No cover image available

The Oxford Handbook of the Phenomenology of Music Cultures

Harris M. Berger (ed.) et al.

https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190693879.001.0001

Published: 2021 **Online ISBN:** 9780190693886 **Print ISBN:** 9780190693879

CHAPTER

Jazz Etiquette: Between Aesthetics and Ethics

Alessandro Duranti, Jason Throop, Matthew McCoy

https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190693879.013.3

Published: 14 April 2021

Abstract

The interaction among a group of musicians before, during, and after the performance of a jazz standard is analyzed to show the interdependence of jazz aesthetics and jazz ethics. The authors argue that what makes jazz distinct from other kinds of musical traditions is not just the ubiquity of improvisation in the genre but the vulnerability that jazz improvisation always generates—a vulnerability that is due to the genre's reliance on both shared conventions and partly unpredictable individual choices. Analyzing video recordings of a university course on jazz organized to reproduce the setting of a jam session, the authors examine in detail the interactional assumptions and consequences of choices made by band members during the performance of "Softly, as in a Morning Sunrise." The authors' analysis shows how musicians position themselves to be responsive to one another as the song progresses, starting from an improvised "introduction" that sets the tempo, rhythm, and style of the song and continuing with smooth transitions from one solo to the next. Drawing from Erving Goffman's ideas about the presentation of self and the phenomenology of Emmanuel Levinas, the authors examine the ethical implications of a musical "vacuum" that was created by one musician's decision to wait to take his solo. In the interaction, the other musicians responded to the vacuum by assuming responsibility for the group's performance and, more broadly, the performance of the jazz tradition, and this chapter uses their actions to illustrate how "jazz etiquette" operates as a practice that includes aesthetic, ethical, and practical concerns.

Keywords: jazz, ethics, face-saving, improvisation, turn-taking

Subject: Ethnomusicology, Music

Series: Oxford Handbooks

Collection: Oxford Handbooks Online

This chapter draws on ideas from phenomenology and interactional approaches to human experience to examine the ways in which the practice of improvisation in the jazz tradition is guided by aesthetic and ethical principles. Contrary to recent claims that "there is no categorical distinction between improvisation and performance" and that, in any genre of music, there is a process of "continuous accommodation" (Cook 2017: 64), we show that jazz musicians execute, conceptualize, and evaluate improvisation in distinct

aesthetic and ethical terms, which draw from and reconstitute genre-specific attitudes toward creativity and cooperation.

Dominant among the aesthetic and ethical requirements of jazz as a cultural tradition is the practitioners' acceptance and celebration of the risk-taking entailed by any live jazz performance, where not only the order and length of individual solos but also even some of the harmonic, rhythmic, and melodic choices made by the players emerge live in performance and are not fully predictable in advance. Much like Aristotle's virtues, which necessarily require a particular context for their specific mode of actualization, the aesthetic and ethical dimensions of virtuosic musical performances in jazz are made possible through the ongoing and often explicitly foregrounded potential for challenge and exposure.[1] As Aristotle argued, virtues are embodied dispositions that are responsive to the particularities of circumstance. From this perspective, the virtue of courage, for example, arises when an individual confronts a risk to their well-being without self-serving motivations in a difficult situation in an effort to pursue some perceived good. As a form of practical discernment, courage is a mean between rashness and cowardice, two responses that, Aristotle argues, either under- or overestimate the risks associated with a given course of action in a particular social context. In opening themselves up to the risk of exposure, jazz performers simultaneously cultivate and enact embodied dispositional capacities for a courage-like discernment to navigate musical challenges in ways that will push them to improvise in a virtuosic manner. Virtuosity, like virtue, is thus conditioned by its specific context of collaboratively contingent actualization.

Following the phenomenological philosopher Emmanuel Levinas ([1961] 1969), whose ethics is founded upon the responsibility that the naked "face" (*visage*) of the other imposes on us before any conceptualization or rationalization, we argue that it is precisely in the existential dynamics of face-to-face encounters that we become exposed to excessive and unthematizable dimensions of alterity, dimensions that, in the end, may resist established conventions or shared stocks of knowledge. According to Levinas, one's primary obligation to others, what he terms our "infinite" responsibility to them, becomes disclosed through this vulnerable experience of exposure. Drawing from both Aristotle's virtue ethics and Levinas's ethics of alterity, which we see as distinctive but complementary perspectives on moral experience, we will show how, in the context of jazz players' interactions *qua* musicians, leaving oneself open to exposure can itself become a cultivated virtue, one in which breaking out of the structure of the song becomes both an aesthetic and ethical imperative.

While all forms of musical performance likely entail such contextualized risks, jazz performance stands out as a special case because the potentiality for exposure is a foregrounded aspect of the genre's aesthetic ethos. Indeed, jazz musicians often challenge one another by playing novel and surprising variations in the context of an otherwise familiar musical piece or make unexpected decisions that are meant to break the routine quality of a performance and produce what Whitney Balliett (1959) aptly called "the sound of surprise." To catch another musician off guard, to see if they are able to catch up and keep up while also being prepared to step in to repair any emerging breakdown that may follow from their missing a beat, cue, or transition, these are actions usually associated with bigger-than-life personalities like Miles Davis (Davis and Troupe 1989; Carr 1998; C. Smith 1998). In this chapter, we argue that, in fact, such actions are a defining feature of jazz aesthetics and ethics.

The complexity of jazz performance is realized in such moments when differing sonic layers of the unfolding musical composition and various embodied and interactional elements of the performance become salient and individual players respond to one another's efforts to create surprising and novel phrasings, rhythms, and harmonic substitutions. As Harris Berger notes in his now-classic phenomenological study of jazz, performance in this tradition thus entails "a complex juggling act in which different flows of experience are arranged in a delicate and dynamic structure" that arise through the organization of the players' attention (1999, 145; see also Throop 2003). With various sonic textures, rhythmic configurations, and embodied actions shifting between the foreground and background of a given

musician's moment-to-moment awareness, attention actively organizes, and is organized within, the flow of performance; further, attention can also be passively arrayed (Husserl 2001) in response to novel or surprising occurrences. For instance, one's attention may be "pulled" by an unexpected note or beat, a glance from a fellow musician, or a missing musical element in the expected unfolding of the song. Such forms of *attentional pull* (Throop and Duranti 2015) disclose not only the virtuosic improvisational responsiveness of jazz musicians but also their vulnerability. When understood in this light, jazz performance is both virtuosic and virtuous, the latter being a quality of music that Jane O'Dea (1993, 52) traces to Aristotle's discussion of music in his *Politics*, where he asks "whether we ought … to think that music tends in some degree to virtue (*pros aretén*)" and concludes that "music has the power of producing a certain effect on the moral character of the soul." It is for these reasons that Aristotle held that music should be taught to the young (1944, 661).

To understand the ethical implications of improvisational responsiveness and vulnerability to exposure, we seek to put Aristotelian virtue ethics into conversation not only with Levinas but also with the work of sociologist Erving Goffman (1959, 1967). In so doing, we are not using jazz improvisation to further test whether Goffman was a phenomenologist (Parsons 1968; Lanigan 1988; Raffel 2002; G. W. H. Smith 2005). Rather, we suggest that the ideas about self and other that these thinkers develop are complementary, and drawing them together can help us illuminate the relation between the vulnerable side of performance and the sense of responsibility band members feel toward each other and the jazz tradition. It is therefore in the midst of intersubjectively arrayed experiences of vulnerability and responsibility that possibilities for the cultivation and enactment of virtue arise.

With regard to responsibility, we take from Goffman the view of everyday encounters as rituals where participants create a shared sense of reality and a public image that protects their inner and true self from being exposed to the judgment of others. Central in Goffman's work is the notion of "face," which he uses to explain public behavior as a kind of performance. Here, social actors engage in "impression management," a process by which they "work" (hence his term "face-work") at making a positive impression and avoiding embarrassment (1967, 97–112). In this respect, the work that people do to establish and maintain a particular face is by definition strategic and covers both information that they "give" and information that they "give off" (1959, 2). In other words, for Goffman, the individual performs in order to control how he or she is being evaluated by others. On the stage of social life, a person avoids feeling "shame, leading him to minimize the chances he takes of exposure" (1959, 253). A jazz ensemble in performance can thus be understood as sharing a "collective face," which each member has some responsibility to protect.

Goffman's ideas about face-work shed light on the social life of music, and his ideas are important context for our work. We argue, though, that the imperative to impression management that Goffman describes accounts for only some of what goes on in musical performance and that the aesthetic and ethical dispositions of individual music cultures introduce other dynamics. In jazz, for example, a distinction must be made between the collective face of established bands, whose members must conform to their fans' expectations or risk disapproval, and a "pick up group" like the one we will be discussing in this chapter. In the latter case, the musicians *themselves* may constitute the primary audience for their performance, especially when the audience is not familiar with the kind of music a band is playing (Bogen 1987). In this respect, we cannot take for granted that "what musicians perform first and foremost is not music, but their own identities as musicians, their musical personae," as Philip Auslander has argued in a well-known article that treats musical performance as the Goffmanian presentation of self (2006, 102). When jazz musicians encounter moments of vulnerable exposure—for instance, as we shall see, in experiencing a sonic "vacuum" in the midst of a performance—the preoccupation with one's own public face in Goffman's sense may be superseded or augmented by an emergent ethical sense of responsibility toward others and toward something more consequential than the immediate context, such as the revered musical tradition being reproduced. This is an experience that is closer to what Levinas saw as the ethical response to a "risky

uncovering of oneself, in sincerity," which may give rise to "the abandon of all shelter, exposure to traumas, [and] vulnerability" (Levinas [1974] 1998, 48).

In this sense, we find a key tension between Levinas's and Goffman's accounts of face-to-face encounters. The same moments that can be characterized in terms of openness and shared vulnerability can also underlie and institute an individual's face-work, as players project the concern for their own "sacredness" (Goffman 1967, 47) onto the respectability of the other players and the music they are playing. For these reasons, the insights of both scholars are needed to illuminate the risky moments of improvisational collaboration among jazz musicians and their pragmatic implications. Significantly, these emergent moments are *not* (or not only, as Goffman might have framed it) ways of getting back on track after a violation of a routine. Rather, risky moments of improvisational collaboration are ruptures of routine activities that make apparent the responsibility of the self toward the other. Exposure, for Levinas, is "radically different from thematization. The one [person] is exposed to the other as a skin is exposed to what wounds it" ([1974] 1998, 49). In the midst of Goffman-like routine exchanges filled with memorized melodies, trusted licks, and rehearsed chord progressions—that is, in the midst of coherent musical and social thematizations—jazz musicians, we argue, invite the possibility of a Levinasian wounding and, in doing so, cultivate a kind of virtuous courage in the Aristotelian sense. In addition to (or beyond) a remedial response of the kind described by Goffman in moments of embarrassment, a violation of expectations by one player can elicit a *reaffirmation* of the ethical fabric of playing music with and for others. This is made possible by jazz as an improvisational genre. In this way, jazz performance is an emergent moral experience in which musicians are attuned and mutually responsive to each other.

The moral implications of musical performances, practices, and interactions can thus inform current debates within the so-called ethical turn in anthropology (Mattingly and Throop 2018). Through their interactions, jazz musicians show how ethics is not just about cultivating fixed ethical responses to situations but about responding to a surplus of potentiality, which includes letting improvised interactional modes of exposure and surprise break the frame of routine predictability. Jazz musicians, as we will show, actively risk the coherence of the musical performance through their vulnerability to the other and thus court what Jarrett Zigon calls a "moral breakdown," a moment when the taken-for-granted and un-self-conscious way of performing suddenly halts and gives rise to "dynamic moments of openness, creativity, and becoming" (2014, 20). Given Zigon's interest in mapping out how the human is fundamentally a "relational-being" engaged in a dynamic "nexus of potentiality," the moral import of maintaining fidelity to the unfolding interactions, even if part of this fidelity is pursuing interactional breakdowns, is shown by the jazz ethic of vulnerability.

In the discussion to follow, we start with a brief description of the setting from which most of our data on jazz improvisation are taken—the musical and verbal interactions of guest jazz musicians in a college-level course on the aesthetics of jazz. In this research, multiple cameras were used to record the musical performances, the exchanges with and among the musicians before they began to play, and the question-and-answer (Q&A) sessions that followed each song or tune.[2] As we shall show, these recordings provided us with a very rich source of information about the musicians and their interactions. As a case study in the decisions and responses of jazz artists in the music-making event, this chapter focuses on the performance of the song "Softly, as in a Morning Sunrise," a well-known jazz standard that is often referred to as "Softly." We examine the interactional assumptions and consequences of particular choices made by band members during the performance.[3]

Despite the song's canonical structure (or "form") and the genre-specific musical knowledge that the musicians share, even the selection of the tune to be performed contains an initial moment of exposure for the musicians. During such an experience of exposure, the performers feel pressure to quickly find a song that everyone knows, even though each player's knowledge of the jazz repertoire varies. Analyzing this performance of "Softly"—and in particular, the temporal unfolding of the embodied and interactive

qualities of signaling and recognition—we highlight how musicians position themselves to be responsive to one another as the song progresses. This temporal unfolding includes those moments when the musicians are pulled to attend to unexpected features of the performance. The attentional pull of surprising features is particularly important in the constitution of *emergent improvised arrangements*. Such arrangements often occur during the introduction to songs (Reinholdsson 1998, 219–223), but they also can appear throughout a performance, as when, for example, musicians alternate between playing the main melody and playing a counter melody, or from playing to not playing. The aesthetic demands of jazz require that these arrangements be improvised but also that they sound rehearsed. The form and the sequential arrangement of "Softly" establishes a *sonic ground*, which makes possible variation on the song's structure and the ways in which that structure is performed by specific players. To illustrate this point, we examine a particular moment in this performance when one of the musicians becomes cognizant of a palpable vacuum, an interactional breakdown that demands a responsive effort at repair. The vacuum evinces a strong attentional pull that compels a response by the pianist, who feels morally responsible to fill the role of soloist left open by the sax player, who did not initiate his solo as expected.

Performing Music in the Jazz Classroom: Documenting the Black Aesthetic

Four times between 2002 and 2011, legendary jazz guitarist Kenny Burrell and linguistic anthropologist Alessandro Duranti, who are both faculty members at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), taught a course for juniors and seniors entitled the Culture of Jazz Aesthetics (CJA).[4] During the first half of most class sessions, a small group of jazz musicians invited by Burrell would play for the students, and after their performance, the guests would engage in an unstructured Q&A session. The questions addressed the topic of the day (e.g., the great soloists, the role of the rhythm section, arranging, records that became influential, the future of jazz) and whatever else emerged in the interaction or seemed relevant to the theme of jazz aesthetics as a cultural tradition. The classroom, located on the first floor of Schoenberg Hall, was equipped with a grand piano, a record player, and music stands, which the students often used as desks. The classroom was spacious enough to include an entire drum set, which allowed for a jazz combo of four to six musicians to play together.

Even though a classroom might at first seem to be a far cry from the settings where jazz performances usually occur, what ended up happening each week closely resembled other settings where jazz is played, either privately or in front of a paying audience. In most weeks, the topic of the class was defined broadly, and the guest musicians were familiar with each other, making the musical interactions in the course similar to those of a jam session. Spontaneous and unrehearsed, the musicians' performances were typical of jazz practice, which celebrates the creativity that emerges out of the partly unpredictable circumstances of improvised music. The high level of musicianship of the artists invited by Burrell ensured that each performance was an example of the kind of interactional imagination that the instructors wanted the students to experience.

Over the four times that the course was offered, more than forty musicians participated as experts and guest artists, and some of them appeared more than once. Excluding guests who were students in the UCLA Jazz Program, a total of twenty-five musicians performed in the class.[5] Most of these musicians were instructors in the UCLA Jazz Program or had taught there in the past. With the exception of one musician, all of the guests performed, including a singer and a dancer.[6] The guests were ethnically diverse and ranged in age from their twenties (Miles Mosley) to their eighties (Gerald Wiggins, Gerald Wilson). Fifteen of the professional guest musicians were African American, six were white, and three were Hispanic. There was less gender diversity, with only three women out of twenty-four guests: a vocalist (Barbara Morrison), a violinist (Lesa Terry), and an arranger, pianist, and vocalist (Michele Weir). The guests were highly talented

musicians and, by and large, had played or recorded with Burrell. All had local or international reputations. The group of students in the Jazz Program, who were all college age, showed a different demographic, with fewer African Americans, some Asian Americans, and more whites. The gender disparity, however, remained. There were very few women in the Jazz Studies Program between 2002 and 2011.

Throughout the life of the course, Burrell treated jazz as a very broad category and emphasized its connection to a wider "black aesthetic," out of which came a great variety of styles. In this view, jazz is a lasting, hybrid, and ever-evolving musical tradition that includes not only forms typically seen as jazz subgenres (e.g., bebop, hard bop, and modal jazz) but also many other forms of American popular music. Viewing jazz in this way had significant aesthetic and political implications, and this perspective was made explicit early in the course's history. For example, when the anthropologist of music Maureen Mahon spoke in the CJA course in October of 2002, she mentioned that before the commercial success of the band Living Colour, the musicians in that group, who were African American, had been told by music producers that they should stick to jazz or to rhythm and blues (see Mahon 2004). To illustrate Living Colour's music, Mahon showed two video clips: one of B. B. King playing "Why I Sing the Blues" and the other of Living Colour playing the same song. In the discussion that followed, Burrell used the two renditions of the same song to lay out his vision of the relationship between jazz and popular music:

> What [the members of Living Colour] were doing is something that has developed with them as African-Americans through their life, through their community, through their neighborhood, through their friends, through their family; which is something some of us loosely call "the black aesthetic," which is part of a subculture which exists in this society, which fosters ... most of the new genres of music which you hear—the latest being hip-hop, rap, etcetera, but [also] jazz and all of its forms, and rock.... That is part of the thing that grows out from the community. It grows out naturally.... There are many reasons for it. Part of it is survival ..., but it's really a means of expression of a certain group of people from the United States that has helped them survive and has helped them communicate with each other.... Jazz is a part of it. Jazz ... has been at the forefront of this, not only of this cultural phenomenon ... this black aesthetic, this music from the African-American [community] but of the American music; therefore since we're the most influential in the world, of the world music, jazz is still in the forefront.[7]

Burrell's vision of the black aesthetic and ideas about the nature of musical genre shaped his understanding of jazz, and this perspective was an essential part of the course. For example, Burrell was highly critical of the use of narrow genre labels in the music industry, which he felt artificially separated musicians who were influenced by each other or who drew inspiration from the same musical sources and which diminish the role that African Americans have played in music the world over. In his own practice, Burrell generally avoided such labels, with the exception of the word "bebop," which he occasionally used in commercial clubs to describe one or more tunes he had just played with his band. In the first decade of the twentieth century and in light of Burrell's own vast discography,[8] his use of the term "bebop" must be understood as covering a much broader spectrum of tunes, harmonies, rhythms, and arrangements than those associated with the original bebop style created by Dizzy Gillespie and Charlie Parker in the 1940s.[9] As a cohost and often a coperformer in the CJA, Burrell's musical choices and style certainly played a role in the kind of music that was played in the course, but there was also considerable variation among the performances of the individual players and from one group to the next. In most cases, the choices of tunes and the styles in which they were performed were dictated by the theme of the week. Some tunes were played in a style that was meant to honor the musicians who made them famous through their recordings and live concerts (Day 2000, 101).

A Performance of "Softly"

On April 25, 2006, five musicians served as guest artists in the CJA class. Four of them were professionals with long and successful careers: Michael Melvoin (piano), George Bohanon (trombone), Jeff Clayton (alto sax), and Clayton Cameron (drums). The fifth musician was Noah Garabedian (standup bass), a student in the Jazz Program who was taking the course for credit. He had been asked at the last moment by Burrell to substitute for a professional musician and instructor who was not available (Roberto Miranda). In combination with other musicians, all five players had been guests in the course once or twice before. As usual, Burrell brought his guitar to class, which signaled his willingness to play and take on the roles of co-instructor and guest artist. On the day in question, the guest musicians and Burrell played three well-known standards—"Softly"; an untitled, improvised blues song started by Burrell; and Dizzy Gillespie's "A Night in Tunisia." Each performance was followed by an extensive Q&A.

Selecting the Song to Play and Agreeing on Its Key

Before they can start to perform, jazz musicians who do not have a list of songs or repertory that they regularly play together must collectively decide which song they will play. As Robert Faulkner and Howard Becker (2009) have pointed out, this is a socially complicated affair because knowledge of the vast jazz repertoire is unequally distributed among jazz players. Further, when an audience is present, there is pressure on the musicians to quickly come to an agreement about which song to play next. When a song is chosen, some of the players may not remember all of the song's parts, or they may be unfamiliar with the recorded version of the piece or the standard arrangements that others know, perform, or merely hint at. The fact that some musicians may be willing to play a tune that they do not know well and the fact that others might see no problem in imposing their song choice on everyone else in the ensemble illustrate how chance, risk, and unequal decision-making authority are constitutive of jazz as a joint activity—even before a single note is played. Given the ever-present risk that something could go wrong and the song could fall apart before the musicians even get started, calling out and initiating a potentially unfamiliar song involves a particular kind of Aristotelian-like courage, a willingness to put oneself at risk in an effort to pursue a great good—the enactment of a virtuosic improvised piece.

Like other performances in CJA, the choice of "Softly" on April 25, 2006, was made on the spot and with minimal negotiation. While the audience was waiting to hear the musicians play, Burrell asked, almost in a whisper, "What should we do?" Trombone player Bohanon answered, "Softly." Burrell immediately played the first few notes of the tune on his guitar, while student bass player Garabedian repeated the title of the song with a smile and a nod, thereby showing his satisfaction with the choice. Burrell's next question was "What key is that in?" Garabedian answered right away: "C minor." The volume of the exchange was so low that Bohanon had to repeat "C minor" and Burrell had, in turn, to repeat the title and key for pianist Melvoin, who had signaled the need to be informed by placing a cupped hand behind his right ear (see Video Frame 1).[10]

Video Frame 1.

Pianist Mike Melvoin cups his hand around his ear to gesture for clarification about the title and key of the first song (UCLA Office of Instructional Development, April 25, 2006).

These quick exchanges, which were not intended to be heard by the audience, are typical of the cultural tradition of jazz and illustrate the informal ways in which jazz musicians establish a common ground before playing as an ensemble. It was especially important in this case for the two players of the chordal instruments (guitar and piano) to know not only the title of the song but also the key in which to play it. While Burrell and Bohanon seemed concerned with finding a tune that was known by the student bassist (Garabedian), they did not turn to consult the alto sax player (Clayton) or the drummer (Cameron), who merely overheard the exchange. We interpret this apparent exclusion as an implicit vote of confidence toward two professional musicians who could be expected either to be familiar with "Softly" or to have the musical competence required to participate in its performance even if they didn't know it.

The Business of Starting and Establishing the Tempo

In the absence of a conductor, the members of a jazz combo need a way to coordinate when and how to start the tune and to agree about the tempo at which to play it. In most cases, both goals can be achieved by having someone "count in time" according to the time signature of the song. In the case of "Softly," which is in 4/4 time, one performer would count, "One. Two. One-two-three-four" (with the first "one" and "two" counted on the first and third beats, respectively). Another way of starting a group performance is for one musician to play a few measures of music that are harmonically related to the song or melodically similar to its tune. These measures not only establish the tempo of the performance but also suggest a particular rhythmic feel for the song. They are also a practical device to let the other members of the band get ready and enter the song "on time" and "in time." This is what happened during the April 25 performance: pianist Melvoin played some ad lib chords and melodic lines that morphed into an in-tempo and harmonically appropriate introduction to "Softly." During the Q&A that followed the performance, Bohanon, who was at the time an instructor in the Jazz Program, spelled out for the students the implications of Melvoin's decision:

> Excerpt 1 (CJA April 25, 2006)

> **Bohanon;** Michael [Melvoin] started on a wonderful, you know, solo piano intro which we didn't know how he was going to get into this tune. But then we heard a ((*imitating with the voice the rhythm and timbre of the piano*)) "humpf bum bu:m. bu:m bum" that was a pulse that made us- that introduced the tempo of the tune. you know, we didn't have to say "how fast are we going to play? Let's play- ..." it was automatic. he set the tempo not the drummer. ((*pointing and looking at drummer behind him*)) because here again is another rhythm instrument ((*pointing to the piano*)) that's able to set the pulse and the mood for what we were going to play.

In praising Melvoin's playing, Bohanon's phrase "it was automatic" proudly expresses the ease with which he and the other players could hear and immediately adapt to the rhythm and tempo established by the piano player. The phrase also makes it known that there is a cultural category—and, with it, a cultural convention—of "a solo piano intro" (i.e., an introduction played and improvised on the piano), which has a particular cultural function. If we "bracket" and momentarily "suspend" (Husserl [1913] 1931, §31–32) our natural acceptance of Bohanon's claim that "it was automatic" for him and the other players to hear and immediately adapt to the rhythm and tempo established by the piano player, we can then ask what makes possible the recognition of what Melvoin is playing as an introduction to "Softly." In so doing, we can come to recognize this practice as an invitation to coordinate around a particular tempo and rhythm. One answer to the question of what makes this recognition possible is found in Pierre Bourdieu's notion of the *habitus*, a concept most notably applied to music by sociologist François Dortier. Explaining in musical terms Bourdieu's famous definition of habitus as "structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures" (Bourdieu [1972] 1977), Dortier writes that "it is only after having internalized musical codes and constraints (the '*structured structures*') that a pianist can then compose, create, invent, and transmit her music (the '*structuring structures*')" (2002, 5). As we show later, there is plenty of evidence of a musical habitus being involved in this act of signaling by the pianist and of its recognition by the other players.

Our multicamera audio-visual recording of the performance of "Softly" allows us to further refine Dortier's Bourdieusian account by identifying the embodied and interactive quality of the musicians' habitus. In addition to the internalized musical competence that the musicians utilize (what Alfred Schutz [1945, 87] would call the "stock of knowledge at hand with all its hidden social references"), the video recordings also show that the players are making selective use of both aural and visual communication to coordinate their actions. As Melvoin begins playing, we see him looking down at his fingers and the keyboard. During this phase, most of the other musicians can be seen looking at him and displaying a "waiting" posture (Video Frame 2).

Video Frame 2.

Musicians looking at pianist Mike Melvoin while he plays a solo introduction to “Softly, as in a Morning Sunrise”

(UCLA Office of Instructional Development, April 25, 2006).

After a few seconds, we can see Melvoin lift his head and look at Bohanon, who is right in front of him (Video Frame 3).

Video Frame 3.

Pianist Mike Melvoin looks up at trombonist George Bohanon

(UCLA Office of Instructional Development, April 25, 2006).

Bohanon then lowers his head in a subtle nod, looks away, lifts up his trombone, and then brings the mouthpiece close to his lips (Video Frame 4). At the same time, Burrell moves to the front of the stage, while Garabedian shifts from embracing the neck of the standup bass with his arms and stretching his fingers (visible in Video Frame 3) to a ready-to-play posture, with fingers spread above the upper portion of his

bass's neck in the anticipation of a C-minor chord (Video Frame 4). At this point, drummer Clayton Cameron is also ready to start.

Video Frame 4.

Trombone player, bass player, and drummer stand ready to play

(UCLA Office of Instructional Development, April 25, 2006).

The visual documentation of Bohanon, Burrell, Garabedian, and Cameron watching Melvoin and getting in a "ready" posture demonstrates that what Melvoin is doing on the piano—his choice of notes, chords, phrasing, and rhythm—has a high attentional pull for the other players, and their actions can be read as reactions to what they hear him do musically. A key difference between Video Frame 2 and Video Frame 3 is that the latter shows Melvoin while he is shifting from playing ad lib to playing an in-tempo comping part in C minor, which had a rhythmic pattern spread over two measures. Parts such as this are typically recognized by the other musicians as a vamp (i.e., a musical phrase that loops), which gives them time to adjust to the tempo before joining in (see Bohanon's discussion in "Excerpt 1," earlier). In other words, the vamp is used by the other musicians as a guide to enter into the musical flow established by the pianist. The exact time at which each of the players does enter, however, is not fixed or predictable. This is shown in the schematic representation offered in Table 1, which indicates the entry points of the various instruments along the same timeline. The vamp created by Melvoin on the piano is shown here to be made of two sets of four beats, with each beat represented in the table by an "x." The beginning and ending of each vamp unit (4+4 beats) are marked by a double oblique (//xxxx/xxxx//).

Table 1. Schematic Representation of Entry Points by the Different Instruments in the Improvised Introduction to "Softly"

Timeline					
	vamp 1	**vamp 2**	**vamp 3**	**vamp 4**	**melody**
piano	//xxxx/xxxx//	xxxx/xxxx//	xxxx/xxxx//	xxxx/xxxx//	plays chords of song
bass		xxxx//	xxxx/xxxx//	xxxx/xxxx//	plays bass line of song
drums			//xxxx/xxxx//	xxxx/xxxx//	keeps playing same beat
guitar				xx//	plays melody
alto sax				//	plays melody
trombone				//	plays countermelody

As the timeline reproduced for each instrument shows, the other players took Melvoin's introductory vamp as an invitation to come in at their discretion, within certain conventional boundaries. The bass player is the first who joins Melvoin. Starting to play at the beginning of the fourth measure, he shows that he does not need a full repetition of the vamp to know that it will be repeated. The drummer starts two beats later, exactly at the beginning of the third repetition of the vamp. The other three musicians (the two horn players and the guitarist) join in after the fourth repetition of the two-bar vamp and start to play the melody. As they do, the pianist and the bass player shift to the chords of the song, the alto sax and the guitar play the melody in quasi-unison, and the trombone plays a countermelody. When they get to the B section of the song, Bohanon and Clayton shift roles, with Bohanon playing the melody and Clayton playing a countermelody.

The Introduction as an Emergent Improvised Arrangement

When one listens to this rendition of "Softly," it sounds as if the musician's parts had been written and memorized, or at least rehearsed. In fact, the various ways that the six instruments enter the harmonic and melodic space defined by the piano player is an emergent improvised arrangement. Using this term, we do not mean to suggest that the organization and content of this de facto introduction was a *complete* invention, a combination of musical choices and ideas never before heard or played by these or other musicians. On the contrary, several aspects of this type of "setting up," "getting ready," and "getting into" a song are familiar to jazz musicians and their fans, starting from the total number of times the vamp was repeated (four) and the number of measures (also four) that were played between the moment when the drummer joined in and the beginning of the song, which his drum roll had anticipated and suggested. A four-bar introduction is quite common in jazz recordings from the 1940s and 1950s, but its routine character does not guarantee that it will be executed to the satisfaction of the band members and the audience. Like the everyday encounters examined by Goffman (1959, 1967) or the openings of telephone calls studied by Emmanuel Schegloff (1986), the successful performance of song introductions in jazz should not be taken for granted. They are, each time, an achievement. Such achievements are the result of a successful coordinated effort to collectively produce something that could sound, count, and work as an introduction to this particular song for this particular combination of instruments on this particular occasion. Without the right musical experience, a musician might not catch the cue that both establishes the tempo and demarcates a possible starting point for the band's entrances.

The importance of this kind of shared knowledge was made explicit on other occasions by other guest musicians. Before beginning a song in his April 18, 2006, performance in the class, pianist Tamir Hendelman announced, "I'm going to start with a little introduction and then they [bassist Roberto Miranda and drummer Clayton Cameron] are going to come in." After all three had finished playing the song, Duranti asked Miranda and Cameron, "How do you know when you come in [i.e., when it's time for you to start playing], when the introduction is over?" Miranda responded first, pointing out that he and Cameron had identified what Hendelman was playing as the second part of a song they knew. He said that they also heard Hendelman "pedal on the fifth [note] of the scale," a convention based on the "five/one [dominant/tonic] relationship in Western music." By emphasizing the fifth note of the key in which the song is set, this device sets up the expectation of a harmonic resolution, usually to the tonic. In Cameron's words, this device will "lead you back to the beginning of the tune."

The experienced jazz musician's ability to pull off such spontaneous and coordinated arrangements defines their art, and with a high rate of success, the performers make such coordinations look easy. In reality, the musicians are playing something that is unrehearsed and in a wide range of ways is not fully predictable. These unpredictable features include how the piece will start, how it will end (Black 2008, 286–289), and, as we discuss later, who will solo, the order of the solos, and how long each solo will last. Jazz musicians, especially those of Burrell's generation, show considerable pride in being able to coordinate their performance in a way that sounds rehearsed, even though it is not. Such musicians seem eager to underscore the smooth execution of improvised arrangements by making tongue-in-cheek comments. After this performance of "Softly," for example, Burrell said ironically, "Just like we rehearsed it," and after the performance by Hendelman, Miranda, and Cameron, he similarly asked, "Just like you rehearsed it, right?" to which Hendelman replied, "Just like we rehearsed it." On both occasions Burrell waited for the applause to end before making these comments, which suggests that he wanted them to be heard. Such comments suggest a form of aesthetic perfectionism that is different from, but is at least as challenging as, the perfectionism found in music traditions where performance is based on a flawless execution of a score, like Western art music.

In fact, jazz musicians often display a critical stance on written music. This can be attributed to the difficulty of using the Western notational system to capture how jazz music is played (Duranti 2009) and the consequent primacy in the jazz canon of recordings over written scores (Williams 2001; Brackett 2017, 118); however, there are also historical and political dimensions of their defiant attitude toward the musical conventions of the dominant European aesthetic culture. This attitude is supported by the desire among jazz musicians to be treated as equal to those who play music—as beautiful and as complex as it can be—that was written by the celebrated European composers of the past. For jazz musicians, authenticity is not understood as the exact reproduction of an original combination of content and form. Rather, it is the ability to create something that was not imagined ahead of time and yet, once completed, appears to have been planned.

Making something appear "rehearsed" relies on the kind of shared knowledge illustrated earlier, which we refer to as the sonic ground. In each case, there was enough common background in the group to make the musicians comfortable in their respective roles and allow them to enter the sonic space of the song at different moments but still arrive at a common point of convergence. Not limited to the introduction of songs, this type of creative coordination is pervasive in jazz performance. In the next section, we focus on two additional aspects of the sonic ground—the song's "form" and expectations about the sequential organization of the various parts of the song, including turn-taking by the soloists.

The "Form"

Conventions are necessary in all collaborative art forms (Becker 2008). One convention shared by all jazz musicians is the classification of tunes in terms of their harmonic structure, which is organized around the number of different sections, number of measures in each section, and sequence of its chords. In jazz, all of this information is referred to as the song's "form." Once memorized, the form helps musicians improvise and accompany a singer or a soloist.

There are many possible forms in the jazz repertoire (see Berliner 1994, chap. 3). Two of the most common are the twelve-bar blues and a set of song forms organized around a sequence of eight-bar sections, each of which is referred to by letter (an "A" section, a "B" section, and, when needed, a "C" section). In the 1950s and 1960s, free jazz and jazz fusion did away with these conventions, but they continue to be relevant for many contemporary jazz groups, including those that performed in CJA. Organized in a series of eight-bar sections, "Softly, as in a Morning Sunrise" was written by Sigmund Romberg (music) and Oscar Hammerstein (lyrics) for a 1928 operetta entitled *The New Moon*. Like other songs of that period, "Softly" has what jazz musicians refer to as a "thirty-two-bar AABA" form (see Faulkner and Becker 2009, 22–24). In this form, the three A sections are melodically and harmonically similar to one another, and the B section (or bridge) has its own melody and chords.

As an organizing principle of both composition and performance, the form of a song provides the sonic ground to simultaneously link and differentiate the musician's performance and serve the jazz aesthetic. Either developed live in performance or established in advance through a written score or a rehearsal, variations on the form are interpreted as ways to make the song more interesting to an audience and to the other players. In the April 25 performance of "Softly," the shared understanding of the song's AABA form allowed the musicians to make sense of the decisions that were individually and collectively executed, including the sequential organization and duration of the solos.

Sequential Organization of a Jazz Tune: Head, Solos, and Trading Eights

When jazz musicians have not had time to rehearse or agree on an arrangement, the collective performance of a song can usually be expected to be organized in terms of three major sequentially ordered parts. First, the band plays the melody (or "head"), with varying degrees of conformity to the way it was originally written or recorded. (If the tune is a blues song, the melody is repeated twice.) Next come the solos. One after the other, each of the musicians plays an improvised part over the chord changes of the original tune or a modified version of those chords. Sometimes, one or more musicians may choose not to take a solo, and the duration of each solo is measured in terms of how many times the soloist plays through the entire form of the song, which is referred to as a "chorus." Finally, all of the musicians play the head melody and end the song.

The April 25 performance of "Softly" began as usual with the head, followed by all of the musicians except the drummer taking solos, each of which was two choruses (sixty-four measures) long.

Table 2. Order of Solos in April 25, 2006, Performance of "Softly"

1. Trombone (George Bohanon)
2. Piano (Mike Melvoin)
3. Alto sax (Jeff Clayton)
4. Guitar (Kenny Burrell)
5. Bass (Noah Garabedian)

After the sequence of soloists shown in Table 2, the trombonist started to improvise again, but this time he only played for eight measures, instead of the song's full thirty-two measures. When he stopped, drummer Cameron soloed for eight measures while the other members of the band rested. Next, the bass and piano joined in, with the pianist Melvoin improvising some melodic lines for the next set of eight measures. This new round of solos was still built on the AABA form but with each player only improvising for an eight-measure section, a routine called "trading." Trading typically features the drummer alternating solos with each of the other players. If there is no drummer, then the turn-taking goes from one player to the next, always in the sequence established in the first round. The length of the solos that musicians may trade vary from song to song, with four- or eight-bar solos being the most common. These conventions illustrate the importance of musical structure, which is usually represented numerically, for coordinating the jazz ensemble's performance. Jazz musicians are very aware of this. During the Q&A after the performance of "Softly," for example, Cameron stated that "all tunes have structure."

> Excerpt 2 (CJA April 25, 2006)
>
> > **Cameron;** I might take a solo on a [twelve-bar] blues. [The other musicians] may give me twelve bars [to improvise on] or we may do it- break it up in fours but we probably wouldn't do eights. if we did eights then, you know, someone's going to be playing fours you know, because of the number of bars. [...] So just depending on the structure of the tune, it all usually works out mathematically.

In Cameron's explanation, the number of bars that are "traded" depends upon the total number of bars in the song. "Softly" is thirty-two bars long, with each eight-bar sequence corresponding to one of the four sections of the AABA form. The sequence of solos in the trading section is provided in Table 3, where we have also noted the correspondence between each eight-bar solo and its place in the AABA form.

Table 3. Sequential Order of Solos during the "Trading Eights" Portion of "Softly"

1. Trombone (Bohanon) – 8 bars	(A1)
Drums (Cameron) 8 bars	(A2)
2. Piano (Melvoin) – 8 bars	(B)
Drums (Cameron) 8 bars	(A3)
3. Alto sax (Clayton) – 8 bars	(A1)
Drums (Cameron) 8 bars	(A2)
4. Guitar (Burrell) – 8 bars	(B)
Drums (Cameron) 8 bars	(A3)

The "mathematics" of the musical structure is highly symmetrical, which allows for predictable coordination between the musicians and fair distribution of solo time (though drummers and bass players typically take fewer solos than the other musicians). The total number of "eights" that are played adds up to sixty-four measures, which corresponds to twice the thirty-two-bar AABA form (i.e., two choruses). This means that the trading-eights portion of the performance is as long as each of the individual solos. While the two-choruses pattern was not prearranged, the pattern's duration is not accidental. The thirty-two-bar AABA form reproduced itself, or rather, the musicians kept relying on it, individually and collectively. The mathematical, symmetrical recurrence of this structure helps to give the impression of a prearranged and smoothly achieved performance. Another advantage of following the AABA form is that it allows the musicians to know when to start (at the beginning of A1) and when to stop their solo (at the end of A3). In trading, the form remains relevant to each segment. Starting his solo after the second set of eight bars (A2), for example, the pianist is expected to improvise on the chords of the B section, which are different from those of the prior two A sections. Keeping track of the form during this kind of exchange is a basic requirement for jazz improvisation and an important skill for students to quickly master (Berliner 1994, 176–180).

The exploitation of the mathematical side of the form is only one of the ready-made properties of songs that can be used to allow for tight coordination. Just as actors in improv theater build upon the elements of setting and plot established by others earlier in the scene—the well-known "Yes and … " rule (Sawyer 2001)—jazz players may also use an element that was just performed as a model for what to do next. This was revealed by Bohanon when Duranti asked him about how he and the others figured out the order of the solos in the "trading eights" section of the performance.

> Excerpt 3 (CJA April 25, 2006)
>
> > **Duranti;** How did you know what to do- when- when you would go [to start trading eights]?
> > **Bohanon;** well we- we did it the same order as we did our solos. I started my solo [first] so I started the eights [first]. ((*moves forward, gestures with right hand toward the drums*)) And then drummer played eights. ((*Points with right arm and hand back to pianist without looking at him*)) Michael [Melvoin] played second [during the earlier solos] so he'll play eight ((*use hands to mimic playing the piano*)) ((*turns to gesture with open right hand to drummer*)) the drummer played eight. So we just followed ((*makes a rolling gestures with two hands*)) the same sequence.

This logic is schematically represented in Table 4 and constitutes what we might call the *build-on-history model*, which suggests that once something is done during a performance, it can be used as a model for what is done later. In this case, the order of the individual solos becomes a model for the turn-taking in the trading-eights portion of the performance.

Table 4. Order of Solos during the Full-Chorus Solo Section Compared with Order of Solos during "Trading Eights" Section

Solos (2 sets of 32 bars each player)	Trading (8 bars each player)
1. Trombone (Bohanon)	Trombone (Bohanon)
	Drums (Cameron)
2. Piano (Melvoin)	Piano (Melvoin)
	Drums (Cameron)
3. Alto sax (Clayton)	Alto sax (Clayton)
	Drums (Cameron)
4. Guitar (Burrell)	Guitar (Burrell)
	Drums (Cameron)
5. Bass (Garabedian)	

Table 4 reveals something else that was not mentioned in the Q&A—that the bass player did not participate in trading eights. In terms of the social organization of the performance, this is an example of exclusion, and the fact that it seems to be taken for granted by the musicians is a good reason for trying to explain it. There are at least three possible criteria that can be invoked. The first criterion is historical and specific to the instruments involved, with bass players being the band members who tend to take fewer solos than other instruments in a band (unless the bassist is the band leader, such as Ray Brown or Christian McBride). A second is seniority, with the bass player in the April 25 performance being the youngest and least experienced player in the group. The third is structural and involves, again, the form of the song. To let Garabedian solo for eight bars right after Burrell would have caused the band to end up with an extra A section after having completed the AABA form, producing a sequence that would have been "ungrammatical." One effect of this would be that the musicians wouldn't know when to return to the head melody, which is necessary to complete the performance. Further, including Garabedian in the eights would not have resulted in an equal distribution of the traded solos, because after the bass player's first A, there would have been only three more sets of eights left—A2, the bridge, and the final A (A3). This would have meant that another player would have been left out of their second chorus.

Borrowing a term from conversation analysis (Sacks et al. 1974), we could say that the adoption of the AABA form as the reference point for trading eights entails that the end of the last A (A3) is always a possible *transition-relevance place*; here, they could either start another round of trading or go back to playing the melody. Like Sacks et al., we use the word "relevance" to emphasize that after any A3 section, the end of trading is *possible* but not necessary. The question then arises how a decision is made and communicated among the band members. Based on the empirical evidence available in our video recordings, we can say that visual access to the body and face of the other band members plays a key role in allowing the musicians to coordinate their actions. Camera 3 shows that after his eight bars of soloing—and as soon as the drum solo starts—Burrell lifts his head to look and nod in the direction of both Bohanon and Clayton, who is seen

(on Camera 2) to nod back. At first, this suggests that the decision to stop trading eights and return to the head was made by Burrell and accepted by the others. As the host and most senior (and famous) player in the group, one could say that Burrell has the positional authority and personal prestige to make such a decision. But if we take into consideration Goffman's idea that any predictable social arrangement must be re-enacted, we should be cautious in assuming the relevance of the status relations among the players and return to what actually transpired in the video recording.

When we repeatedly watched in slow motion the recording made by Camera 3, we saw that before Burrell looked up from his guitar to signal the return to "the head," Bohanon had *already* slightly lifted his head and turned to look at Burrell. The way he performed these head gestures suggests that he was making known his expectation that a change was likely to occur next, with a return to the head as the most likely option at that point. Thus, what had at first seemed to be Burrell's embodied directive could be reinterpreted as Burrell's *response* to something that had been suggested by Bohanon's look.

Whether one accepts this interpretation or not, it is clear that the musicians achieve their tight coordination by paying close attention to one another and by making their intentions or preference known (and thus relevant) to each other by means of visible gestures or changes of posture. Using Goffman's dramaturgic metaphor of human interaction, we could say that players are performers not only in the traditional sense of that term (people who act in front of and for an audience) but also in the sense that they are socially enacting a set of interactional principles, which thereby become relevant to the ongoing activity. By providing embodied visual cues to each other about what could or should come next, players make the historically sedimented expectations about solo turn-taking—for example, "this is the right duration for trading" or "we are sounding good, let's keep going"—relevant for their coordination with the rest of the band. Under these circumstances, a priori hierarchies based on prestige or seniority may or may not be relevant to the actions of other band members, as projected by subtle gestures and changes of posture. In rapid and nuanced exchanges, the force of the other's "face" may not rise to the level of the ethical imperative posited by Levinas; nevertheless, such glances are often informationally rich enough to suggest one course of action over another.

The Ethics of Jazz "Etiquette"

In this section, we show how an inquiry into a matter of sequential order of the solos turned into a discussion of etiquette in performance. An important concern in the jazz tradition, the phenomenon of etiquette can be used as a testing ground for the notion of face, in both the Goffmanian and Levinasian senses of the term. In evoking the need to show respect, jazz musicians practice a unique sense of etiquette while making choices during performances.

In CJA class, Burrell and Duranti encouraged the students to be curious observers of the performances and actively participate in the Q&A that followed each song. Responding to the students' questions, the musicians told stories about themselves or other jazz performers and gave accounts of the musical choices they had made in the song they had just played. After Bohanon's remarks about the order for trading eights, which we quoted in Excerpt 2 earlier, a student asked a question about visual communication in the performance.

> Excerpt 4 (CJA April 25, 2006)
>
> > **Student;** So you traded ... eights in the same order that you did solos.
> > **Bohanon;** yes.
> > **Student;** so did you- I was trying to see if you guys were <u>eyeing</u> each other.
> > **Bohanon;** ((*shakes his head*)) no.[

> **Student;** Is that how you decided who was going to do a solo?
> **Clayton;** ((*nods*)) We <u>were</u> ... eyeing each other.
> **Student;** okay. ((*laughing*)) ha-ha.
> **Others;** ((*join laughter while Clayton confirms*))
> **Clayton;** ((*overlapping with laughter*)) yes. yes. yes.

This transcript captures a rare moment of disagreement in the interactions among the guest musicians: Bohanon says that they were not eyeing each other, but Clayton immediately and emphatically contradicts him. The difference between their answers went unnoticed in the Q&A, partly because Bohanon quickly adjusted his stance, first by nodding slightly after Clayton's remarks and then by smiling at what has now been taken by the audience as a humorous confession. It turns out that Clayton had a bigger point to make, namely, that "there is an etiquette" to playing jazz.

> Excerpt 5 (CJA April 25, 2006)
>
> > **Clayton;** people think it's intuitive but- but there is a: :- ... a:- ... uhm there is an <u>etiquette.</u> about it. and- and you can step on other people's ... jazz feet....
> > **Students;** ((*laugh*))
> > **Clayton;** if you don't- if you don't follow the <u>rules</u> and pay attention to the etiquette. and then of course you are also allowed to- do whatever you want. so... usually you are very respectful of your musicians=These are great musicians ((*pointing toward the rest of the band*)). so you don't want to just jump out there and say "this is The Jeff Clayton Show." ((*while saying this, he walks forward, mimicking someone who tries to grab all the attention of the audience*))
> > **Students;** ((*laugh*))
> > **Clayton;** that's- that's not what it's about. It's about us playing together so uhm ... so I like to play <u>together</u> I like to be a team player. I like to be a part of what's going on around- all around. uh in the band. so: I- I like to follow the rules and ... do those things ((*nods*))

Once introduced, the term "etiquette" becomes the overall conceptual umbrella for other musicians to talk about the choices that they made during the performance. After Clayton said that one should be respectful of the other musicians and not make the performance into one's own individual show, it is not surprising that Bohanon took the floor again, this time to explain—if not justify—why he played the first solo.

> Excerpt 6 (CJA April 25, 2006)
>
> > **Bohanon;** Another thing to- to- to piggy back on what you asked ... you know ... Jeff [Clayton] played the melody actually first so ... just it would seem ... feasible that if <u>he</u> had the <u>melody</u> I might play the first solo. If I had the melody, he would probably play the first solo. that's just the way ... we think. you know I didn't want to come play the melody then play all the solo, you know, this way we had a variety going on. Everybody would kind of be going around ... and we didn't- we didn't speak about it. we didn't even have to talk about it=but it sort of- it <u>felt</u> right to do it that way. that's usually the <u>ca</u>se ... you know, it's about how does the music <u>feel</u>. Michael [Melvoin] started on a wonderful you know, solo piano intro....

Bohanon's remarks speak to the student's implicit question about whether the musicians needed to look at each other to coordinate their actions while soloing. Bohanon points out that they "didn't speak about" who was going to solo first, and immediately after this passage, he goes on explaining that the musicians also do not need to discuss the tune's tempo. (See the remarks quoted in Excerpt 1, which immediately followed

those of Excerpt 6.) The criterion for the decision about the order of solos is said to be available from the immediately prior interaction: "Jeff [Clayton] played the melody actually first," and therefore, "it would seem … feasible" for Bohanon to solo first. The solo was "feasible" in this context, but it was by no means obvious or certain. In a large number of jazz recordings, the band member who plays the melody also takes the first solo. Further, the statement that "Jeff played the melody" is only partly accurate, as Clayton had only played the melody of the A sections, while Bohanon had played the B section. In addition to suggesting that jazz etiquette expresses the culture's democratic ethos—a debatable claim (Hagberg 2006, 472; Duranti 2009, 21)—Bohanon here is explicit about another criterion for selecting who should solo next: "variety." Both the egalitarian ethos and the variety principle are echoed in Clayton's subsequent account of his decision not to play his solo after Bohanon.

> Excerpt 7 (CJA April 25, 2006)
>
> > **Clayton;** that's very interesting because after George's [Bohanon's] solo, … and after I had already played the melody I felt that I shouldn't play the melody [i.e., not start a solo]. That I should stand down. So Mike Melvoin took the solo after … George. was that true?
> > **Melvoin;** ((*nods*)) hum-hum
> > **Clayton;** yeah.
> > **Melvoin;** and I waited (all those) bars to begin= [
> > **Clayton;** because I thought there was too much horn (going on)

In Excerpt 7, Clayton confirms the relevance of jazz etiquette by saying that he felt that he should not be the next one to improvise because he had just played the original melody. He also provides support for Bohanon's call for "variety" by claiming that he decided to let someone else go next to avoid "too much horn," which also shows concern for an aesthetics of timbre.

What Clayton leaves unsaid is that his choice *not* to play next created a problem for everyone else. This is made explicit in Melvoin's subsequent comments, starting with his implicitly apologetic remark, "and I waited (all those) bars to begin." As shown in Excerpt 8 (which follows the last two turns of Excerpt 7), Melvoin does not expect to solo next and initially looks to Burrell as a possible candidate for the second solo. Once he realizes, however, that Burrell is not starting to solo, Melvoin feels the weight of responsibility upon himself. Here, the musician's etiquette takes an ethical turn. Courage is needed to keep going in the face of the pending unraveling of the song. This unfolding of courage begins with the recognition of "a vacuum" created by Clayton's unexpected decision and continues with the invocation of a collective responsibility toward the music that is being played.

> Excerpt 8 (CJA April 25, 2006)
>
> > **Melvoin;** and I waited (all those) bars to begin= [
> > **Clayton;** because I thought there was too much horn (going on)
> > **Melvoin;** =because like I thought perhaps. Kenny would play the next solo [
> > **Bohanon;** ((*points toward Clayton, then corrects gesture to Burrell*))((Bohanon, Clayton, and Cameron all laugh))
> > **Melvoin;** and I didn't hear (it/him). and like … part of the etiquette is that if- … if a vacuum exists longer than ((*turns to look at Burrell*)) two beats ((*laughs*)) ha-ha.
> > **Melvoin;** ((*to audience*)) you know, we are very very aware … [
> > **Clayton;** (you) jump into it.
> > **Melvoin;** we are all just- we're just playing one music … all of us together. This is just one music not ((*gestures with hand toward others in the band*)) an individual music for each one of us=we are all in this completely together. and- a solo- a solo starts now! and it hasn't started yet and that's two beats in. and so that was my cue that it was my solo …

> **Bohannon;** mh-mh.
> **Clayton;** mh.

We could speculate about why Melvoin would expect Burrell to go next by once again evoking seniority, fame, previous experiences playing together, or other reasons. We could also speculate about why Burrell did *not* go next. We have chosen, instead, to focus on the implications of Melvoin's mention of "a vacuum."

The Vacuum

During a music performance, everyone present—players as well as members of the audience—listens to the same sounds, but not everyone hears them in the same way. What Melvoin, a studio musician with a long list of credits in both jazz and pop music (including participation in the recording of the Beach Boys' famous "Good Vibrations"), hears as a vacuum may have gone unnoticed to the audience, especially because the musicians in the rhythm section continued to play. Melvoin's comments reveal not only this individual player's musical sensibility but also his assumption of responsibility for how the music is being played and how the band performs as a collective enterprise, where the choices of each member reflect on the whole, and vice versa.

In Goffmanian terms, the vacuum that Melvoin hears is potentially face-threatening for him as an individual and for the band as a group. Melvoin's report about having waited to start his solo ("I waited all those bars … ") can be read as a confession of his embarrassment at not having been an attentive band member, while his evocation of etiquette is a way of emphasizing the need to come to the rescue and fill the vacuum with something as quickly as possible. These statements suggest that music performance requires the same kind of impression management that Goffman found in other kinds of public behaviors, where social actors seek to give "an impression of infallibility" (Goffman 1967, 43). But drawing on Levinas's vision of ethics as an exposure to vulnerability, we think that something else is also going on here. Rather than trying to appear infallible, what jazz musicians want to project is the ability to overcome errors by transforming them into challenges to be met. This attitude finds expression in Burrell's comment "Just like we rehearsed it," though this is not meant to be taken literally. The specific ethical virtuosity implicit in this comment lies in the tension between jazz musicians' desire to sound "as if" they rehearsed and their simultaneous introduction of all kinds of variations, impromptu arrangements, and unexpected choices. This means that rather than merely playing something they had rehearsed or memorized, jazz musicians also want to be seen as embracing the risk and fallibility of improvisation (Monson 1996, 154–171; Feurzeig 1997; Klemp et al. 2008). Of course, in performance most audience members do not notice errors and jazz musicians do not draw attention to them. However, this issue is sometimes addressed when musicians are directly questioned.

This was the case, for example, in a 2002 Q&A session that followed guest pianist Gerald Wiggins's masterful performance of the jazz standard "Body and Soul." In the course, Wiggins introduced to the students the concept of "clam," by which he meant "a mistake that you would like to cover up." Asked by Duranti to give an example, Wiggins again began to play the beginning of "Body and Soul," this time inserting altered chords that sounded increasingly distant from the original chords of the song and increasingly discordant. As discussed in Duranti and Burrell (2004), the exercise turned into a test for the other musicians, who were asked to identify exactly at what point a "mistake" could be said to have occurred. After others had identified one clam or another, alto saxophonist Jeff Clayton, who was another guest on that day, rejected the premise of the exercise. Rather than making mistakes, Clayton claimed that Wiggins had done what jazz musicians routinely do:

> We [jazz musicians] play and we play and we play and we paint ourselves … in and out of corners all the time, and so what I just heard from what Gerald [Wiggins] was playing, was … I heard him

> paint himself into a harmonic corner and manage to get out because there was - there was tension, and there was release, so I just thought it was just something else beautiful, he meant to go there.
>
> (Wiggins quoted in Duranti and Burrell 2004, 85)

This experience of hearing "something else beautiful" and of hearing that Wiggins "meant to go there" is precisely what arises in the midst of painting oneself "in and out of corners." It is an existential condition that is virtuous in its acceptance of the risk of exposure and, for that very reason, calls for a virtuosic solution.

Conclusion: Uncharted Futures

In this chapter, we have applied an interactionally informed phenomenological approach to jazz performance to argue that what makes jazz distinct from other kinds of musical traditions is not simply the ubiquity of improvisation but the interactional implications of the uncertainty that improvisation produces. The unplanned arrangements that emerge in the course of the performance are virtuosic solutions to routine problems such as starting a song, establishing a tempo, and providing room for soloists to be creative. At the same time, the inability to know ahead of time exactly who will do what makes players vulnerable to the choices made by others. A case study in the unfolding dynamics of musical collaboration, our analysis of this performance shows how one musician's desire to create sonic and timbral variation created a problem for another musician, who felt responsible for filling what he perceived as an emerging vacuum. Though the problem of the vacuum was overcome almost as soon as it arose, it threatened the collective quality of the performance as a coordinated group effort around a well-known song. Problems like the vacuum occur because jazz musicians subscribe to an aesthetics that is built on being open to risks. Rather than giving off the impression of infallibility—to each other or to the audience—jazz musicians thrive when masterfully coping with contingency of their own making, including what might be heard as an error.

The interactions that occur in jazz are complex, and taken alone, no single theoretical orientation can do justice to them. In this performance of "Softly," the musicians' performance could be interpreted as an example of Goffmanian impression management or the players' Levinasian desire to respect the infinite responsibility toward an individual or collective other. Indeed, both theorists must be evoked because, for jazz musicians, there is a continuous tension between the need for impression management and the ethical imperative to respond to the challenge initiated by others. This tension arises out of, and in turn reinscribes, the open-ended, sedimented, virtuous dispositions such as courage that defined Aristotle's ethics. Because virtuous conduct is fundamentally situated and emergent, the details of social interaction matter, and an awareness of this situation has shaped our research methods. In our discussion, we have been guided by an empirical commitment to documenting what actually happens during a live performance. The simultaneous multicamera view of the various participants allowed us to analyze the interactional articulation of the musicians' embodied dispositions and their reactions to each other's musical production. Mutual aural and visual access constitutes the ground on which both routine and innovative solutions must be found and interpreted. "Jazz etiquette" is, thus, a name for what may appear as subtle moves. We would argue, however, that no matter how small, such moves are always consequential because they are open to aesthetic and ethical evaluation.

Levinas's philosophy can also help us interpret the weight of the educational context where the performance of "Softly" took place. In the classroom setting, the micro-sociality of the face-to-face interactions proceed to a more encompassing and richer sense of musicians' intersubjective attunement. Attuning and adjusting to one another occurs within a thick temporal space that encompasses the jazz musicians' past performances, risky present, and virtuosic, if uncharted, future amidst jazz audiences to

come. In a classroom with expert performers, student musicians, and other students who were not musically educated, what transpired was not simply an ethics of responding to other musicians, but one of teaching nonexperts. This is the kind of teaching that, for Levinas, "comes from the exterior and brings me more than I contain" ([1961] 1969, 51). Indeed, to be taught in a Levinasian sense is to allow oneself to overflow with more than one can contain from the other. To be sure, such situations involve risk. In the context of jazz performance, moments such as the vacuum or the clam are precisely a desirous site to respond to an ethical call and thus to extend and exceed oneself through learning. The jazz musicians experience what Levinas calls the "Desire" to go beyond the routinized stocks of knowledge and open oneself to the other. This Desire continually opens up the excessive dimensions of exposure. As Levinas writes, "in Desire there is no sinking one's teeth into being, no satiety, but an uncharted future before me" ([1961] 1969, 117). In jazz, such uncharted futures include the teaching of others. In the pedagogical context, the ethical potential to respond to the other by exposing oneself to failure serves to instill in learners such ethical virtues, which let the alterity of past jazz performances and current performing overflow unto uncharted futures. This is the nature of the dynamic and intergenerational conversation characterized by an ethics of vulnerability that seeks to rupture the historical precedents, routines, and stocks of knowledge through exposing oneself to the face of the other.

Rather than being limited to the moment when a musician takes a solo, improvisation pervades all corners of the performance. It starts from the first few beats of a pianist's introduction and continues throughout the piece in emergent arrangements and unexpected decisions that, at any moment, may narrow or broaden the possibilities of subsequent actions, reproducing a previous order or shifting to a less predictable soundscape. The combination of an interactional approach with a phenomenologically inspired ethics of alterity reveals how jazz musicians' continuous and mutual auditory and visual monitoring is not just a practical solution for cooperation. Rather, it cultivates virtues and an ethical responsiveness to the temporal unfolding of collective performance before an audience. If, as Arnold Davidson (2016) has argued, improvisation is the form that freedom takes, jazz can be understood as a music that is both designed and realized so that all participants, players and audience alike, can experience freedom, each on their own terms. And with freedom comes responsibility, which starts with the question of how to respond (Lewis 2019, 441). In the interaction we analyzed, Clayton's choice *not* to play at one transition was heard by Melvoin as a call to fill a vacuum. In trying to quickly figure out who might solo next, Melvoin took upon himself the responsibility of the band as a whole and of the jazz tradition as collectively reproduced. In his words, "we are just playing one music ... all of us together. This is just one music not an individual music." In this moment, like others we analyzed in this chapter, the term "jazz etiquette" refers to the ways that the musician simultaneously attends to the aesthetic, ethical, and practical dimensions of the performance. Using ideas from phenomenology to guide an empirical investigation of the players' actions before, during, and after the performance of one song, our analysis uncovers the complex moments where the individual and the collective face mutually inform, support, and give meaning to each other.

Acknowledgments

We express our appreciation to Kenny Burrell and all of the other musicians who, between 2002 and 2011, participated in the Culture of Jazz Aesthetic course and gave permission to be video-recorded during class time or in other contexts. (See note 4 for the names of the guest artists.) Sincere thanks also go the staff of the UCLA Office of Instructional Development and its then director Larry Loher, who generously supported video recording with multiple cameras in the classroom and in concert halls. A number of people collaborated with Duranti to make these video recordings; among them, special thanks go to John Bishop, Steven Black, Paul Connor, Devin Hahn, Jeremy Konner, Heather Loyd, and Dario Mangano. We are also grateful to the many people over the years who helped copy, transcribe, and organize the large corpus of video material from which the examples discussed here are taken. Earlier drafts of this chapter benefitted from detailed comments by Harry Berger, Kati Szego, and an anonymous reviewer. Any errors or misinterpretations of the interactions analyzed in this chapter are solely ours.

Appendix: Transcription Conventions

The excerpts provided in this chapter are based on videotaped interactions of musicians, students, and other participants in the Culture of Jazz Aesthetics (CJA) course. Following standard conventions in discourse and conversation analysis, we have not edited the interviews for content or form. Our goal has been to reproduce as accurately as possible the verbal part of the original interactions, with the understanding that any correction or editing of the original exchanges is likely to alter our ability to assess how, at the time of recording, participants themselves were constructing their utterances and making sense of what was being said or done. To help readers understand the transcripts, we provide here a list of the conventions used in the excerpts.

(1)	the number on the top left corner of the excerpt refers to the sequential place of each example in this chapter
Burrell;	name of speaker is separated from the transcription of talk by a semicolon (;) and one or more spaces
We <u>were</u>	underlining represents emphasis or contrastive stress
last time,	a comma indicates that the phrase ends with a slight rising intonation (e.g., the intonation used when speakers are projecting further talk or more items in a list)
I do.	a period indicates falling intonation, which often suggests the potential for the end of a turn
[	left bracket between two turns indicates the point of overlap between two turns
(him/it)	talk between parentheses indicates the transcriber's uncertainty about what was said
(?)	question marks between parentheses indicate that a portion of talk could not be heard accurately and no guess was possible.
((*laugh*))	information about nonverbal action is surrounded by double parentheses and set in italics
…	three dots indicate an untimed pause
Jeff [Clayton]	text surrounded by square brackets is information that is likely to be understood by participants
[…]	three dots between square brackets mean that a portion of the transcript was left out

References

AllMusic. n.d. “Kenny Burrell | AllMusic Discography.” Accessed August 5, 2020. https://www.allmusic.com/artist/kenny-burrell-mn0000068780/discography.
WorldCat

Aristotle 1944. *Politics*. Translated by H. Rackham. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Aristotle. 1999. *Nicomachean Ethics*. 2nd ed. Translated by Terence Irwin. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Auslander, Philip. 2006. “Musical Personae.” *Drama Review* 50 (1): 100–119.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Balliett, Whitney. 1959. *The Sound of Surprise: 46 Pieces on Jazz*. 1st ed. New York: E. P. Dutton.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Becker, Howard S. 2008. *Art Worlds*. 25th Anniversary ed., updated and expanded. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Berger, Harris M. 1999. *Metal, Rock, and Jazz: Perception and the Phenomenology of Musical Experience*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Berliner, Paul. 1994. *Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Black, Steven P. 2008. “Creativity and Learning Jazz: The Practice of ‘Listening.’” *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 15 (4): 1–17.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Bogen, James. 1987. “Finding an Audience.” *Papers in Pragmatics* 1 (2): 35–65.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1972) 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Brackett, David. 2017. “The Social Aesthetics of Swing in the 1940s. Or the Distribution of the Non-Sensible.” In *Improvisation and Social Aesthetics*, edited by Georgina Born, Eric Lewis, and Will Straw, 113–134. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Carr, Ian. 1998. *Miles Davis: The Definitive Biography*. London: HarperCollins.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Cook, Nicholas. 2017. “Scripting Social Interaction.” In *Improvisation and Social Aesthetics*, edited by Georgina Born, Eric Lewis, and Will Straw, 59–77. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Day, William. 2000. “Knowing as Instancing: Jazz Improvisation and Moral Perfectionism.” *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 58 (2): 99–111.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Davidson, Arnold I. 2016. “Spiritual Exercises, Improvisation, and Moral Perfectionism: With Special Reference to Sonny Rollins.”

In *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Improvisation Studies*, vol. 1, edited by George E. Lewis and Benjamin Piekut, 523–538. New York: Oxford University Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Davis, Miles, and Quincy Troupe. 1989. *Miles: The Autobiography*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Discogs. n.d. "Kenny Burrell | Discography | Discogs." Accessed August 5, 2020. https://www.discogs.com/artist/30184-Kenny-Burrell.
WorldCat

Dortier, Jean-François. 2002. "Les idées pures n'existent pas." In "Pierre Bourdieu" of *Sciences Humaines* 15 (February–March): 3–8.
WorldCat

Duranti, Alessandro. 2009. "L'oralité avec impertinence: Ambivalence par rapport à l'écrit chez les orateurs samoans et les musiciens de jazz américaines." *L'Homme* 189: 23–47.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Duranti, Alessandro. 2018. "Jazz pris pour cible et la politique de la reconnaissance artistique." In *Politique et music*, edited by Mariella Pandolfi and Laurence McFalls, 211–234. Montreal: Boreal.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Duranti, Alessandro, and Kenny Burrell. 2004. "Jazz Improvisation: A Search for Hidden Harmonies and a Unique Self." *Ricerche di Psicologia* 27 (3): 71–101.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Faulkner, Robert R., and Howard S. Becker. 2009. *Do You Know … ? The Jazz Repertoire in Action*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Feurzeig, David Kahn. 1997. *Making the Right Mistakes: James P. Johnson, Thelonious Monk, and the Trickster Aesthetic*. PhD diss., Cornell University.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face to Face Behavior*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Hagberg, Garry L. 2006. "Jazz Improvisation: A Mimetic Art?" *Revue internationale de philosophie* 60 (238): 469–485.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Husserl, Edmund. (1913) 1931. *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*. Translated by W. R. Boyce Gibson. New York: Collier.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Husserl, Edmund 2001. *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis. Lectures on Transcendental Logic*. Translated by Anthony J. Steinbock. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Klemp, Nathaniel, Ray McDermott, Jason Duque, Matthew Thibeault, Kimberly Powellet, and Daniel J. Levitin. 2008. "Plans, Takes, and *Mis-Takes*." *Critical Social Studies* 1: 4–21.

Lanigan, Richard L. 1988. “Is Erving Goffman a Phenomenologist?” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 5 (4): 335–345.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Levinas, Emmanuel. (1961) 1969. *Totality and Infinity. An Essay on Exteriority*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Levinas, Emmanuel. (1974) 1998. *Otherwise than Being, or, Beyond Essence*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Lewis, George E. 2019. “Listening for Freedom with Arnold Davidson.” *Critical Inquiry* 45 (Winter): 434–447.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Mahon, Maureen. 2004. *Right to Rock: The Black Rock Coalition and the Cultural Politics of Race*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Mattingly, Cheryl, and C. Jason Throop. 2018. “Anthropology of Ethics.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 47: 475–492.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Monson, Ingrid. 1996. *Saying Something: Jazz Improvisation and Interaction*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Mortensen, Kristian. 2016. “The Body as a Resource for Other-Initiation of Repair: Cupping the Hand Behind the Ear.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 49 (1): 34–57.
Google Scholar WorldCat

O’Dea, Jane. 1993. “Phronesis in Musical Performance.” *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 27 (2): 233–243.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Parsons, Talcott. 1968. “Interaction.” In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, edited by D. L. Sills. New York: Macmillan.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Raffel, Stanley H. 2002. “If Goffman Had Read Levinas.” *Journal of Classical Sociology* 2 (2): 179–202.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Reinholdsson, Peter. 1998. *Making Music Together: An Interactionist Perspective on Small-Group Performance in Jazz*. Studia Musicologica Upsaliensia. Nova Series 14. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. “A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation.” *Language* 50: 696–735.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Sawyer, R. Keith. 2001. *Creating Conversations: Improvisation in Everyday Discourse*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Schegloff, Emmanuel A. 1986. “The Routine as Achievement.” *Human Studies* 9 (2/3): 111–151.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Schutz, Alfred 1945. “Some Leading Concepts of Phenomenology.” *Social Research* 12 (1): 77–97.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Smith, Chris 1998. “A Sense of the Possible: Miles Davis and the Semiotics of Improvised Performance.” In *In the Course of*

Performance: Studies in the World of Musical Improvisation, edited by Bruno Nettl and Melinda Russell, 261–289. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Smith, Gregory W. H. 2005. "Enacted Others: Specifying Goffman's Phenomenological Omissions and Sociological Accomplishments." *Human Studies* 28: 397–415.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Throop, C. Jason. 2003. "Articulating Experience," *Anthropological Theory* 3 (2): 219–241.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Throop, C. Jason, and Alessandro Duranti. 2015. "Attention, Ritual Glitches, and Attentional Pull: The President and the Queen." *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 14 (4): 1055–1082.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Williams, Patrick 2001. "De La Discographie et de son usage. L'œuvre ou la vie?" *L'Homme* 158–159 (April–September): 179–199.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Zigon, Jarrett. 2014. "Attunement and Fidelity: Two Ontological Conditions for Morally Being-in-the-World." *Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology* 42 (1): 16–30.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Notes

1 In a famous passage from the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle describes the situated nature of the virtues: "I refer to moral virtue, for this is concerned with emotions and actions, in which one can have excess or deficiency or a due mean. For example, one can be frightened or bold, feel desire or anger or pity, and experience pleasure and pain in general, either too much or too little, and in both cases wrongly; whereas to feel these feelings at the right time, on the right occasion, towards the right people, for the right purpose and in the right manner, is to feel the best amount of them, which is the mean amount—and the best amount is of course the mark of virtue" (1999, 93).

2 Jazz musicians typically refer to a musical work as a "song" or "tune," even if there is no singer present in a performance. Throughout this chapter, we will use the terms interchangeably.

3 This work is part of a larger project by Duranti on jazz socialization. In this research, performances and interactions among jazz musicians were recorded in a wide range of contexts, including auditions, student concerts, and other courses in the UCLA Jazz Program; club dates featuring Burrell as band leader in Los Angeles; and once, a celebration of Burrell's seventy-fifth birthday at Yoshi's restaurant and nightclub in Oakland, California. Some of the songs performed at Yoshi's were included in the 2007 CD *Kenny Burrell. 75th Birthday Bash Live!*

4 Burrell holds a joint appointment in the Department of Ethnomusicology and the Department of Music. During the period of this research, Burrell was the director of the UCLA Jazz Studies Program, which he founded. Now housed in the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music, the program has recently been renamed "Global Jazz Studies."

5 Between 2002 and 2011 the following professional musicians were guests in the CJA course: Justo Almario, Louie Bellson, George Bohanon, Clayton Cameron, Frank Capp, Billy Childs, Jeff Clayton, Sherman Ferguson, Charlie Harrison, Tamir Hendelman, Hubert Laws, Bennie Maupin, Mike Melvoin, Roberto Miranda, Barbara Morrison, Miles Mosley, Charles Owens, Tom Ranier, Bobby Rodriguez, Lesa Terry, Trevor Ware, Michele Weir, Chester Whitmore, Gerald Wiggins, and Gerald Wilson. Some of these musicians appeared more than once.

6 One of the guests, Bennie Maupin, narrated to the students his development as a jazz musician, including the experience of being hired by Miles Davis to play bass clarinet on *Bitches Brew*, portions of which he commented on while the record played in the background.

7 A French translation of this quote appeared in Duranti (2018, 227–228).

8 See AllMusic (n.d.) and Discogs (n.d.) for listings of Burrell's recordings.

9 The term "post-bop" was suggested by Harris Berger (personal communication) as a way of capturing something of the style or genre in which Burrell and his guests performed "Softly." We recognize that this label might help some readers get some sense of how the song was played. Given the sensitivity of the issue of music genre categorization, we are, however, reluctant to use it in our description without having had a chance to discuss it with the musicians themselves.

10 On the role of the cupped hand gesture in social interaction, see Mortensen (2016).