such as the added note at the beginning or the higher register) re-configure the criteria for resemblance. Just as the inexact octatonic scale in "Monk’s Dream" encouraged a "fuzzier" criteria for the formula’s octatonicism, the added note at the start of Figure 4.8 might encourage a fuzzier interpretation of the passage’s characteristic rhythm.

At each stage, new examples are not merely "sorted" into a pre-existing categorization structure. The resemblance criteria are continually re-formed as the intertext grows, and this processes of categorization impacts not only which new member-objects are added, but also the ways in which the constituent member-objects are interpreted. With four of the five examples following roughly the same rhythm, a listener might, consciously or subconsciously, apply that rhythm to the ostensibly unmetered "Monk’s Dream." In Figure 4.9, such an interpretation projects itself onto the transcription, and it becomes aurally real when re-listening to the passage. Categorization is not simply determined by the objects categorized; the objects themselves are impacted by their categorization. In other words, each stylistic grouping reflects an underlying ontological dialectic: the musical objects both shape the category and are shaped by the category.

Table 4.1 schematizes the process outlined above, showing the ways in which the resemblance criteria change as new category members are added. To summarize: the process of categorizing similar-sounding musical passages occurs through various overlapping criteria; the

\textsuperscript{17} Larry Young, "Backup," recorded 1964, on Into Somethin’, Blue Note 4187.
addition of new member-objects to a category provokes the re-examination of the category, its resemblance criteria, and the musical features of the objects it contains; and the pre-existence of a category structure provides a possible trigger for aural salience, leading to the addition of new member-objects.

4.4 Testing Hypotheses

While the slow shifts of the Young category exemplify the ways in which a listener’s resemblance criteria can gradually adjust to respond to each new case, another methodological approach can illustrate drastic changes in how a listener conceptualizes a lick. In this section, I imagine a series of phenomenological transformations that repeatedly reconfigure a lick by Jackie McLean. As before, each stage adds new music to a stylistic category and, accordingly, forces the listener to reevaluate; with every input, he or she must continually reorient the category to either accept the new music into the category or reject it. At the same time, the category’s internal structures and hierarchies are reshaped to accommodate the shifting priorities of the stylistic category.

In each of these stages, the listener generates a new "guess"—an initial hypothesis that must be verified and refined through testing. Each stage begins with a new set of applicable
test cases. As these test cases grate against the assumptions of the previous stage, the earlier hypothesis is re-formed. This process is ongoing. It assumes no teleological basis, and no endpoint exists at a perfectly understood stylistic marker. In fact, I am consciously avoiding words like "development" that might imply ideas of evolution or progress; although there may be a subjective teleology, leading to the correct identification of a player’s style, the categorization process is continually ongoing, and a feature that a listener regards as a characteristic "Larry Young" lick one day could easily be interpreted as a meaningless cliché the next (see further discussion in section 4.5). Rather, a stylistic category exists as long as it is useful, in practical terms; if it can identify a player or a genre or another significant musical or extramusical feature, it succeeds, and if it cannot, it is discarded.

For this example, I examine three "snapshots" of a category in flux. First, the category is oriented around a two-part phrase with a "head" and "tail." Next, the listener excises the tail in order to accommodate a new population of similar examples. In the following stage, the tailed version seems to reemerge alongside other prototypes, leading to a multi-centered conception of the lick.

4.4.1 First stage: head + tail

On the Donald Byrd album *Byrd in Flight*, alto saxophonist Jackie McLean plays a number of licks that follow the same general shape (see Figure 4.10 for an initial example). Following

---

18 Donald Byrd, “Bo,” recorded 1960, on *Byrd in Flight*, Blue Note 4048.
Daniel Harrison’s study of heads and tails in J. S. Bach’s fugal subjects, one could treat the McLean passage as divided into two distinct components: the "head" of the phrase containing the upward neighbor motion by a quarter-tone interval and the "tail," which trails off in a diatonic descent in sixteenth notes. Despite the apparent gap between the compositions of J. S. Bach and the improvisations of Jackie McLean, Harrison’s approach is apropos in that he examines the transformation of fugal subjects over time, particularly focusing on the interplay between head and tail motives in some of Bach’s fugal subjects. This conceptual metaphor—a melodic segment as a transforming animal—serves as an initial frame for understanding how a listener might group and re-group McLean’s repeated melodic phrases, which exhibit a similar interplay of head and tail motives.

Figure 4.11 shows seven similar examples from the two tracks on the album on which McLean is featured. As usual, considerable variation exists between the different motives. The three-note "head" motive sometimes swells to half-step intervals (#1) or shifts closer to a triplet rhythm (#2). The motive occurs at two different speeds: an eighth-note pace (#3, #4, #5, and #7) and a sixteenth-note pace (#1, #2, and #6). As with many of the other examples in the chapter, the lick’s metric placement slides between beats 1, 2, and 3. Most notably, some of the motives do not include the "tail" component (#1 and #3), and given its prevalence in the rest of the passages, these two motives may lie on the "outskirts" of the nascent category.

In general, however, the motive remains relatively consistent. "My Girl Shirl," in particular, shows the lick in a relatively solidified form, beginning with the quotation of the composed melody by Duke Pearson. Four of its five iterations (#4-7) appear in similar harmonic contexts.

---


20 For ease of discussion, I will refer to these in their temporal order as #1, #2, #3, etc. By no means do I intend to convey any hierarchical designations with this notation. Although another kind of analysis could easily differ, my interpretation provides motive #1 with no originary function. For more discussion on these kinds of interpretive issues, however, see section 4.6. In addition, these examples present a selective account of similar passages in these tracks. Although retrospectively one might hear a wider range of resonant examples, I begin with this initial population to reflect one possible initial step—among many potential groupings and segmentations—for a listener. Byrd, “Bo”; Donald Byrd, “My Girl Shirl,” recorded 1960, on *Byrd in Flight*, Blue Note 4048.
Figure 4.11: Jackie McLean, motives from "Bo" and "My Girl Shirl"
with the quarter-tone neighbor motion starting on 5 (C in the key of F minor) and preceding a descent in harmonic minor, often changing directions upon reaching 3 (A♭). This figure frames the entire solo on "My Girl Shirl," appearing at his entrance (#3) and at the solo’s conclusion (#7), as well as repeatedly marking the ends of the A sections in the tune’s AABA form (#4, #6, #7).

4.4.2 Second stage: head grows, tail is excised

Figure 4.12 shows another set of resonant examples. Immediately, the listener must reconsider the category’s orientation. In these new passages, the tail component is almost entirely absent, with the only exception being the first phrase from "It’s Time" (#8). Although it had appeared to be a relatively consistent addition to the head motive in the tracks on Byrd in Flight, the tail now seems to be an inessential component of the lick. The process of recognizing style requires a listener to constantly test and re-test emergent stylistic categories. In this case, the category’s initial form, with a two-part construction ends up being deemed "incorrect" in light of these new examples.

Instead, the category is reconfigured around the head motif. Focusing attention on this turn figure, the new examples expand the acceptable variability of the neighbor motion, with wider interval spans (although still within two semitones) and varied rhythms. Whether consciously or unconsciously, and whether occurring through reflection or simply fading memory—in this case, the earlier tailed examples superseded by tailless ones—the reconfiguration of category materials proves essential to the listener’s abilities of stylistic identification.

21 On the recording, the A♭ ghost note in #7 remains inaudible, but its presence emerges from the other parallel passages on the album. For further discussion, see section 2.3.2.
Figure 4.12: Jackie McLean, motives from "It’s Time," "Melody for Melonae," "The Lion and the Wolff," and "Wiggin’"
Also significant in this new group are the several passages in which McLean plays the
turn figure several times in a row. In six of these (#10, #12, #14, #15, #18, and #19), the turn
appears two or more times in close proximity. In retrospect, this repeated version bears some
resemblance to #3. Using this new group of examples, a listener might land on a revised
hypothesis: instead of the head-and-tail motif, the repeated neighbor motion is a potential
stylistic marker for McLean.

4.4.3 Third stage: several centers

With the addition of a new body of examples (Figure 4.13), the category changes yet again.
Part of the listener’s hypothesis is confirmed: the repetition of the turn figure seems to be a
significant feature, appearing in all five passages from "Blues for Jackie" (#20, #21, #22, #23, and
#24) In addition, the previously truncated tail, which seemed like an mistaken generalization
in stage two, re-emerges as a significant feature yet again in "Capuchin Swing" (#26, #27).

Two prototypes emerge. Counting all 27 of the passages heard so far, the tail appears eight
times (roughly 30%), and the repeated turn figure appears ten times (nearly 40%). The rest of
the passages (eight examples, roughly 30%) contain the turn figure but it is neither repeated
nor followed by a diatonic descent. From the standpoint of stylistic identification, these pas-
sages are tricky. Because the turn figure is relatively simple on its own, these cues could easily
become false identifiers of McLean’s style. By focusing on two central exemplars, the listener
is able to build two potential stylistic markers out of a single cue.

---

23 #18 also illustrates a repetition of the turn figure. I have not included this, however, because the space between
the repetitions is a bit larger than those of #10, #12, #14, #15, and #19.

release as Blue Note 4116. The track "Blues for Jackie" was later released as a bonus track on the CD reissue of
McLean, “Capuchin Swing,” recorded 1960, on Capuchin Swing, Blue Note 4038.

25 Here, I use “false identifier” to mean a cue that the listener interprets as signifying player X, but that is not in fact
unique to player X’s improvisations. This issue will be explored further at the end of this chapter.
Figure 4.13: Jackie McLean, motives from "Blues for Jackie" and "Capuchin Swing"
Furthermore, the listener is poised to expand the category further by potentially drawing new connections between the instances that are neither "tailed" nor repeated. If we re-examine two of the passages (Figure 4.14; #11 and #25), we can see that an alternate tail could exist; both of these turns are followed by a perfect fifth leap upward. This hypothesis, like its predecessors, is tenuous and can only be validated by testing it against other examples.

In the preceding three stages, we observed a series of shifts in how the listener conceives of a category, and by extension the musical materials it contains. A listener generates an initial hypothesis and then tests it, refining elements of a first guess and discarding others. He or she generates new inferences and tests them, continually reconfiguring the stylistic categories.

This description of stylistic understanding gels with that of Leonard Meyer, who suggests that knowledge of style is almost always "tacit," emerging from experiences of performing and listening rather than explicit instruction in music’s structural regularities. Additionally, style is internalized through "a mixture of observation guided and qualified by often vague and inchoate hypotheses—hunches based on prevalent cultural beliefs and attitudes about

---

26 As is immediately apparent, two of these passages ("Melody for Melodae" and "Capuchin Swing") have much in common. Besides extensive intervallic similarities (including not only the perfect fifth leap upwards, but also the minor third descent preceding it), the turn begins on the same pitch, the rhythm is very similar (although displaced), the melodic peak (F in both cases) is articulated similarly with an approach tone (E), and the peak is followed by a stepwise descent (ornamented in the case of "Capuchin Swing").
the nature of relationships in the world” which are then "refine[d]… by testing them against the data discerned in works of art, ultimately relating separate hypotheses to one another in order to create a coherent theory.” It also relates closely to aspects of Charles Peirce’s semiotic theory. Peirce suggests that without an known semiotic code that would enable meaning to be parsed via deduction or induction, a listener must rely on abduction to generate new meaning—a process which he describes as "nothing but guessing." In a more detailed definition, Peirce writes that

An *Abduction* is a method of forming a general prediction without any positive assurance that it will succeed either in the special case or usually, its justification being that it is the only possible hope of regulating our future conduct rationally, and that Induction from past experience gives us strong encouragement to hope that it will be successful in the future.

In this sense, Peirce’s abduction encompasses more than guessing; he seems to see it as the *only* way to generate truly new meaning. Meyer’s understanding of style acknowledges the possibility that most cases that would *seem* to be abduction in fact involve a substantial amount of induction. Yes, they may be "vague and inchoate hypotheses," but they are also based on experiences and cultural predilections.

But more important to the discussion of this section is the fact that, for both Meyer and Peirce, these processes rely on participants continually testing and reevaluating their guesses. Umberto Eco notes that the pragmatic basis of Peirce’s theory requires constant validation:

If the interpretation … does not produce a practical habit allowing the interpreters to successfully operate according to that interpretation, the process of semiosis

28 A code, which Michael Klein defines as “a convention of communication that organizes signs into into a system correlating signifiers to signifieds within a particular domain” (51) also resonates with this project. In his 1976 *A Theory of Semiotics*, Umberto Eco aligns the idea of a code with fluid categorization by calling a code a "fuzzy concept" (82)—a term he takes from an article by George Lakoff, who in turn had related it to ideas of prototypical categorization by Eleanor Rosch. Umberto Eco, *A Theory of Semiotics* (Indiana University Press, 1979); Lakoff, “Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts”; Rosch, “On the Internal Structure of Perceptual and Semantic Categories.”
would have failed. In the same sense, one is entitled to try the most daring abductions, but if an abduction is not legitimated by further practical tests, the hypothesis cannot be entertained any longer.\footnote{Umberto Eco, \textit{Drift and Unlimited Semiosis}, Institute for Advanced Study Distinguished Lecturer Series (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1990), 6.}

Without this process of hypothesis and practical validation—which continually occurs for a listener over the process of many listening experiences—stylistic identification would be impossible. And, built into its very core, this process \textit{requires} transformations like those outlined in the Jackie McLean example above.

4.4.4 Conceptualizing transformations

We can conceptualize these transformations using the performance dispersion map, a methodology developed by José Bowen that represents the relationships between musical performances in terms of a "geometric metaphor."\footnote{Bowen, "The History of Remembered Innovation: Tradition and Its Role in the Relationship Between Musical Works and Their Performances," 161.} Although Bowen’s interest lies in exploring ideas of musical ontology and questioning the work concept as it relates to composition—particularly the notion of a work as something stable and fixed—his ideas relate equally well to improvisational formula. Some of the same assumptions about stability exist with respect to improvised licks. Jazz pedagogical texts, for example, routinely present students with a set of melodic phrases to learn.\footnote{One example, taken at random from Amazon.com, offers a simple promise: "Now you can add authentic jazz feel and flavor to your playing! Here are 101 definitive licks, plus a demonstration CD, from every major jazz guitar style, neatly organized into easy-to-use categories." Wolf Marshall, \textit{101 Must-Know Jazz Licks: A Quick, Easy Reference for All Guitarists} (Milwaukee, WI: Hal Leonard, 2000).} As shown in the preceding section, licks can be very unstable, and the process of categorizing musical materials involves missteps and refinement. Bowen’s dispersion maps can serve as a valuable representation of this transformative process.
Figure 4.15: Performance dispersion maps, from Bowen, 1993
Representing performances as individual dots, Bowen graphically shows a series of "changes in the history of the style of performance." As more performances are added, the work is re-configured; this reconfiguration is represented by Bowen’s graphic, appearing in Figure 4.15. Beginning with an initial performance (Figure 4.15a), Bowen notes that changes in the ontology of the work must be understood relativistically; any variation between performances can only be judged with respect to each other. At first, therefore, nothing is assumed about the performance. It could be typical or atypical, but these judgments can only occur with respect to other performances.

When new examples arrive (Figure 4.15b), they help to "define a set of normative assumptions" about the piece. Bowen recognizes that this these assumptions draw a preliminary boundary around the performances. Figure 4.15c suggests alternative ways in which an outlier can be interpreted: either it can be viewed as an anomaly and "discarded" or it can be subsumed within the grouping, with new examples clustering around it and linking it to the original population. Figure 4.15d shows how fading cultural memory can functionally erase and a cluster of performances and reshape the boundaries of what constitutes the "piece."

Although Bowen uses performance dispersion maps to explore compositional ontologies, the discussions of shifting boundaries that are continually renegotiated echoes the ideas of musical categorization outlined in this chapter. Figure 4.16 shows a set of performance dispersion maps—or, rather, a cue dispersion maps—representing the three transformative stages of the Jackie McLean stylistic category outline above. Individual passages are represented by dots, with category boundaries represented by thick solid lines and centers of category represented by thinner, stippled lines. Each vertical layer (a, b, and c) shows a different stage in the
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35 ibid., 162.
36 As mentioned before, boundaries (both for entry and for centrality) in prototypical categories are generally not strict, but rather exist as gradients. In this graphic representation, however, strict boundaries are conveyed with these lines. These can be understood as continually moving, so that the dots near the outer edges might vacillate between being inside and outside of the category, casting their status as liminal category members.
process, corresponding to the category transformations outlined in sections 4.4.1, 4.4.2, and 4.4.3. The lefthand side of the diagram shows the widening set of passages that the listener encounters, while the righthand side illustrates the subsequent category formed.

In the first stage (Figure 4.16a, corresponding to section 4.4.1), the initial group of passages with the head-tail motive can be seen in the cluster of five dots on the lefthand side, while the two tailless examples appear to the right. In the category formed, all seven examples are grouped together, but the listener generates a strong prototype (the head-tail motive) around which the category is centered.

The second stage (Figure 4.16b, corresponding to section 4.4.2) shows that this initial center was misguided, since it includes many examples that deviate from the central head-tail versions of the first stage. Responding to the wide spread of examples, the listener reconfigures
the category to de-center the head-tail motive and instead forms a looser, amorphous category based upon the turn figure. Noticeably, however, the listener begins to experience a growing cluster on the righthand side of passages in which the turn figure repeats.

The third stage (Figure 4.16c, corresponding to section 4.4.3) shows more examples still, and the clear clustering on the right- and lefthand sides lead to a new category structure. Once again, the the tail figure serves as a prototype, and it is joined by another prototype with the repeated turn figure (first observed in stage two). In addition, the bottom cluster shows the inklings of a new prototype in-the-making, in which the turn figure is followed by an upward leap.

I hope to have made clear that transformation is not merely an occasional feature of stylistic categories, but rather an essential component of categorization. Listeners construct their musical categories with the aim of extracting meaning from what they hear; by design, these groupings are constantly shifting and changing. Although I end my discussion of the McLean lick with an internally bifurcated category, this is by no means the category’s final form. These kinds of categories, I suggest, have no final form. Depending on what else the listener hears (or re-hears) and how he or she interprets it, the McLean lick could follow any number of possible paths: it could split into three centers (tail, repeated, and leap), which in turn could split into their own categories; one or both of the centers could be overpowered by a new population of examples that muddle the salience of that particular cluster; or, indeed, the entire category could be discarded, if the listener begins to encounter “false positives”—similar sounding licks by players other than Jackie McLean—that undermine its efficacy as a stylistic marker. And these, of course, are but a few of innumerable possibilities. How the listener structures a category depends on a series of subjective conscious and unconscious choices; the only certainty is that, whatever form it takes, a category will—and must—be constantly changing.
Since I am suggesting that stylistic categories remain forever impermanent, we might briefly reconsider some of the examples introduced in the past two chapters in light of these continuing transformations. Certain licks that are initially regarded as distinctive of a particular performer’s style may eventually be incorporated into a wider idiomatic style. As a listener hears other examples of long ascending octatonic scales, for example, the associations with Larry Young traced throughout section 4.3 might gradually dissolve. The reemergence of this lick during Lee Morgan’s solo on the alternate take of “Smoke Stack” (from the album *A Blowin’ Session*, 1957; Figure 4.17 shows Morgan’s seventh chorus) undercuts the listener’s nascent notion that this lick points toward Larry Young. Inundated with similar passages in other musicians’ solos, a listener’s associations and accumulated meanings might dissipate as the cue transforms from distinctive to cliched.

Because listeners construct meaning fluidly, however, the passageway between stylistic identifier and stylistic cliché can operate in both directions. A listener can begin by regarding the octatonic ascents heard in the solos of Lee Morgan and Larry Young as an unremarkable or idiomatically common, and yet that same listener might later to associate meaning with these passages. If Larry Young seems to use a particular octatonic cliché over and over, that cliché can acquire a “Larry Young-ness,” despite the ubiquity of the musical gesture.

In the same way, musical quotations can become stylistic markers. Although similar quotations appear throughout solos by numerous performers, Joe Henderson’s relatively frequent references to “The Irish Washerwoman” (see, for instance, 2.14) often indicate his performative presence. Stylistic identifiers need not emerge from some unique feature of an improviser’s music, and George Lewis has argued that assumptions and judgments about an improvisation’s uniqueness relate to problematic myths of “pure spontaneity” emanating largely from
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37 Johnny Griffin, “Smoke Stack (alternate take),” recorded 1957, on *A Blowin’ Session*, Blue Note 1559.
art music practitioners. Listeners construct musical meaning out of disparate musical events and, accordingly, their associations rely on not only on what music materials they hear, but also when they hear them.

### 4.6 Conclusion: Perspectives on Categorization

This discussion reminds us that the objects in a category and the ways in which a category is structured reveal only part of the story. Aside from the category’s structural features, how we conceive of the category significantly impacts any musical judgement or interpretation that subsequently arises. Dora Hanninen has suggested four potential perspectives applied to musical categories by analysts: morphologies, populations, lineages, and individuals. Interpreting the category through each of these lenses provides a different viewpoint. Morphological per-

---


perspectives, as a whole, emphasize the similar features shared between objects. Focusing on the differences and affinities among two objects in the category, the morphological perspective concentrates on comparison by citing specific features of category members. (This bears some affinity with my discussion of resemblance criteria in Chapter 2). In general, most intertextual analyses fall within this camp, rarely straying beyond the comparison of two examples.\(^{40}\)

By contrast, orienting a category toward populations shifts the attention away from one-to-one comparisons between objects toward broader conceptions of the category “as an integrated system” (as in Chapter 3).\(^{41}\) while the lineages perspective focuses on the diachronic nature of the materials being categorized, arranging them in terms of a progression or development.\(^{42}\) Lastly, the individuals perspective conceives of the different members of a category as one individual “that persists over time and is revisited (and perhaps transformed) in a series of encounters.”\(^{43}\) As mentioned in Chapter 3, Hanninen generates this perspective out of philosopher Ruth Millikan’s notion of “reidentification,” and individual instances within a category are perceived as multiple encounters with the same musical “substance.” While I have avoided historically oriented conceptions of stylistic categories in these discussions, this chapter outlines a perspective that perhaps synthesizes aspects of Hanninen’s lineages and individuals perspectives. Each section traced several encounters with new musical examples, continually examining how each new example (or set of new examples) forces a listener to recontextualize the category in the context of his or her past and present experiences.

In addition to these analytical perspectives in treating stylistic categories, listeners often adhere to aesthetic perspectives on categorization. Within the community of jazz listeners, the

\(^{40}\) Here, I agree with Michael Klein’s assessment of most studies of musical intertextuality as proclaiming a text’s radically open nature while simultaneously confining the analytical practice to simple comparisons of two pieces. Klein, *Intertextuality in Western Art Music*, 18.


\(^{42}\) In fitting with one of the undercurrents of this project, I should point out that a listener can bring his or her own diachronic perspective that does not necessarily reflect the historical order of the recordings he hears. Out-of-order, transhistorical listening is common and yet, as far as I know, it has received scant attention from scholars. For a short discussion of this kind of listening, see Klein, *Intertextuality in Western Art Music*, 98-99.

frequent divisions between avant-garde and historicist camps of listeners can be understood, to some extent, as differing ideologies of stylistic categorization. Should the aim of jazz music be to respect its origins and for musicians to follow predecessors’ stylistic principles? Or should jazz eschew categorization entirely? Examining trends in jazz historiography, Scott DeVeaux traces the answers to these questions amid ideologically charged divisions between members of the avant-garde and the "neoclassicists, who insist on the priority of tradition and draw their inspiration and identity from a sense of connectedness with the historical past." 44

Comments by Lee Konitz suggest that rigidly bounded stylistic categories can become overfamiliar and border on the clichéd: "Charlie Parker almost sounds like an imitation of himself now, in terms of how fixed his playing often was, with his great phrases that he put together in ingenious ways. But he relied on them." 45 With this perspective, some listeners continually seek the unfamiliar—whatever pushes and pulls their existing category boundaries, forcing them to generate new categories. To guitarist Adam Rogers, this instinct is tied to his musicianship: "The feeling I get when I hear sounds that mystify and move me, and I don’t understand how they were created, is what made me want to become a musician." 46 Paul Bley summarizes, epigrammatically: "If I know what you do, I don’t like it; you’re constantly supposed to elude me." 47

By contrast, comments by figures like Med Flory reveal an interest in reapproaching familiar jazz styles and recordings. Beginning in the 1970s, Flory and other members of the ensemble Supersax transcribed Charlie Parker solos and arranged them in four-part harmonies for a series of recordings. 48 Although their solos in live performances frequently included distinctive post-bop inflections, the members of the ensemble often seemed committed to recreating an

44 DeVeaux, “Constructing the Jazz Tradition: Jazz Historiography,” 527.
early bebop style rooted in the styles of players like Parker, Dizzy Gillespie, or Bud Powell. In Flory’s 1980 blindfold test, his reactions to a series of bebop records reflect an interest in the overlap between history and style ("On that tune, Dizzy played the history of the jazz trumpet") as well as some anxiety with respect to later stylistic trends.⁴⁹ Flory notes that

Like a lot of guys, I didn’t dig Miles at the beginning when he replaced Diz. It didn’t sound like Miles had any chops, but I’m starting to realize that the impact he had on trumpet players isn’t all that bad. He’s atmospheric, and, compared to what’s happening now, it’s great to listen to. At the time, I thought Miles ruined a lot of trumpet players who tried to imitate him instead of Diz [...]

Flory’s attitude—which some might accuse of fetishizing the past—highlights an interest in working within the parameters of a particular style. In this case, Flory suggests his aesthetic preference for working within the set of stable stylistic categories he has associated with bebop.

So, just as a category’s internal structures impact listener experience, how the listener thinks about what he or she hears can prove equally fundamental. Conceiving of the category of "Hank Mobley-isms" introduced in the beginning of the chapter (section 3.1.1) in terms of a single lick continually re-emerging and transforming will produce a different effect than thinking in terms of a historical progression. These kinds of judgments often overlap with ideological undercurrents within the jazz community, and as such, a listener’s categories shape not only his own aesthetic evaluations, but also reflect (and influence) intersubjective evaluations shared among jazz listeners. These issues will be explored further in Chapter 5.

⁵⁰ Ibid.
So far, the preceding chapters have theorized a process of jazz listeners’ stylistic familiarization and subsequent stylistic identification. In a self-reinforcing circular process, jazz listeners want to know who is playing and, accordingly, they build up stylistic categories that enable them to associate particular musical features with particular performers: a certain phrase that evokes Hank Mobley (section 3.1.1), for instance, or a particular inflected pitch that signifies Benny Golson (section 2.5).

Having established that listeners can develop stylistic categories and use them to identify performers, we are now able to explore how these processes open up new dimensions of listening. By building these musical categories and imbuing them with meaning, listeners are able to expand their interpretive perspectives on the music they hear. These new dimensions can be pragmatic—as when a listener notices a record that has been mislabeled with the incorrect performer— but they can also affect the listener’s experiential connection to what he
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1 This happens more frequently than one might expect. In a 1975 blindfold test, drummer Norman Connors recognizes a familiar fellow drummer, and insists on his identification despite what the interviewer, Herb Nolan, says:

[Connors:] There’s only one person who can play like that, Roy Haynes. [ …] That’s Roy Haynes and Archie [Shepp], so far.

Nolan: The liner notes say the drummer is Beaver Harris on this cut.

Connors: They made a mistake!
or she hears. As mentioned briefly in Chapter 1 (page 24), stylistic identification can apply a new affective impact to a previously unknown performer; according to one listener, "Sonny [Rollins] played one note, and I don’t know if it’s because I knew it was him, but man, you feel something."

Emotive significance is not the only new realm opened up by a listener’s established stylistic categories. This chapter explores several new domains in which stylistic familiarity reconfigures the listening experience. First, a listener’s stylistic categories enable communication with others; individual jazz listeners, with their ability to reference stylistic pillars via stylistic identification, together build a discursive community that can talk not only about the music’s contexts, but also about the specific stylistic features that populate its texts. Second, the development of stylistic categories enables listeners to make nuanced observations about musical features, including parsing stylistic influences and interpreting musical utterances at varying levels of signification. Finally, much of the chapter explores the interaction between these two spheres: how a shared, culturally conditioned understanding of a player’s style impacts the ways in which a listener might evaluate different layers of musical influences. This discussion delves into an extended case study untangling the meanings associated with a well-known John Coltrane lick.

Connors is indeed correct and the re-release of the album clarifies that Haynes is the drummer on the track in question. Herb Nolan, “Blindfold Test: Norman Connors,” Down Beat (January 30, 1975): 27. In a 1989 blindfold test, Tommy Flanagan notices an error in the personnel listed on the album’s liner notes for a different reason. After Flanagan recognizes the pianist as Sadik Hakim, the interviewer mentions that the album lists trumpeter Dizzy Gillespie as playing piano on the recording. Flanagan explains: "Never mind what the jacket says. The names were changed for contractual reasons. Diz had a union card and Sadik didn’t.” Fred Bouchard, “Blindfold Test: Tommy Flanagan,” Down Beat (March 1989): 41.

Panken, “Blindfold Test: Ron Blake.”
5.1 A SHARED CONCEPTION OF STYLE?

The previous chapters focus on individual jazz listeners’ roles in constructing stylistic categories, characterizing stylistic familiarization and recognition as largely subjective processes achieved by solitary listeners. Yet it is also apparent that these stylistic categories are not insurmountably personal; just because the process of stylistic recognition involves an interpretive and subjective dimension does not mean that we are forced to descend into a realm of absolute relativism. Jazz listeners can (and do) participate in a collective discourse about musical style. Listeners communicate with one another about musical observations emerging from their individual categorizations. Indeed, any potential explanatory power in the analyses that ground this dissertation relies on a reader’s ability to flexibly relate to my own subjectively generated stylistic categories.

In this section, I briefly recontextualize the questions of stylistic identification with respect to several communal dimensions of jazz listenership. If we return to one of the blindfold tests cited in Chapter 1 (appearing on page 51), we recall the divergent ways in which two experienced jazz listeners might recognize a familiar player, even when encountering the same unknown recording. In a blindfold test that I have already referenced several times, pianists Mulgrew Miller and Kenny Barron respond to different resemblance criteria in identifying an unfamiliar recording of fellow pianist Tommy Flanagan. Miller recognizes particular musical features specific to Flanagan:

I thought of Tommy right away, playing ‘How High the Moon.’ I recognized his touch and that unique kind of language, vocabulary in his playing. What always gives Tommy away for me is his left hand, which is a kind of legato left hand as opposed to a rhythmic left hand. Tommy plays these sustained chords with his left hand.3

Barron, by contrast, invokes other familiar players on the recording, and draws upon his own conception of a wider stylistic category specific to jazz pianists from Detroit:

3 Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Kenny Barron & Mulgrew Miller.”
The minute I heard this I could tell that this was someone who liked Bud Powell, and it sounded like someone from Detroit. I was thinking Barry Harris, but Mulgrew said no because it sounded like the rhythm section of Peter Washington and Lewis Nash. That being the case, I thought it must be Tommy Flanagan, my hero.4

Despite the differences in how they determined the player was Flanagan, the two listeners’ agreement about who is playing enables another dimension in their conversations about what they hear. By identifying Flanagan, they can not only engage with the general aesthetic considerations of this particular recording, but also aurally embed the performance in an intertextual array of remembered performances by the same player.

In this sense, the processes of stylistic recognition are at once subjective and intersubjective. Individually, listeners recognize a player based on subjectively generated musical categories. Collectively, however, parallel observations about a musician’s style may well emerge. Figure 5.1 schematically illustrates a diverse range of hypothetical listener responses to an unknown pianist, as illustrated in the Mulgrew Miller and Kenny Barron dual blindfold test. In this graphic, we see listeners with anomalous guesses (e.g., "I think it’s Wynton Kelly"), but a general agreement congregates at the diagram’s center, collectively suggesting that the pianist is Tommy Flanagan. Examining these responses reveals that although many of the listeners have generated their own, independent rationale for their guesses, some listeners’ reasons are interconnected. One listener cites reasons A and B, while another identifies reasons B and C, and a third recognizes C and D; this kind of enchainment reflects one way in which stylistic categories can be regarded as intersubjective.

Ingrid Monson refers to this kind of enchainment as the "shared but different musical association" omnipresent in discourses among jazz musicians and listeners.5 In conversation with drummer Ralph Peterson, Ingrid Monson notes a particular phrase reminiscent of a motive from Dizzy Gillespie’s "Salt Peanuts, and Peterson connects this comment to what he calls the "Art Blakey rhythm":

4 Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Kenny Barron & Mulgrew Miller.”
5 Monson, Saying Something: Jazz Improvisation and Interaction, 128.
"I think it's Wynton Kelly."

"I think it's Tommy Flanagan because of reasons R and S."

"I think it's Tommy Flanagan because of reasons A and B."

"I think it's Tommy Flanagan because of reasons B and C."

"I think it's Tommy Flanagan because of reasons P and Q."

"I think it's Tommy Flanagan because of reasons X and Y."

"I think it's Barry Harris."

"I don't know who it is."

"I think it's Hank Jones."

Figure 5.1: Schematic representing subjective and intersubjective dimensions of stylistic recognition
The phrase that reminded me of ‘Salt Peanuts’... was contained in Geri Allen’s response to Peterson’s Art Blakey rhythm. When I mentioned ‘Salt Peanuts,’ Peterson knew exactly which musical passage I had in mind, but he focused on a different set of details to explain his musical thinking. The shared but different musical association was not merely fortuitous since there is a musical relationship between the Gillespie riff and the Art Blakey rhythm: the rhythmic accentuation of ‘Salt Peanuts’... corresponds to the accentuation pattern... of the Art Blakey rhythm... My point is that intermusical relationships need not be exact or unambiguously shared in order for them to be communicative. The fact that we both had intermusical associations with this passage is what made it a topic of discussion.

Although they each make the intertextual (or to use Monson’s preferred term, intermusical) association in different ways, both Monson and Peterson recognize a particular familiar musical motive, and this recognition, in turn, opens a new communicative realm.

Despite its purpose as a metaphorical representation of potential listener responses, Figure 5.1 still attempts to embrace the messiness of listeners’ stylistic identifications. In the figure’s divergent array of possible guesses, nearly half of the responses reveal disagreement with the collective hypothesis at the figure’s center (Tommy Flanagan). This choice serves a rhetorical purpose. Although one might occasionally encounter a circumscribed group of listeners that agree relatively consistently about who is playing, and how they are recognizing a given player (or another musical category), this is not necessarily the case. Listeners like Mulgrew Miller and Kenny Barron draw upon different bases of knowledge and different musical cues, and, accordingly, cite different reasons for their eventual collective identification of Tommy Flanagan. Likewise, the blindfold tests are replete with disagreement and mutability in listeners’ guesses.

Similarly, Figure 5.1 never invokes the notion of an objectively correct response. Ideas of style are collectively constructed and constrained, and their accuracy is understood with respect to other listeners as much as it is evaluated against a technically correct answer. As a community,

---

6 Monson, *Saying Something: Jazz Improvisation and Interaction*, 128.
7 Figure 5.1, of course, does not show comments by actual listeners. As in many of the examples in this dissertation, the figure hypothesizes several potential listener responses in order to reflect upon the subjective and intersubjective dimensions of stylistic recognition.
jazz listeners establish culturally accepted misgueses, particularly when it comes to issues of musical influence. Listeners often confuse the style of trumpet player Jon Faddis, for example, with that of Dizzy Gillespie—particularly when encountering recordings from early in Faddis’s career. In numerous blindfold tests in *Down Beat*, listeners compare or equate Faddis’s playing with Gillespie’s style. Yusef Lateef mentions Faddis in the same breath as Gillespie, noting that an unknown soloist "could be the trumpet player who used to work with Diz who plays so much like him . . . Jon Faddis." Similarly, in two blindfold tests separated by nearly five years, Harry "Sweets" Edison recognizes Faddis’s playing through comparisons to Gillespie’s. In the earlier 1976 blindfold test, Edison notes the presence of "one of Dizzy’s followers—he calls Dizzy his father—Jon Faddis" and Edison goes on to clarify for interviewer Leonard Feather how he is able to distinguish between Faddis’s and Gillespie’s playing:

*Feather*: How can you be sure it wasn’t Dizzy himself?

*Edison*: Because he wasn’t as sure of his horn as Dizzy is. Diz has all the confidence in the world in himself, because he originated that style of playing, and there’s no substitute for originality [ . . . ] As I’ve always said, it’s better to be an originator than an imitator. Of course you’ve got to have an idol, but you can’t just concentrate on what your idol does; you should deviate and use your own mind and try to originate something that nobody can do but you. It’s quite a feat to accomplish—the style, the sound. You hear one note of Louis Armstrong and you have no doubt that it’s Pops. Dizzy’s the same way. He’s an originator and you can always tell Dizzy.

Edison—who, like other blindfold test respondents, couches his comments in tropes of authenticity and innovation strongly associated with predominant teleological narratives of jazz history—identifies Faddis while acknowledging the stylistic similarities between the elder Gillespie and the younger Faddis. Again, in a 1981 blindfold test, Edison reiterates his earlier

---

8 Faddis’s blindfold test comments also reveal Gillespie’s influence. In a characteristic remark from a 1974 blindfold test, Faddis immediately identifies Gillespie with an intimate familiarity with the album: “That was Dizzy, that was Dizzy, that was Dizzy. It’s from the album *Have Trumpet, Will Excite*. fourth cut, side one, after *Moonglow, My Man*, and *My Heart Belongs to Daddy*. That’s Dizzy, what more can I say? That man has more knowledge behind those puffed-out cheeks . . . he’s like a museum.” Nolan, “Blindfold Test: Jon Faddis.”


10 Feather, “Blindfold Test: Sweets Edison.”

11 For further discussion of trends in jazz historiography, see DeVeaux, “Constructing the Jazz Tradition: Jazz Historiography.”
assessment, remarking upon a different Faddis track that "It sounded like Dizzy, but I would guess—with those chops and the sound of Dizzy—that its got to be that little Dizzy [ . . . ] Jon Faddis, that’s his name." These comments reflect an interest in imitation and influence, and particularly spotlight the value placed on a jazz listener’s ability to trace the historical lineages of particular instruments and schools of playing.

It also, however, reflects a clear circumstance in which the "correct" answer to a question of stylistic identification becomes a matter of cultural and social correctness as much as it relates to whose name is written in the album’s liner notes. In identifying an unknown soloist who plays what Edison calls "Dizzy cliches," many listeners might recognize Gillespie even if it is, in fact, Jon Faddis (or vice versa). In circumstances like these, the gap between a socially acceptable answer (Gillespie) and a technically correct response (Faddis) narrows and disappears. When identifying an unknown player’s style, a listener embeds his guess in an expansive landscape of responses that collectively determine culturally acceptable and anomalous answers.

5.2 LAYERS OF SIGNIFICATION

The misdirected guesses in Figure 5.1—Wynton Kelly, Red Garland, Barry Harris, Hank Jones—also illustrate the polysemic nature of stylistic markers. When listening to improvisations, the same cues can trigger different potential meanings. Hearing a particular phrase might cause one listener to think of Tommy Flanagan while another recalls Hank Jones, and a distinctive melodic run might evoke both Dizzy Gillespie and Jon Faddis.

---

12 Feather, “Blindfold Test: Harry Sweets Edison.”

13 Ibid. These evaluations continue to crop up in discussions of Faddis’s and Gillespie’s style. In a 2009 blindfold test, Hugh Masekela notes: "That felt to me like Dizzy Gillespie, though it could have been Jon Faddis.” Panken, “Blindfold Test: Hugh Masekela.”
As evidenced by the Gillespie/Faddis discussion above, musical influence, in particular, complicates straightforward stylistic identifications.\textsuperscript{14} When their stylistic categories begin to blend with one another, listeners attempt to find rationale to explain the perceived musical mixture or disparity. Most frequently, these explanations turn toward questions of stylistic influence. The blindfold tests in \textit{Down Beat} echo with responses such as "If the horn player isn’t Dave Douglas, he’s definitely influenced by Dave"\textsuperscript{15} or "If it isn’t Miles, it’s a disciple of Miles."\textsuperscript{16} In these and countless other responses, the distinction between influencer and influencee erodes. The stylistic categories that a listener has developed are too imprecise to definitively say who is playing; in response, the listener might transform or abandon the pre-existing stylistic category (as outlined in Chapter 4)—or, alternatively, he or she might append an additional layer of signification on top of the stylistic observation.

In this section, I unpack several musical passages that circle around stylistic categories I have previously associated with John Coltrane. When encountering "a Coltrane lick" in an improviser’s solo, it is tempting to simply state unequivocally that the player is referencing Coltrane. Alternatively, one might suggest that the performer has absorbed the Coltrane lick into his or her vocabulary, reflecting Coltrane’s influence (or the influence of someone else who has been influenced by Coltrane). Certain aspects of Coltrane’s musical style, in particular, have been codified and taught to learning jazz musicians and are widely recognized among jazz listeners. But this section also attempts to acknowledge the individualized listening histories that undergird such an observation, highlighting the fact that influence is perceived and not ab-

\textsuperscript{14} Discussions of influence are widespread among jazz scholars, musicians, and listeners. Drawing on Henry Louis Gates’s theory of Signifyin(g) in African-American art forms, John P. Murphy has suggested that, when it comes to jazz, a "joy of influence" should supplant Harold Bloom’s concept of the "anxiety of influence." John P. Murphy, "Jazz Improvisation: The Joy of Influence," \textit{The Black Perspective in Music} 18, nos. 1/2 (1990): 7–19. Jad Rasula has argued that the prominence of recordings in jazz presents challenges to jazz historians, and that the prospect of historically traceable influence, in particular, is rendered impossible in a culture where "recordings circulate nonsequentially, privately, and defy reliable documentation of their consumption." Rasula, "The Media of Memory: The Seductive Menace of Records in Jazz History," 143. Although influence cannot be reliably tracked, it continues to be perceived (or, perhaps, constructed) by jazz musicians and listeners.

\textsuperscript{15} Panken, "Blindfold Test: Eric Revis."

\textsuperscript{16} Feather, "Blindfold Test: Sweets Edison."
solute. Even in the case of a widely acknowledged and familiar Coltrane lick, stylistic allusion or influence begins as a relationship between a listener’s own stylistic categories. Here, I also explore the correlations between three interconnected arenas:

- A listener’s assuredness in his or her stylistic identification
- The perceived strength of a stylistic influence that a listener discerns
- The structural features of a listener’s stylistic categories

These entangled relationships between category structure and listener perceptions appear summarized in Table 5.1. When encountering material from a stable stylistic category, or repeatedly hearing cues grouped at the center of a category, a listener may: i) be more confident in the guess (“the pianist is definitely Bud Powell influenced”17); ii) interpret a perceived stylistic influence as less unconscious and more intentional (“Here you can hear [...] the obvious Jimi [Hendrix] reference”18); and iii) assume that his or her observations would be shared among a community of jazz listeners (“Everybody knows it’s Johnny Hodges”19). Depending on these factors, different listeners’ stylistic identifications drift along these continuums, at times reflecting a shared, apparent "truth" and at other times grasping towards a murky inkling of possibility.

---

17 Feather, “Blindfold Test: John Harmon.”
19 Feather, “Blindfold Test: Wild Bill Davis.”
5.2 LAYERS OF SIGNIFICATION

5.2.1 Gradations in musical influence

Upon recognizing a particular Coltrane or Coltrane-esque feature in the musical texture, blindfold test participants often discuss the perceived influence in precise, nuanced terms. To listeners, a potential influence is not binary—either Coltrane or not Coltrane; rather, influences lie along a gradient, reaching from tenuous quasi-influence ("it sounds like he might be playing something Coltrane-ish") to a confident stylistic allusion ("Oh, he’s playing a Coltrane lick"). This continuum is unsurprising, given the inextricable relationship between stylistic identification and stylistic influence identification. As expressed in Chapter 3, the majority of listener-formed stylistic categories have gradients for entry into the category as well as degrees of centrality within members of the category. Recognizing and parsing stylistic influences, therefore, requires the same level of care for listeners.

Although the distinctions are sometimes subtle, the language that listeners choose belies the degree of Coltrane that they hear. If a listener hears a cue previously positioned centrally in the listener’s conception of Coltrane’s style (i.e., a stylistic prototype), or if a listener repeatedly encounters various cues associated with the saxophonist, he or she would likely express certainty at the evaluation, "This sounds like Coltrane." A listener’s language leaves traces of how assured (or, conversely, how uncertain) he or she feels in a guess. Comparing three very similar utterances reveals a delicate continuum in the listeners’ stylistic identifications:

- Charli Persip: "It really sounded like John to me."
- Victor Feldman: "The tenor sax sounded a little like Coltrane."
- Zoot Sims: "The tenor player sounded like Coltrane there at times."

At first glance, all of these comments seem to make the same observation: the unknown player sounds like John Coltrane. Strengthened by the inclusion of the word "really," however, Persip

20 Primack, “Blindfold Test: Charli Persip.”
intensifies his hypothesis, while Feldman and Sims’s respective observations remain hesitant ("sounded a little like"; "sounded like...at times"). Sims’s remark also seems to imply an intermittent Coltrane-like sound, perhaps dependent upon the occasional reemergence of familiar stylistic categories he has previously associated with Coltrane.

Other blindfold tests comments reveal further gradations that distinguish degrees of Coltrane’s influence in unfamiliar recordings. Saxophonist Lenny Pickett, for example, remarks:

Something about [Oliver] Nelson in that recording—the way he does some little runs and approaches high notes—sounds to me very Trane-esque. I mean, I wouldn’t have guessed it was Trane, but I would have guessed that it was somebody influenced by him, as so many players were at that time.\(^{23}\)

Pickett recognizes stylistic features he has previously associated with Coltrane (the "little runs" and how the player "approaches high notes"), while at the same time distancing his hypothesis from Coltrane himself. Oliver Nelson’s playing, to Pickett’s ears, seems to resonate with stylistic features he has previously associated with Coltrane, and yet the soloist remains clearly distinguishable from him. Pickett’s ability to separate Coltrane from Coltrane-esque relies on the kinds of fluid categorization outlined in Chapters 3 and 4. By developing a network of loose, flexible categories, a listener can evaluate not merely which musicians are playing but also interpret how they are playing with respect to other familiar musicians’ styles.

It may seem as if I am nitpicking at minor components of comments that the interviewees made offhandedly. Yet these kinds of graded evaluations of style appear throughout the blindfold tests, and listeners often spend long stretches of their interviews meticulously establishing the degree of influence they hear in an unfamiliar player. Aurally analyzing the playing of a fellow drummer, Tony Williams takes great pains to clarify the exact nature of an apparent stylistic influence he hears: "The drummer sounded like he listened to Elvin [Jones] a lot. I don’t know if it’s Elvin or not, but I’d say it’s not. It sounded like Elvin, but certain things he did sounded like somebody who had listened to Elvin."\(^{24}\) Rather than simply say that the player


\(^{24}\) Tolleson, “Blindfold Test: Tony Williams.”
"sounds like Elvin" or "sounds influenced by Elvin," Williams reiterates his point several times, circling around the issue in order to make precise the degree of "Elvin-ness" that he hears. Williams’s remarks also stress the interconnectedness of listening and performance: what a musician hears—and the stylistic categories formed during listening—can re-emerge in the performer’s own playing. Musicians listen to their predecessors and peers extensively, and the stylistic categories that they build infect their playing, either consciously or unconsciously.25

This idea of conscious or unconscious stylistic absorption appears frequently throughout blindfold tests’ metaphorical interpretations of influence. Some commenters seem to view stylistic influences as substances existing within a player; utterances like "a little [Sonny] Rollins and a little Coltrane in him"26 suggest that the player exists as a container filled with various influences. These interpretations often relate to narratives of self-expression in which improvisations involve expressing some element of the soloist’s inner being.27

Alternatively, some listeners envision stylistic influence as something enacted by the performer, as in a comment like "He did some Lester Young things there"28 or "He’s got that Trane thing happening."29 In these examples, stylistic influence involves a musical choice; a player momentarily invokes a particular stylistic influence and then may move on to something else. In a characteristic example, a listener notices a stream of stylistic influences:

Throughout the solos and whole performance you heard all kinds of suggestions and phrases of things Duke [Ellington] played, a little bow to Dizzy [Gillespie],

---

25 See section 1.1.4 for further discussion.
27 On the other hand, some comments view stylistic influence pejoratively, often decrying a player’s slavish epigonism. Unlike the comments emphasizing stylistic influences as an authentic process of absorption and expression of one’s self, which emphasize stylistic influence as an inner trait, these negatively oriented interpretations might focus on external details of a player’s performance. In a 1997 blindfold test, for instance, guitarist John Abercrombie notes that “It could be George Benson. Those licks sound like George. If that’s not George Benson, it’s one of his clones. I heard a guy playing live on television who sounded exactly like George Benson; he even played a George Benson guitar.” Birnbaum, “Blindfold Test: John Abercrombie.” These kinds of comments sometimes reveal this disparity: stylistic categories that are viewed as internal creations of a musician-listener are deemed authentic, while external features that evoke a predecessor might be viewed as inauthentic.
just dropping those things in, those nuances, and very much the voice of Tommy Flanagan coming through loud and clear.\(^{30}\)

Unlike the narrative of expressing one’s unconscious influences, the idea of a musician casually "just dropping those things in" squarely places the agency in the hands of the performer (Tommy Flanagan). In this conception, style functions as a tool, and a vocalist like Shirley Horn can be "Milesian in her approach," evoking Miles Davis through her actions rather than her being.\(^{31}\) Similarly, James Carter’s comments (previously quoted in Chapter 1, page 57) interpret style as something a player chooses to do: "Sounds like Newk [Sonny Rollins]. And then it doesn’t. […] This is not Newk, but there’s some Newkisms in there. He’s Newking; he’s got the microwave oven on, whoever it is.\(^{32}\) Carter seems to envision stylistic influence as a verb; his descriptions—particularly the evocative neologism "Newking"—conceptualizes a musician’s engagement with stylistic predecessors as something the player does.

In all of these examples, the varied discussions of musical influence reveal the nuanced ways in which listeners deploy stylistic categories—even beyond strict stylistic identification. Listeners take care in distinguishing not only which influences are audible, but they also speculate on the extent and nature of these influences. In these subtle judgments, listeners delicately examine what they hear with respect to their pre-existent stylistic categories, evaluating idiosyncrasies and unexpected musical mixtures in order to surmise a network of influences.

5.2.2 Perceived influence?: the "Coltrane-esque"

Consider the melodic fragment that closes one of the phrases in Jackie McLean’s solo on "Blues for Jackie" (Figure 5.2); this example comes from one of the same tracks previously treated in

---


\(^{32}\) Birnbaum, "Blindfold Test: James Carter."
Chapter 4.33 To my ears, the 1–2–3–5–8–1 pattern McLean deploys at end of the phrase strongly points to Coltrane’s style, particularly, the track "Countdown" from the saxophonist’s 1960 album Giant Steps.34 Figure 5.2 shows McLean’s phrase, while Figure 5.3 illustrates several versions of the motive appearing in Coltrane’s solo on "Countdown." Not only does McLean’s melody mimic the intervallic and rhythmic structure of the repeated iterations of the 1–2–3–5–8–1 motive in "Countdown," it—like the varied incarnations in Coltrane’s solo—appears at the

---


34 I believe many other jazz listeners might agree with this assessment. For the purposes of the present argument, however, I will discuss the phrase’s signification solely from my own perspective. See further discussion in section 5.3. John Coltrane, Giant Steps, recorded 1959, Atlantic 1311. I have included only the relevant passages transcribed from "Countdown," because full transcriptions are widely available. For transcriptions of several Coltrane solos on recordings from this period, including "Giant Steps" and "Countdown," see Masaya Yamaguchi, John Coltrane Plays "Coltrane Changes" (Milwaukee, WI: Hal Leonard, 2003). Another similar resource is John Coltrane Omnibook (Milwaukee, WI: Hal Leonard, 2013).
end of a long, continuous string of eighth notes at a moment of harmonic resolution with the return to the F tonic in the tenth bar of the twelve-bar blues form.\textsuperscript{35}

With this concatenation of various stylistic features associated with Coltrane, two basic questions arise. First, why do I hear this $\hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{5}-\hat{8}-\hat{1}$ pattern as evoking Coltrane? Second, why do I hear this pattern as evoking Coltrane rather than signalling that Coltrane is the performer who is playing? In answer to the first question, my interpretation of this pattern as signifying Coltrane (either as an conscious stylistic allusion or as an unconscious influence) relies on my previous formation of a stylistic category built around iterations of the $\hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{5}-\hat{8}-\hat{1}$ pattern. As I mentioned, I strongly associate this ascending melodic line followed by a downward octave leap not just with Coltrane in a general sense, but with the track "Countdown," in particular. The phrase (and its variants) appear six times in Coltrane’s solo, which, as a teenager, I laboriously transcribed and played through on my own instrument. Figure 5.3 shows these six incarnations of the motive in "Countdown"; although some variation exists between its different appearances, the motive frequently appears in a moment of tonal resolution (most often, in the eighth bar of the form upon the resolution to the local C tonic), and it always concludes a phrase.\textsuperscript{36} In my mind, the first appearance of the motive in "Countdown" (A\textsubscript{8} on Figure 5.2) has been reinforced as the prototypical version, both through its repetition (D\textsubscript{8}) and transposition (D\textsubscript{4}) throughout the solo, but also owing to the fact that for years I frequently played the first chorus of "Countdown" as a warm-up exercise before practicing or performing. This process reinforced the A\textsubscript{8} version of the motive as the prototypical version of the lick within "Countdown," and it also positioned the $\hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{5}-\hat{8}-\hat{1}$ motive at a central position within my conceptualization of Coltrane’s style.

\textsuperscript{35} Although it may at first appear that the last measure of the excerpt does not reflect a harmonic resolution, the F\textsubscript{7} and Dm\textsubscript{7} marked above the score are a part of a larger I\textsubscript{7}-vi\textsubscript{7}-ii\textsubscript{7}-V\textsubscript{7} turnaround at the end of the twelve-bar blues form.

\textsuperscript{36} The only exception to the phrase’s placement at harmonic resolutions is its appearance in the seventh bar of the eighth chorus (labeled H\textsubscript{7} on 5.2). This variant sounds a bar earlier than one might expect, based on the previous appearances in the solo.
Responding to the second question presented above, the passage’s surrounding context helps signal that the player is not Coltrane. This occurs both through what the performer plays—for example, the appearance of a lick that I have previously associated strongly with Jackie McLean—and through what the performer does not play. In other words, the observation, "Jackie McLean is playing a Coltrane lick" relies on several interconnected stylistic interpretations occurring simultaneously or in quick succession: i) the signification of a stylistic category strongly associated with Coltrane (e.g., the $\hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{5}-\hat{8}-\hat{1}$ pattern); ii) the lack of other notable stylistic cues that signal Coltrane; iii) the signification of stylistic categories strongly associated with other players (e.g., Jackie McLean).\(^{37}\)

In the Jackie McLean passage, the $\hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{5}-\hat{8}-\hat{1}$ motive points toward Coltrane, but its signification is overwhelmed by alternative cues. Figure 5.4 shows an extended excerpt of the passage from "Blues for Jackie." After beginning the chorus with material that one might interpret as Coltrane-esque (the rising four-note $\hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{1}$ motive sequenced upward), the non-diatonic end of the opening phrase—with its extension of the dissonant $G\flat$—seems to strongly signal McLean’s angular, harmonically outside style.\(^{38}\) The second phrase of the chorus recalls a

\(^{37}\) See section 2.2.1 for further discussion of negatively defined stylistic cues.

\(^{38}\) Coltrane’s style is sometimes discussed using the idea of "digital patterns": short, scalar fragments such as $\hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{1}$. See the upcoming discussion in section 5.3.1.
Jackie McLean—suggesitive stylistic category already established in the preceding chapter: the repeated turn motive from section 4.4. Primarily, however, McLean’s distinctive harsh timbre on the alto saxophone dispels any notion that Coltrane might be playing.\footnote{Numerous other clues hint that Coltrane is not the performer. Although one could potentially confuse the instrumentation with a tenor saxophone, the melody’s range and timbre suggests that the instrument is the alto saxophone, which Coltrane played relatively rarely on recordings—particularly in the late-1950s/early-1960s era that corresponds to these other stylistic features. Additional contextual cues include the compositional style of “Blues for Jackie,” a hard bop tune in a style that Coltrane recorded somewhat infrequently, and, most importantly, the four improvised choruses full of Jackie McLeanisms that precede this excerpt.}

In this example, I am not suggesting that McLean or the other performers on the track are consciously aware of a reference to Coltrane (or that they are unaware of it, for that matter). Rather, this example shows how this kind of interpretive meaning—that Jackie McLean sounds Coltrane-esque here—relies on a listener’s body of established stylistic categories. These categories may be consciously recognized and manipulated by a musician, or shared among a expansive community of listeners, but that need not necessarily be the case. Even in the experience of a single listener, certain musical passages can attain new significance through the establishment of stylistic groupings.

5.2.3 Stylistic reference: “a Coltrane lick”

Other cases involve stylistic categories that are shared more widely among jazz listeners. In the first part of the McLean 1-2-3-5 pattern, for instance, the 1-2-3-5 component is widely associated with Coltrane’s playing.\footnote{Although throughout this section I refer to the pattern as 1-2-3-5, the differing harmonic contexts mean that the melodic pattern does not necessarily outline 1-2-3-5 with respect to the underlying chord or tonic. Instead, it may sometimes outline different scalar fragments (for example, scale degrees 5-6-7-2) or superimpose an alternative chord over the harmony. The B-C♯-D♯-F♯ played over an altered C dominant seventh in Figure 5.5, for example, projects a B major/dominant 1-2-3-5 pattern over a C chord, producing a range of harmonic alternations (♭7-♭5-9-7/11-♭5) that fit within an altered dominant sound.} Pedagogical texts reference this pattern, and it frequently appears in scholarly references to a Coltrane or Coltrane-like style; these treatments often
associate the pattern with "Coltrane changes," the array of harmonic progressions using equal division of the octave into thirds.\footnote{For mentions of the 1-2-3-5 pattern in Coltrane’s solos, see, for example, Kernfeld, “Two Coltranes.” Likewise, in Bebop: The Music and Its Players, Thomas Owens mentions both 1-2-3-5 and 1-2-3-5-8-1 patterns in Coltrane’s playing and—as with many of his analyses—finds an affinity with the style of Charlie Parker. Thomas Owens, Bebop: The Music and Its Players (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 93. For an examination of this figure in other scholarly and pedagogical texts, see the upcoming discussion in section 5.3.1. For more on Coltrane changes, see David Demsey, “Chromatic Third Relations in the Music of John Coltrane,” Annual Review of Jazz Studies 5 (1991): 145–180; Matthew Santa, “Nonatonic Progressions in the Music of John Coltrane,” Annual Review of Jazz Studies 13 (2003): 13–26. In addition to the well-known antecedent to Coltrane changes in the bridge of the jazz standard "Have You Met Miss Jones," Daniel Henderson has recently found a suggestive chronological (if indirect) precedent to Coltrane changes. Examining the output of composer Billy May, who wrote music for a wide range of children’s records in the 1940s and 50s, Henderson suggests that the harmony and melody of Coltrane’s “Giant Steps” were aurally prefigured by May. Daniel Henderson, “Jazz Harmony for Kids: The Capitol Records Children’s Albums of Billy May, 1946-54,” Jazz Perspectives 8, no. 2 (2014): 117–152.}

To my ears, however, a single occurrence of this passage in isolation would not necessarily signify Coltrane. The 1-2-3-5 motive, thoroughly ingrained into jazz styles both preceding and following Coltrane’s active years as a performer, remains on its own a unremarkable part of musical landscape; for me, it is only through its repetition or its appearance alongside other markers of the saxophonist’s style that the pattern begins to signify Coltrane. This evaluation, emerging from a similar discussion in Chapter 2 (see section 2.2.1), points to the importance of understanding stylistic markers within a wider framework, and recalls Benjamin Givan’s recent argument for the necessity of evaluating stylistic context when analyzing jazz improvisations. Examining Sonny Rollins’ iconic solo on "Blue 7," Givan dismantles the notion—widely held among jazz musicians, pedagogues, and listeners—that Rollins’ recorded melody stands as an exemplar of a composed, intricately constructed melody and solo. Rather, Givan argues, "Blue 7" stands as one of the saxophonist’s "most casually executed" recordings, replete with missed cues between the band members and varied iterations of Rollins’ standard melodic formulae.\footnote{Givan, “Gunther Schuller and the Challenge of Sonny Rollins: Stylistic Context, Intentionality, and Jazz Analysis,” 226.} Showing how the motivic cell that recurs in the solo appears throughout other recordings of the time, Givan highlights the need for intertextual, contextually sensitive analytical approaches to jazz improvisation. Although he situates this discussion with
respective to a poietically oriented conception of stylistic context, Givan's attention to stylistic context emphasizes a wider scope when approaching questions of musical style. Integrating Givan's approach with Michael Klein's method for analyzing musical resonances through an ever-widening intertextual array (see section 4.3), I will examine a range of different examples over the rest of the chapter, continually reorienting the stylistic category to reflect the shifting musical connotations that are drawn out.\textsuperscript{43}

If the $1\-2\-3\-5$ pattern on its own fails to signify Coltrane, what surroundings then enable this meaning to take hold? Sequential repetitions of the motive strongly suggest to me that the Coltrane reference is intentional, or at least that my interpretation, "This sounds like Coltrane," would be widely shared by many jazz listeners.\textsuperscript{44} Figure 5.5 shows several such sequenced repetitions of the $1\-2\-3\-5$ pattern. Both of these come from recorded solos in the 1960s, one by saxophonist Hank Mobley and the other by trumpet player Freddie Hubbard.\textsuperscript{45} Upon hearing each of these passages, my immediate response was that the musician was playing "a Coltrane lick." And although I would suggest that my Coltrane-oriented interpretations would be rela-

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure5_5.png}
\caption{Sequenced $1\-2\-3\-5$ patterns in: Hank Mobley, "Child's Play"; Freddie Hubbard, "Clarence's Place"}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{43} Klein, \textit{Intertextuality in Western Art Music}.
\textsuperscript{44} These are not the only circumstances in which the $1\-2\-3\-5$ pattern connotes Coltrane. Other patterns, such as the previously mentioned $1\-2\-3\-5\-8\-1$ pattern, or the ascending $1\-2\-3\-5$ pattern followed by a four-note stepwise descent ($1\-7\-6\-5$), up a minor third (e.g., C-D-E-G-E\textsuperscript{♭}-D\textsuperscript{♭}-C-B\textsuperscript{♭}). For the purposes of this section, however, I am focusing on the sequenced $1\-2\-3\-5$ pattern.
\textsuperscript{45} Donald Byrd, "Child's Play," recorded 1960, on \textit{Byrd in Flight}, Blue Note 4048; Freddie Hubbard, "Clarence's Place," recorded 1963, on \textit{The Body & the Soul}, Impulse! A-38.
tively widespread among jazz listeners, the exact nature of how these fragments convey John Coltrane is more complex than it would first appear.

In the first example, from a solo by Hank Mobley on the track "Child’s Play," the 1-2-3-5 pattern sequences upward in perfect fourths, outlining a circle of fifths progression in a momentary harmonic excursion away from the F major tonic. The tune’s harmonic context accentuates Coltrane-like qualities of the melody. Vacillating between a standard progression (I-vi-ii-V) and the same passage embedded with a series of tritone substitutions (I-♭III-♭VI-♭II), the A sections of the solo continually drift toward an approximation—albeit brief—of Coltrane changes. The tritone substitution in the passage transforms the standard Fmaj7-Dm7-Gm7-C7-Fmaj7 progression (heard repeated throughout the composition’s A sections) into the chromatically inflected progression Fmaj7-A♭7-♭Dmaj7-♭G♭7-Fmaj7, leaping between distant key areas in a manner analogous to Coltrane’s third-related substitutions. Table 3.1 illustrates this connection: the transition between the first three chords in the Mobley excerpt, Fmaj7 to A♭7 to ♭Dmaj7 evokes the distinctive harmonic gesture that opens "Giant Steps" (Bmaj7-D♭7-Gmaj7). Although the longer harmonic cycle of "Giant Steps" is cut off in "Child’s Play" for a quick return to the tonic, the harmonic and melodic resemblance to such an iconic record suggest that the passage would be widely accepted as a stylistic allusion to Coltrane.

Yet, it is important to note that despite the shared cultural associations that the passage might have, the allusion is a perceived one, and the recognizably Coltranean influence cannot be assumed to be grounded in historical fact. Coltrane’s Giant Steps was released in January 1960, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Child’s Play,” mm. 1-3</th>
<th>Fmaj7</th>
<th>Dm7</th>
<th>Gm7</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>Fmaj7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Child’s Play,” mm. 3-5 (with tritone substitutions)</td>
<td>Fmaj7</td>
<td>A♭7</td>
<td>♭Dmaj7</td>
<td>G♭7</td>
<td>Fmaj7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Giant Steps,” mm. 1-3 (transposed)</td>
<td>Fmaj7</td>
<td>A♭7</td>
<td>♭Dmaj7</td>
<td>E♭7</td>
<td>Amaj7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Harmonic progressions in "Child’s Play" as compared to "Giant Steps"
Mobley’s solo on "Child’s Play" (from the Donald Byrd album *Byrd in Flight*), dates to a January 8, 1960 recording. While it is possible that Mobley had heard Coltrane’s sequence of $1^\text{-}2^\text{-}3^\text{-}5$ patterns on "Giant Steps" (either on a recently heard recording or in a live performance) and assimilated this particular component of Coltrane’s style, it remains relatively unlikely that Mobley intended the passage to self-consciously evoke "Giant Steps."

The point of this speculation, however, is not to confirm or deny Coltrane’s influence on Mobley, but rather to acknowledge musical influence as a perceived phenomenon. The meaning, in this case, emerges out of the domain of culture: a stylistic category that has been discursively shared among jazz listeners and musicians. I will return to this idea shortly.

In the excerpt from Freddie Hubbard’s solo on "Clarence’s Place" (Figure 5.5), the $1^\text{-}2^\text{-}3^\text{-}5$ pattern again repeats at three different pitch heights. Although the rhythm section plays a simple minor blues turnaround ($D^\flat 7-C^7\text{alt-}Fm^7$), Hubbard outlines a $1^\text{-}2^\text{-}3^\text{-}5$ pattern beginning on $D^\flat$, then leaps upward to start the motive on $G^\flat$ and then B. Hubbard’s sequence projects a momentary arc along the circle of fifths, while simultaneously producing an altered dominant sound as the $B-C^\#-D^\#-F^\#$ line highlights alterations to the fifth and ninth of the underlying $C^7$ harmony. As in the Mobley example, this continual reiteration of the $1^\text{-}2^\text{-}3^\text{-}5$ phrase (raised by five semitones each time) again resonates to me as a blatant reference to Coltrane’s style on the album *Giant Steps*.

Is this interpretation something I am imposing on Mobley’s and Hubbard’s playing? Although it is possible others might disagree, I am by no means alone in this semantic assessment. Among other commentators, the consecutive repetition of $1^\text{-}2^\text{-}3^\text{-}5$ motives—often sequenced upwards by perfect fourths—are imbued with this same significance. In a recent dissertation treating the improvisational style of guitarist Joe Pass, David Mooney labels several passages with the referential moniker "Giant Steps" and refers to the $1^\text{-}2^\text{-}3^\text{-}5$ pattern as the "Coltrane

---

Lewis Porter notes that Coltrane had been working on chord progressions akin to those in "Giant Steps" “well before the recording dates,” so it is possible that Mobley had already gained harmonic familiarity with these changes.
Figure 5.6: Sequenced repetitions of 1-2-3-5 pattern in Joe Pass, "Django" [0:51], from Mooney, 2015 (heard 8vb)

Figure 5.7: Sequenced repetitions of 1-2-3-5 pattern in Joe Pass, "Walking Up" [0:53], from Mooney, 2015 (heard 8vb)

cell" (Figures 5.6 and 5.7). In each of these excerpts, Pass repeats 1-2-3-5 three times in a row, reaching upward by perfect fourth each time. Mooney’s labeled excerpts (one from the opening measures of Pass’s solo on "Django," and the other from midway through his first chorus on "Walking Up") closely resemble the Hubbard and Mobley examples appearing in Figure 5.5. As in the Mobley example, the 1-2-3-5 pattern repeats at three different pitch levels, each time rising by perfect fourth. For Mooney, the lick Joe Pass plays strongly suggests Coltrane, and specifically the style associated with "Giant Steps." Mooney writes: "I associate this cell with John Coltrane, as he uses it often in his "Giant Steps" solo to address the rapidly shifting chord progression." Later, he speculates that "Pass must have been familiar with this solo, famous


Mooney, “Joe Pass’s "Catch Me!”, "Joy Spring," and "For Django": Transcription and Analysis,” 244.
5.3 A PANOPTIC VIEW OF THE "GIANT STEPS" LICK

Figure 5.8: The "Giant Steps" lick; a generalized version of sequenced \( \hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{5} \) pattern, derived from previous examples by Hank Mobley, Freddie Hubbard, and Joe Pass as it was by 1964, and it is possible that he was referencing Coltrane.\(^{49}\) Mooney’s independent understanding of this passage with same stylistic meaning as my own points toward a shared significance for this "Giant Steps" motive.

These Coltranisms, excerpted from the solos of Hank Mobley, Freddie Hubbard, and Joe Pass, exhibit highly similar structures to one another: each incarnation transposes \( \hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{5} \) patterns upward by perfect fourths two times (Figure 5.8; referred to henceforth as the "Giant Steps" lick because of the association made by Mooney and myself). This kind of strict parallelism, rarely seen in this dissertation, might give us pause. Why are these examples so similar to one another, rather than varied licks and fluid categories seen throughout the previous chapters of the dissertation (for example: the licks by Hank Mobley (section 3.1.1), Larry Young (4.3), or Jackie McLean (4.4))? First, the obvious answer: I have carefully selected examples that outline the same thrice-repeated \( \hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{5} \) pattern, and we will shortly expand the field of contenders to examine a wider and more diverse range of musical examples. But I believe my selection biases cannot fully explain the prominence of this particular incarnation of the basic \( \hat{1}-\hat{2}-\hat{3}-\hat{5} \) cell.

5.3 A PANOPTIC VIEW OF THE "GIANT STEPS" LICK

While in part this agreement comes from my selection of examples, I would suggest that these repetitions of this particular version of the lick are far from coincidental. This version occupies

\(^{49}\) Mooney, “Joe Pass’s "Catch Me!", "Joy Spring," and "For Django": Transcription and Analysis,” 412.
a central, prototypical position in the stylistic category for several reasons that relate to the culture surrounding jazz listening and performance.

Before continuing, we may ask the question: does the prevalence of this version of the 1-2-3-5 pattern due to the fact that Coltrane frequently plays this particular incarnation? Having initially associated the passage not only with Coltrane, but specifically with "Giant Steps,” we might expect to find the saxophonist frequently playing this version on the iconic recording. Coltrane indeed plays the 1-2-3-5 cell many times on his thirteen choruses on "Giant Steps,” but he never plays the sequenced version present in the solos of Mobley, Hubbard, and Pass. Figure 5.9 shows a number of similar passages from "Giant Steps."50 Markedly appearing at the beginnings of choruses (I1, K1, L1, R1), the pattern recurs several times sequenced upward by minor third. Only once in the solo is the pattern repeated at a perfect fourth (H3), and only once does a similar contour emerge (D5): three upward sequences of four-note cells, with 1-2-3-5 flanked on each side by arpeggiated and scalar figures.

A close examination of Coltrane’s solo on "Countdown" (Figure 5.10), from the same album, also reveals several similar passages, but nothing that exactly aligns with the four matching

---

50 As elsewhere, I have notated the measure numbers as a letter and a number: the letter refers to the chorus in which the soloist is playing ("A" = first chorus, "B" = second chorus, etc.), and the number refers to the measure number within that chorus. With this metric, "D5" on Figure 5.9 refers to the fifth measure of the fourth chorus. Coltrane’s opening solo on "Giant Steps" extends for thirteen choruses (A-M), then he improvises for two further choruses after the piano solo (R-S). As before, I have included only the relevant passages transcribed from this track and "Countdown,” because of the widespread availability of these transcriptions. See footnote 34 in this chapter.
Figure 5.10: Similar sequenced repetitions of the 1-2-3-5 cell in Coltrane’s "Countdown"
versions by Mobley, Hubbard, and Pass. Even in a highly formulaic solo like "Countdown," this particular version of the "Giant Steps" lick remains absent; we encounter many variants that repeat the cell up a perfect fourth one time (most frequently in the sixth bar of the form), and, beginning in C15, Coltrane gradually moves four-note ascending cells upward in a contour similar to the version found in Figure 5.8. Extending the repertoire base further to other Coltrane recordings from the late 1950s, it is still relatively rare to encounter the consecutive repetition of two ascending 1-2-3-5 patterns in a row, let alone three. Figure 5.11 shows two further examples from Coltrane’s playing: the excerpt from "Some Other Blues" shows the cell played three times in a row (twice on C and then once on Eb) while the example from "Russian Lullaby" illustrates the pattern again sequenced by perfect fourth—but only one time.

While the individual components of the Mobley/Hubbard/Pass version of the lick can be found in Coltrane’s playing on "Giant Steps," the accumulation of these particular features does not resemble Coltrane’s actual playing as much as it does a culturally constructed image of his style. When a listener recognizes a "Coltrane lick" in the material that Mobley, Hubbard, and

51 Several variants appearing at the ends of choruses (B15, F15) also repeat the pattern raised up by a minor third.
53 This version of the lick may appear in other recordings by Coltrane, as an exhaustive analysis of Coltrane’s extensive recorded catalog is beyond the scope of this project. The point, however, remains: the particular version of the lick shown in Figure 5.8 owes its popularity to something other than the iconic recording of "Giant Steps."
Pass play, he or she is recognizing a caricature of Coltrane’s playing. The sequenced four-note cells offer an exaggerated simulacrum that heightens and expands one particular feature of Coltrane’s playing: the 1-2-3-5 pattern.

5.3.1 The "Giant Steps" lick in jazz pedagogy

So how did this particular caricature of Coltrane’s style develop? This phrase, which seems to connote Coltrane’s style (and specifically "Giant Steps") to jazz listeners like Mooney and myself, emerges out of a culture of jazz pedagogy that impacts not only the ways in which musicians improvise, but also how listeners construct concepts of musical meaning.

First and foremost, as jazz has entered the academy, "Giant Steps" has become canonized as a central pillar of jazz pedagogy. Exploring the composition’s prevalence in jazz training, David Ake notes several reasons for the tune’s primacy in jazz education, but primarily highlights the challenge it presents to beginning improvisers. The symmetrical harmonic structures and uneven root movement force students to play "vertically"—i.e., with respect to each underlying harmony, as opposed to a more horizontal approach that orients an improviser toward melodic construction. Because of this, Ake says, "one can’t fake one’s way through this piece," and student performances of "Giant Steps" therefore provide instructors with "a clear sense of each of each student’s ability" to musically converse in the dominant jazz pedagogical paradigm of chord-scale relationships. Ake suggests that the pedagogical focus toward this composition also relates to a mythology surrounding Coltrane’s work ethic when it came to practicing, and indeed discussions of "Giant Steps" and practicing often intertwine. In the introduction to the

---


55 Ibid., 131. Chord-scale theory teaches students scales that correspond—in Ake’s words, "offer the fewest ‘wrong notes’" (122)—with underlying harmonic structures. Ake, like others, problematizes the supremacy of these training methods in jazz, which prioritize pitch at the expense of other musical features like rhythm and ensemble interaction.
Jamey Aebersold Play-A-Long volume *John Coltrane* (a "music-minus-one" book/recording set in an expansive series), David Liebman writes that the speed at which Coltrane improvised over the tune "showed great practice and diligence on what was, and still is, an extremely difficult challenge" and emphasizes that "the ability to navigate these changes is a must for all improvisors after Coltrane."  

In teaching beginning improvisers how to solo over the non-traditional harmonic progressions of "Giant Steps," pedagogues often invoke the concept of short, three- to eight-note scalar motives adapted to varying harmonic circumstances. These short motivic cells, sometimes termed "digital patterns" (a label purportedly coined by jazz composer and pedagogue David Baker), are frequently discussed using scale degrees oriented with respect to the local tonic or root of the chord (e.g., 1231, 1-2-3-1, or 1-2-3-1). Almost every discussion of Coltrane’s style around the time of *Giant Steps* invokes the notion of three- or four-note digital patterns. In his Coltrane biography, Lewis Porter states that, in recording "Giant Steps," the saxophonist "chose to construct his solo largely out of four-note patterns that could be easily transposed to fit each chord." David Baker’s study on Coltrane’s musical style, similarly describes the use of "three and four note scalar cells [...] usually used permutationally."  

Conversely, in jazz pedagogical texts’ introductions to digital patterns as an improvisational tool, authors often reference Coltrane’s *Giant Steps* album and specifically single out its titular track as an archetype. *Patterns for Jazz* (1970), a widely disseminated primer on improvisation, suggests early on that listeners consult tracks on *Giant Steps* for examples of digital patterns. One of the authors, Jerry Coker, strengthens this connecting thread in his other instructional books. In *Elements of the Jazz Language for the Developing Improvisor* (1991), Coker writes:

---

60 Jerry Coker et al., *Patterns For Jazz* (Lebanon, IN: Studio P/R, 1970), 23.
Though digital patterns have been used since the early days of jazz (probably at a relatively unconscious, instinctive level), the device was brought suddenly and sharply into notice by John Coltrane, whose brilliant solos on "Giant Steps" and "Countdown" made use of a number of digital patterns, each pattern occurring literally dozens of times. Although the solos are improvised, the nature of the tune progressions and tempos, both tunes being made up of quickly-modulating chords of short duration (mostly two-beat durations) at a very fast tempo, encouraged a more mechanistic approach, to say the least. Transcriptions of the solos quickly revealed the stunning number of digital patterns contained in them. Perhaps the greatest lesson we learned from examining Trane’s efforts was not that a mechanistic approach was sensible, needed, or used, but that it revealed a portion of a master’s practice habits. In other words, Coltrane practiced digital patterns apart from, preceding, and in preparation for tunes like "Giant Steps" and "Countdown"!

Coker’s comments, imbued as they are with various problematic narrative threads and mythologies of jazz historiography, reveal a connection—culturally reinforced—between the concept of digital patterns and Coltrane’s "mechanistic" style on "Giant Steps" and "Countdown."

As Coker and others conceptually link Coltrane’s style with short, motivic cells, one particular pattern continually resurfaces. In pedagogical texts, as well as scholarly discussions of Coltrane’s playing, the 1-2-3-5 cell emerges as the most prevalent and widely cited example of a digital pattern; many texts reference the 1-2-3-5 as their first—and sometimes only—example. Ake mentions Coltrane’s use of "simple four-note patterns (mostly emphasizing scale degrees 1-2-3-5)." Patterns for Jazz begins its discussion of digital patterns with 1-2-3-5. Saxophonist Jimmy Heath, discussing Coltrane’s practice routine with Lewis Porter, mentions “Trane liked four-note patterns; we did them all around the keys,” and Heath’s sole example of a four-note pattern (as transcribed by Porter) shows, yet again, 1-2-3-5. In one of his texts, Coker includes a statistical analysis of "Giant Steps" to justify singling out 1-2-3-5 to begin his discussion of digital patterns; according to his study, Coltrane plays the motive fifteen times in the first four

---

61 Coker, Elements of the Jazz Language for the Developing Improvisor, 8.
62 Ake, Jazz Cultures, 130.
63 Coker et al., Patterns For Jazz, 23.
64 Porter, John Coltrane: His Life and Music, 66.
choruses of "Giant Steps." This assessment equating Coltrane’s style on "Giant Steps" with digital patterns, and 1-2-3-5 in particular, continues in later texts. Andy LaVerne’s *Countdown to Giant Steps* (another entry in the Jamey Aebersold Play-A-Long series) notes that many of the contained melodic exercises "were played by Trane as well (the best known being the four-note pattern 1-2-3-5)." LaVerne acknowledges that this particular pattern is "best known," implying that among musicians and listeners, 1-2-3-5 is strongly associated with Coltrane and that it serves as the archetypical cell when discussing digital patterns.

Finally, these pedagogical texts often begin their exercises with sequenced repetitions of the 1-2-3-5 pattern. In improvisation guides and exercise manuals treating digital patterns, the first example in the section often illustrates 1-2-3-5 being sequenced upward in perfect fourths; this progression along the circle of fifths presents a common method of cycling through keys both in musicians’ practice routines and in the common language of jazz harmony. Patterns

---


67 In this way, the melodic sequences shown in the Mobley, Hubbard, and Pass examples also reflect a more normalized diatonic approximation of "Giant Steps" rapidly moving harmonic progression.
for Jazz begins its discussion of four-note patterns with the familiar sequence along the circle of fifths (Figure 5.12). Other texts follow suit, and they sometimes also prioritize the cell transposition upward by minor third to mirror the opening of "Giant Steps." Andy LaVerne’s "Training for Trane," from Countdown to Giant Steps introduces third-related 1-2-3-5 patterns early on in Exercise 2, alternative between minor third and perfect fourth ascents (Figure 5.13). These trends continue in jazz pedagogical texts; a 2003 jazz guitar improvisation guide by Mark Dziuba begins its discussion of digital patterns with 1-2-3-5 cell, and immediately presents the cell transposed upward in an ascending fourths cycle, followed by a separate minor thirds cycle (Figure 5.14).

---

68 Coker et al., Patterns For Jazz, 23. David Baker also mentions this particular pattern as one of a wide array of "selected melodic patterns of John Coltrane"; the variant appears as pattern # 6 on page 84 of Baker, The Jazz Style of John Coltrane: A Musical and Historical Perspective.

69 LaVerne, Countdown to Giant Steps, 1.

70 Mark Dziuba, The Big Book of Jazz Guitar Improvisation (Van Nuys, CA: Alfred, 2003), 99. Dziuba’s exercises also reveal a gestural basis for this variant’s popularity among guitarists. Because of the standard tuning of the guitar,
This investigation suggests a culturally grounded reason for the connotations that Figure 5.8 implies. When Mobley, Hubbard, Pass, or other musicians play 1-2-3-5 patterns in an ascending perfect fourths, they are engaging not only with Coltrane’s playing and each other, but with a wide range of discourses that fundamentally shape how both musicians and listeners conceptualize the phrase. For listeners, these patterns have been heard over and over, and for musicians, they have often been practiced repeatedly, drilling them aurally and kinesthetically into their bodies and minds. As outlined in Chapter 3 (section 3.2.3), this kind of repetition can lead to an idealized cue category, based around a strong central prototype. Across varied sources, this particular variant of the lick became conceptually linked to "Giant Steps" and positioned itself at the center of a stylistic category. To summarize:

1. The Coltrane track "Giant Steps" has become a central text in jazz pedagogy.

2. Coltrane’s style on this track has been equated with the concept of digital patterns: short, three- to eight-note scalar cells adapted to varying harmonic circumstances.

3. The prototypical digital pattern associated with this improvisational technique, and with Coltrane in particular, is 1-2-3-5.

4. Pedagogical texts present sequenced repetitions of this pattern, and often begin with exercises repeating the 1-2-3-5 pattern in a cycle of ascending fourths.

Once again, I must reiterate that I am not attempting to interpret the meaning that Mobley, Hubbard, or Pass are intending to invoke when they play this melodic line. Rather, I am unpacking the reasons why a listener like myself or David Mooney might recognize this passage as sounding like "Giant Steps." The 1-2-3-5 pattern’s relationship to Coltrane’s style is well-known in jazz scholarship and pedagogy, but the ways in which listeners construct stylistic categories from this relationship—collectively and individually—shape not only what meaning the lick signifies, but how it signifies it as well.

the 1-2-3-5 pattern transposed upward in fourths preserves the physical gesture of the melodic cell while simply moving one string over each time (see Figure 5.14 for example guitar tab and fingering notations). This may partially explain the prevalence of this lick in the playing of Joe Pass, among others.
5.3.2 Conceptualizing the "Giant Steps" lick

In the preceding examination of the "Giant Steps" lick, we established a strong, central prototype guiding the way in which a listener might understand and interpret similar examples. Returning to the performance dispersion maps (PDMs) borrowed from the work of Jose Bowen (see section 4.4.4), Figure 5.15 shows a series of PDMs outlining the preceding discussions of the category. First introducing solely iterations that repeat the 1-2-3-5 pattern three times (the Mobley/Hubbard/Pass variant), sequenced upward by perfect fourth each time (Figure 5.15a), we then expanded the category (Figure 5.15b) to encompass associations with Coltrane’s "Giant Steps." At this stage, the repeated appearance of an upward minor third sequence—appearing markedly at the beginnings of choruses nine, eleven, twelve, and eighteen (at Coltrane’s re-entrance after the piano solo)—momentarily challenges the centrality of the perfect-fourth-sequenced examples we originally introduced. Integrating examples from "Countdown" and other contemporaneous recordings (Figure 5.15c) strengthened a new variant: the 1-2-3-5 cell repeated only two times, sequenced upward by a perfect fourth (seen at the top of the PDM). The echoing appearances of this variant in "Countdown," "Some Other Blues," and "Russian Lullaby" shifted the category’s center, while the appearance of several more examples sequenced upward by minor third strengthened the category’s lower pole. Briefly, it seems that these two versions might become dual centers for the category. With the introduction of numerous pedagogical materials that highlight repetitions of the cell in ascending fourths (as well as some passages accruing at the minor-third sequenced pole), the balance shifts back to our original center (Figure 5.15d). Finally, as I introduce several more examples in the remainder of this chapter (Figure 5.15e), the area between these disparate nodes fills in a bit, allowing the category to embrace a number of different alternatives while keeping the central prototype intact.
Figure 5.15: Performance dispersion maps for "Giant Steps" lick, five-stage category transformation
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Figure 5.16: Repeated 1-2-3-5 patterns with variations in: Tiger Okoshi, "Como En Vietnam"; Joe Pass, "Smoke Gets In Your Eyes"; Lee Morgan, "Mickey’s Tune"; Kenny Barron, "High Blues Pressure"; Wayne Shorter, "Blues à la Carte"; Eric Alexander, "Four"
Expanding the range of similar examples reveals a number of different approaches to this lick and subsequently break up the lick’s homogeneity found in the beginning of the discussion. Figure 5.16 shows six more versions, with increasing variation from the preceding prototype.71 The first passage, from a solo by trumpeter Tiger Okoshi, shows a slight rhythmic variation to the previous generalized version of the lick. Almost identical to the earlier Joe Pass excerpts in "Django" and "Walking Up," the guitarist’s passage from "Smoke Gets In Your Eyes" sequences the motive upward twice in perfect fourths. This time, however, Pass lowers the last note of the sequence so that the third digital pattern follows 1-2-3-4 rather than 1-2-3-5. The Lee Morgan example (from his solo on "Mickey’s Tune") similarly includes the ascending fourth sequence and the familiar melodic cell repeated several times. Morgan varies the entrance, however, beginning the sequence with an arpeggiated pattern (A♭-E♭-C-E♭) that only begins to resemble the familiar 1-2-3-5 cell with its last two notes. Kenny Barron’s variant of the phrase in "High Blues Pressure" repeats the 1-2-3-5 motive four times, sequencing it according to both pedagogically reinforced versions. First, Barron repeats the pattern up a minor third, then up a perfect fourth (at this point, the passage resembles the opening of Andy LaVerne’s exercise from "Training for Trane" reproduced in Figure 5.13), then continues to sequence the pattern in ascending perfect fourths (which follows the model seen throughout this chapter in Figures 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 5.12, and 5.14). In the Wayne Shorter excerpt, the 1-2-3-5 patterns are sequenced twice downward by whole steps (as opposed to ascending fourths), and the Eric Alexander example illustrates a case in which the root movement varies in each repetition (up a semitone, then up a fourth).72


72 Shorter recorded "Blues à la Carte" on November 9, 1959, prior to the release of Coltrane’s Giant Steps in January 1960. One could speculate about Shorter’s exposure to “Giant Steps” preceding this—Shorter performed with Coltrane on at least one gig in New York where they played “Giant Steps” (in August 1959)—but regardless, the
In comparison to the consistent versions of the "Giant Steps" lick in Figures 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7, these iterations reveal variations (albeit minor ones). Although perhaps closer to Coltrane’s actual playing, the examples in Figure 5.16 begin to deviate from the ways in which jazz cultures have constructed and reinforced a collectively imagined stereotype of Coltrane’s style on "Giant Steps." As more examples are added, a stylistic category expands and reworks itself, and perhaps a listener begins to understand the lick (and Coltrane’s style in general) with greater nuance.

5.3.3 A few final episodes

To conclude the chapter, I will offer three brief analytical excursions emerging from the prior discussion of the "Giant Steps" lick.

1. Uncertainty and certainty in overlaid meanings

Briefly alluded to in section 1.2, listeners sometimes encounter situations where the album’s liner notes provide too little information to determine who is playing. On the record The Lee Konitz Duets (1967), saxophonist Lee Konitz plays a series of duets with various other instrumentalists, including tenor saxophonists Joe Henderson and Richie Kamuca. On the final essential "Coltrane-ness" of these opening melodic gestures remains readily apparent. In a Down Beat blindfold test of this track, saxophonist Donny McCaslin observes that the player has an influence of Coltrane "for the sound and the type of melodic lines at the beginning of the solo." Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Donny McCaslin,” For an interview with Shorter in which he discusses these this 1959 gig, see Julie Coryell and Laura Friedman, Jazz-Rock Fusion: The People, The Music, 2nd ed. (Milwaukee, WI: Hal Leonard, 2000), 323.

track of the album, "Alphanumeric," Konitz unites all of the preceding duet-mates for a free-flowing ensemble performance. On this track, Konitz plays alto saxophone and electric tenor saxophone, while Henderson and Kamuca both play tenor saxophone. Figure 5.17 reveals another iteration of the "Giant Steps" lick from this track. Although I believe Henderson plays this passage, I cannot be certain; amidst a chaotic texture of piano, bass, drums, and trombone, Kamuca and Henderson alternate and play over top of one another. Henderson begins the section with several recognizable "Henderson-esque" cues, and Kamuca takes over about fifteen seconds in, slightly louder than Henderson in the mix. About ten seconds later, after Kamuca has climbed upward, Henderson interrupts and begins descending, and Kamuca soon juts back in, playing over Henderson in an angular descending melodic sequence. As they play simultaneously, they soften, twisting their melodies together in the same register, and then one saxophonist cuts out. The other continues and builds in volume, emerging into the lick transcribed in Figure 5.17.

I am fairly confident that Henderson is the one playing—the timbral qualities, the way he attacks the low A♭, and what I can tell of the two melodic lines that approach it—but what I can say with absolute certainty is that he is playing a variant of the "Giant Steps" lick. In this case, stylistic identification presents a degree of uncertainty regarding who is playing, but certainty about what is being played. To me, the ascending sequence of 1-2-3-5 patterns (even with its 1-2-3-1 variation in the middle) strongly signifies Coltrane.

2. The interaction between improvisational and compositional style

Although the present study focuses primarily on stylistic identification in an improvisational context, the listening and categorizing processes outlined apply equally to compositional style. Figure 5.18 shows the first eight measures of pianist Freddie Redd’s composition, "The Thespian," with the melody arrangement as played by Jackie McLean and Tina Brooks on the 1960
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Figure 5.18: Freddie Redd, variant on "Giant Steps" lick in "The Thespian," mm. 1-8 [0:00]

Throughout the tune (and twice in the first eight measures), McLean and Brooks play the 1-2-3-5 pattern and then leap upward by perfect fourth to play it again. For a listener, this melody is just as able to signify the "Coltrane-esque" as any material from an improviser’s solo.

To another listener, however, the meaning of this lick could hypothetically tie itself to "The Thespian" rather than to Coltrane. To this listener, when Coltrane plays a similar lick on "Russian Lullaby" (Figure 5.11), it connotes Redd’s style, rather than Coltrane’s own. Although I have established entrenched cultural reasons why the Coltrane association may be more universally shared among jazz listeners, I am not trying to exclude alternative ways of listening. Every recording and performance we hear shapes how we interpret the new music we encounter, and a listener’s individualized history impacts the ways in which he or she constructs musical meaning.

74 Freddie Redd, “The Thespian,” recorded 1960, on Shades of Redd, Blue Note 4045.
3. Tributes and stylistic influence

Among musicians and listeners concerned with placing players in a historical lineage, musical
tributes remain central to jazz as it exists today. In their jazz history survey, Scott DeVeaux
and Gary Giddins classify large parts of recent decades as overtly historicist, but jazz musicians
have long concerned themselves with paying tribute to the past. Past compositional elegies
like Benny Golson’s "I Remember Clifford" (for Clifford Brown) or Charles Mingus’s "Goodbye
Pork Pie Hat" (for Lester Young) endure as mainstays of the standard repertoire. Honorifically
titled compositions, such as John Coltrane’s "Mr. P.C." for Paul Chambers, or Cedar Walton’s
"Mode for Joe," for Joe Henderson, similarly pervade recordings and performances, and often
take on increasing significance as musical tributes as time goes on. Artists continually re-
lease tribute records, with varying levels of overtness in their homages; Chick Corea’s Further
Explorations (2012), for instance, alludes to Bill Evans’ 1961 album Explorations in its title, fea-
tures longtime Bill Evans Trio bassist Eddie Gomez and drummer Paul Motian, and includes
an array of Evans’ originals (e.g., "Peri’s Scope") and favored tunes ("Alice In Wonderland"),
as well as new tribute compositions (e.g., Corea’s "Bill Evans"). Within this environment,
an added layer of tribute often emerges within the player’s improvisations. As Paul Berliner
notes, musicians’ licks play with "performance histories and associated meanings," and these
allusive meanings underpin more overt tributes.

Figure 5.19 shows yet another version of the "Giant Steps" lick. Excerpted a breakneck solo
on Conrad Herwig and Brian Lynch’s Latin jazz tribute album Que Viva Coltrane (2004), the
passage illustrates a momentary reference to Coltrane’s style embedded in a larger tribute to

75 Whyton, “‘Four for Trane’: Jazz and the Disembodied Voice.”
76 Gary Giddins and Scott DeVeaux, Jazz (New York: W. W. Norton, 2009), 573-619.
77 Even in this chapter, several of the examples come from similar tributes (John Lewis’s "Django") or honorific
compositions (Kenny Dorham’s "Blues for Jackie").
78 Chick Corea, Eddie Gomez, and Paul Motian, Further Explorations, recorded 2010, Concord Jazz CJA-3364-02.
79 Berliner, Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation, 228.
Coltrane as a composer. By building a repertoire of stylistic categories, listeners enable the comprehension of fleeting allusions like this one and this recognition builds on the collective discourse—verbal and musical—of the "Giant Steps" lick.

CONCLUSION

Expanding upon the conceptions of style in the previous discussions, this chapter reevaluates stylistic identification in terms of conceptual categories cultivated both individually and collectively. Shared within a discursive culture, jazz listeners and musicians together construct ideas of what Dizzy Gillespie sounds like, or what "playing like Trane" entails.

Listeners evaluate music in terms of nuanced musical influences by deploying the stylistic categories they have individually developed. Taking great pains to distinguish different levels of influence, listeners might discriminate between a recording that "really sounds like Coltrane" and one that "sounds like someone who likes Coltrane." These evaluations may operate in accordance with the relationship between newly heard musical features and a listener’s pre-existing stylistic categories. In disentangling a perceived Coltrane influence in various passages, I argued that the recognition of a particular motivic sequence as a "Giant Steps" lick (Figure 5.8) relates to a widespread cultural characterization of Coltrane’s style by musicians and listeners alike.
CONCLUSION

How do jazz listeners recognize a performer on an unfamiliar recording? How do jazz listeners identify style? These questions guided the preceding five chapters, which have argued for increased attention on the role that listening plays in musical style. Through a wide range of examples, I have shown the extent to which our understandings of a particular player’s style or a particular lick within that style emerge—and are fundamentally shaped—by the peculiarities of our individualized and collective listening experiences. With this in mind, a player’s style is not merely evident in a performance. Rather, listeners construct stylistic categories in dialogue with the performer and, as such, stylistic groupings reflect traces of listeners’ interpretations.

This project also emphasizes the potential flexibility of stylistic categories in two dimensions: intersubjectively in different listeners’ divergent interpretations; and diachronically in a single listener’s reconceptualization over time. Both for different listeners and for the same listener at different times, stylistic categories do not exist as fixed, immutable entities, but rather as fluidly conceptualized and constantly changing organisms. This flexibility emerges in the selection of resemblance criteria, which can reflect diverse and overlapping interpretations simultaneously. Likewise, a listener continually reorients and reconfigures stylistic categories to account for anomalous examples or newly apprehended nuances.

By emphasizing the flexibility of stylistic categories, I also suggest a new way to conceptualize musical style itself. In my view, musical style involves a hefty dose of listener interpretation, necessarily incorporating subjective elements and perceived truths. With this in mind, stylistic analyses must necessarily contend with this interpretive dimension—or risk invalidating their own aims with implicit biases.
The challenge of the hypothetical listener

Throughout the dissertation, I embrace a plurality of hypothetical listener responses. Exploring processes of stylistic identification in the *Down Beat* blindfold tests, the first chapter revealed two factors contributing to this approach: the wide range of diverse experiences exhibited by jazz listeners and these listeners' challenges articulating the implicit processes of stylistic recognition. In generating these hypothetical responses, I also relied on my own experiences as a jazz musician and listener, as well as conversations with other jazz insiders.

This emphasis on hypothetical listening may bother some readers. If I am generating my examples from potential responses of jazz listeners, do the examples presented herein reflect analytical tautologies? Have I simply presented examples that reinforce my own points? In truth, however, this criticism could be placed on any music analysis that deploys examples transcribed from recordings; transcription relies fundamentally upon interpretation and therefore these questions loom implicitly behind many approaches to jazz. To counter these challenges, I emphasize interpretive pluralities, with alternative readings of the same passages and the representation of different listening perspectives. I embrace the hypothetical; throughout the pages of *Down Beat* my conversations with jazz listeners, and reflections on my own experiences, I was reminded of the tentative and dynamic nature of stylistic categories. By showing numerous divergent listener responses, I emphasize the complexity and fluidity of these processes. Listeners can respond in diverse, often contradictory ways, and these responses integrate into a musical culture that collectively determines their significance and validity.
Applications within jazz

The analytical tools developed within the last five chapters allow us to illuminate new dimensions of jazz. The previous chapter illustrates the ways in which this listener-informed, flexible understanding of musical style can begin to thoughtfully analyze perceived musical influences. Pursuing an initial analytical judgment (e.g., "Javon Jackson’s solo on ‘Hamlet’s Favorite Son’ sounds like Joe Henderson") necessarily benefits from knowing how the analyst has constructed and reconstructed his or her stylistic categories (e.g., "Joe Henderson-ness").\(^{81}\) This avenue—an analytic study of listener-perceived musical influence—would offer new insights into already robust field treating meaning and signifyin' in jazz.\(^{82}\)

The series of short analytic episodes that close Chapter 5 (section 5.3.3) allude to several other potential offshoots of this study. Reorienting away from improvisation toward compositional style would illuminate another aspect of jazz listenership. Participants in the Down Beat blindfold tests frequently identify not only the improvisers, but also the composers and arrangers. One listener notes: "That arrangement—I thought, as I was listening to it that it was Bill Holman, because I’ve played a lot of his arrangements in the past that had that same kind of voicing and sound."\(^{83}\) Just as we saw with respect to improvisers, jazz listeners show an interest in identifying compositional style.

---

\(^{81}\) Javon Jackson, “Hamlet’s Favorite Son,” recorded 1996, on A Look Within, Blue Note CDP 7243 8 36490 2 0. I am not alone in this judgment, by the way. In his review for Javon Jackson’s 1996 album A Look Within, critic Scott Yanow offhandedly draws a similar comparison: "Tenor saxophonist Javon Jackson deserves a lot of credit for stretching himself on this release. Although he can sound very close to Joe Henderson at times, on the set he interprets a wide-ranging repertoire that allows him to avoid falling into the revivalist hard bop category." Scott Yanow, “A Look Within - Javon Jackson,” AllMusic, http://www.allmusic.com/album/a-look-within-mw0000072645, accessed December 1, 2014. This affinity between my reaction and Yanow’s reflects, once again, the complex interplay of shared and subjective stylistic categories discussed in Chapter 5.


\(^{83}\) Feather, “Blindfold Test: Tom Scott.”
Likewise, jazz’s cultural interest in style does not end with individual improvisers. Listeners frequently identify ensembles and prioritize the formation of a cohesive, collective style. A *Down Beat* blindfold test of the Esbjörn Svensson Trio reveals this sentiment:

[Magnus Öström]: That’s Paul [Motian].

[Dan Berglund]: And Scott [LeFaro].

[Esbjörn Svensson]: And Bill Evans. We were practicing for this "Blindfold Test" in the bus earlier today by listening to his trio. So we were all ready to scream the name when this came on. They have such a typical sound.

[Öström]: They also have a group sound.

[Svensson]: These are three individuals coming together to create something completely different. You can hear each of them as individuals, but together they create a special sound.84

Interpreting the dialogue between the style of the ensemble and styles of its constituent members, Svensson, Berglund, and Öström identify the Bill Evans Trio. This attention to collective style presents another pathway to continue investigating the questions outlined in this project.

*Applications to other genres*

Shedding light on these (often implicit) processes of stylistic identification in jazz also offers wider implications for music analysis in other genres. At the end of Chapter 1, I suggested that the prevalent interest in stylistic identification among jazz listeners relates centrally to how the music is produced and disseminated. Table 0.1 illustrates some of the factors contributing to stylistic identification’s centrality within jazz cultures. The genre’s orientation toward style (individual and collective), widespread dissemination through audio recordings, largely instrumental nature, and abundant catalog of albums generate a situation in which listeners

84 Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Esbjörn Svensson Trio.”
CIRCUMSTANCES | RAMIFICATIONS
--- | ---
Musical and cultural emphasis on style | ↔ Listener wants to know who is playing
Dissemination on audio recording | ↔ Listener cannot immediately recognize visually
Largely instrumental | ↔ Listener cannot immediately recognize voice
Highly variable ensembles | ↔ Listener cannot predict who is playing
Multiple players on same instrument | ↔ Listener cannot predict who is playing
Musicians generate many recordings quickly | ↔ Listener cannot memorize every possible recording

Table 0.1: Relationship between musical/cultural circumstances and ramifications for listeners

want to know who is playing (or composing, or arranging), but must develop aural-analytical tools to find the answers.

Yet bop is not the only musical genre to encounter these musical and sociocultural circumstances. Many types of recorded music—particularly those emphasizing improvisation—demonstrate similar conditions: certain strains of avant-garde improvised music; free jazz; rock genres like progressive rock; bluegrass; and numerous others. Some of these musical cultures may well have their own analogs to the *Down Beat* blindfold tests; one example is the "Invisible Jukebox" column for the UK music periodical *The Wire*, which presents interviewees with an eclectic (and often obscure) mix of unfamiliar examples, ranging from Nico to Karlheinz Stockhausen to ritual music from Northern Thailand.85 For musicians and listeners within these genres, the different musical and cultural configurations might well lead to strains of stylistic identification markedly different than those found in jazz.

*Identifying who, identifying what*

In certain musical genres, the focus may shift from identifying individuals to identifying other types of musical categories. As expressed in section 1.1.3, jazz listeners’ comments reveal stylis-

---

DIALECT → "He’s playing some standard jazz guitar licks."
INDIVIDUAL → "That’s Oscar Peterson."
INTRAOPUS STYLE → "I didn’t like this track so much [...] he had this one motif he kept repeating."
ENSEMBLE → "It sounds like the Bill Evans Trio."
GENERATION → "I would say it’s an older trumpet player."
CITY → "Sounds like the Chicago school of tenor saxophone."
REGION → "It’s by someone from Central America."
GENRE → "It doesn’t sound like he’s playing bebop. That’s hard blues."

Table 0.2: Synthesis of Table 1.1 and Table 1.2 showing varying levels of style in Meyer and the Down Beat blindfold tests

In these expanding contexts, listeners might concern themselves with identifying what is being played rather than who is playing it. Among jam band devotees, for example, listeners develop nuanced ways of identifying what jam the band is performing. This extends my project beyond recorded music to encompass aspects of the live concert experience, and shifts toward questions of ontology. Future avenues of inquiry could explore the role of stylistic identification in these musical cultures.

86 Mandel, “Blindfold Test: John Scofield.”
87 Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Gerald Clayton.”
88 Feather, “Blindfold Test: Joachim Kuhn.”
89 Ouellette, “Blindfold Test: Ron Carter.”
90 Jeske, “Blindfold Test: Jon Faddis.”
91 Whitehead, “Blindfold Test: Greg Osby.”
92 Panken, “Blindfold Test: Enrico Pieranunzi.”
93 Davis, “Blindfold Test: Arthur Blythe.”
94 Many thanks to Christopher Gupta for his insight on this matter.
Analytical listening

Finally, this project attempts to turn attention toward a realm of analytical listening. Matthew Butterfield has argued for the need for "developing practical tools for the real-time analysis of music in the context of live performing events."\textsuperscript{95} Stylistic identification is a type of real-time analysis: drawing on their previous listening experiences, listeners interpret diverse musical and extramusical cues in order to determine who is playing and parse stylistic influences. In the context of live performance, the "who is playing?" question remains relatively trivial for sighted listeners. But the question of "what is being played?" or "who does the player sound like?"—identifications of compositional style and musical influence—remain relevant to the live experience.

Additionally, a focus on this kind of intertextual analytical listening taps into how, across genres, many listeners convey nuanced musical observations through resemblance. When a listener (musically trained or not) says that the Bruno Mars song "Locked Out of Heaven" sounds like The Police, he or she taps into a intertextual web of previously generated musical categories.\textsuperscript{96} Using the methodological approaches developed in this project, we can begin to unpack these kinds of evocative analytical utterances. With this in mind, my treatments of stylistic categories contribute to a wider practice of analytic listening.

*****

All of these avenues make apparent the inextricable links between listening, discussing, and performing—and I have illustrated the tightly interwoven connections between these threads in jazz communities. A musician practicing the opening chorus of "Giant Steps" generates

\textsuperscript{95} Butterfield, "Music Analysis and the Social Life of Jazz Recordings," 343.
stylistic categories that inform not only subsequent playing, but also how he listens and associates meaning to new music. Jazz enthusiasts posting album reviews on a message board can argue about the disparate musical influences that they perceive on the record. A listener singing along to a familiar trumpet player’s solo develops the ability to distinguish between Lee Morgan and a musician that is playing "Morganly."

Listening is a central part of jazz, and evaluating style is a central part of jazz listening. By understanding the ways in which listeners individually and collectively construct stylistic associations, we can begin to explore underlying meanings that swirl in tides and eddies beneath the music’s surface.
APPENDIX: TRANSCRIPTIONS

The challenges presented by transcription of improvised jazz—and transcription in general—are well-documented: accurately transcribed rhythms risk being unreadable (or metrically dishonest); pitch, particularly in harmonies, can be impossible to accurately ascertain; articulation, attack, and timbre are often important features unable to be captured in written form; swing feel varies wildly, even within a single solo, and is frequently notated as straight eighths or sixteenths; and so on.¹ Musical recordings in general remain somewhat uncomfortably positioned with respect to jazz studies—an unsurprising fact given the delicate ontological status of recorded sound with respect to improvisation.²


² Jad Rasula has suggested that jazz historians often show an implicit discomfort toward recordings because, among other reasons, the recorded artifacts themselves already constitute history “made audible.” Rasula, “The Media of Memory: The Seductive Menace of Records in Jazz History,” 136. For vehement oppositions to recording’s presence in jazz, see Derek Bailey, *Improvisation: Its Nature and Practice in Music* (Da Capo Press, 1980); Butterfield, “Music Analysis and the Social Life of Jazz Recordings.” I do not, however, see these objections as fundamentally opposed to my project. Butterfield, for example, emphasizes a need to develop real-time analytical methods in order to allow cultures of live performance to thrive without the economic competition of recordings. Yet as mentioned in the preceding conclusion, a listener’s recognition of a player’s style is a type of real-time analysis; it is a means by which jazz musicians and listeners analyze the music as it is heard. Although I am using recordings
Simha Arom has suggested three types of transcribed scores that can be defined from an oral tradition: the etic score, the emic score, and the modelized score. The etic approach represents an attempt to fully capture every aurally perceptible acoustic feature, but results in "overloaded scores... which are hard to read, and worse still, make it impossible to distinguish the elements which are relevant from ones that are not." By contrast, the emic score requires a culturally informed transcriber who can interpret the relevance of various acoustic phenomena and thereby recognize and adjust "meaningless" divergences from significant ones. The modelized score purports to crystallize a pedagogical and/or cognitive structure underlying surface variants of the performance or performances. Although Arom’s methods are attuned to the particularities of African polyphony, his distinctions serve as a useful lens for my own methodologies for transcription.

Throughout this project, I use my knowledge as a jazz listener and player to inform emic transcriptions of melodic fragments from audio recordings. Since I am focusing on the recognition of an individual player’s style, I largely exclude transcriptions of other ensemble parts unless they are pertinent to the observations being made. This strategy runs counter to recent trends in jazz analytical scholarship. Scholars’ emphasis on interaction and collective improvisation in jazz analysis has encouraged a move away from isolated melodic transcriptions of soloists to full transcriptions of an entire ensemble. While such approaches are necessarily emic in that the transcriber must continually evaluate and adjust the parts he notates based on knowledge of the idiom and performance habits of improvisers, a full quartet or quintet score incorporates an etic sense of overabundance and, somewhat more questionably, can give the false impression that it is a "neutral" or "objective" score. Winkler suggests that, in many analytical applications, a transcriber can fail to (publicly) acknowledge the challenges—the as my artifacts of study, an explication of this process of real-time analysis surely comports with some aspect of Butterfield’s aim.

---


interaction of partials produces "sum" and "difference" tones, masking, etc.—of aurally ascertaining the identities of simultaneous pitches.\(^5\) To avoid this impression, my transcriptions are purposely limited in scope, and are often intended as visual supplements to a primarily aural experience.

Furthermore, because my aim is to analyze esthesic processes of stylistic recognition, I sometimes notate imaginative components of listening such as "mishearings" (compare, for example, Figures 4.6 and 4.9, or the differing interpretations seen in 2.5). At times, my analytical examples drift toward modelized scores, within which I attempt to represent prototypes or phenomenological "summaries" of listener experience. As opposed to Arom, however, I am not always interested in how performance operates; rather, I am concerned with the listener’s responses to the recording. My transcriptions sometimes include a basic harmonic label (appearing above the staff), but I am not necessarily concerned with notating the particular chord or voicing used by the rhythm section, which often contain extensions and substitutions that are negotiated collectively—with, say, the bassist outlining a \(D_b7(\#11)\) while the pianist plays a \(G^7\) (both serve the same dominant function toward \(C\)).\(^6\) For most examples, I follow the conventions of a jazz lead sheet and notate the chord as a basic functional harmony (e.g., \(G^7 - C^\text{maj7}\)) unless a substitution is crucial to the melodic fragment being used. In other cases, I omit the harmony altogether in order to draw attention to melodic similarities between passages.

\(^5\) Winkler, "Writing Ghost Notes: The Poetics and Politics of Transcription."
The following section includes two extended transcriptions in order to provide added musical context for the examples in section 3.2.1 ("Repeated cue"):

- Milt Jackson’s solo on "Delilah"\(^7\)
- Wynton Kelly’s solo on "Gettin’ and Jettin’"\(^8\)

\(^7\) Jackson and Montgomery, "Delilah (Take 4)."
\(^8\) Mobley, "Gettin' and Jettin'."
Figure A.1: Milt Jackson, solo on "Delilah (take 4)"
Figure A.3: Wynton Kelly, solo on "Gettin’ and Jettin’," continued
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