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JAZZ TAXONOMIES

For some time, scholars have been devising taxonomies by labeling and classifying various types of jazz improvisation. Several labels are now widely familiar: “paraphrase,” “chorus phrase,” “thematic improvisation,” “formalistic improvisation,” and so forth. Writers have occasionally redefined existing labels to suit their individual methodological concerns, and this has given rise to some terminological inconsistencies. The present paper seeks not to evaluate or critique diverse theoretical perspectives, but simply to clarify how certain terms are defined and applied. Much of what follows is familiar disciplinary territory; the principal authors to be discussed – André Hodeir, Gunther Schuller, Thomas Owens, Barry Kernfeld, and Henry Martin – are among the field’s major contributors. By considering their work in chronological order, we can trace how some of contemporary jazz theory’s basic terms and concepts have evolved.

Paraphrase/chorus phrase: Hodeir’s dichotomy

Two types of phrase exist side by side in jazz, just as in European music; one might be called theme phrase and the other variation phrase. They can hardly be confused, for their rhythmic equilibrium is not the same. The theme phrase is more stripped, less diffuse, because it has less ornament than the variation phrase. The latter may be subdivided into two principal types, the paraphrase and the chorus phrase. The first retains definite melodic affinities with the theme phrase from which it springs; the second, which is a kind of free variation, gets away from it completely. [original emphasis]

In his well-known statement classifying jazz improvisations, André Hodeir refers to a solo melody as a “phrase.” His term “theme phrase,” while defined rather elliptically, basically describes a performer’s minimally altered realization of a pre-existent (composed) melody. Its complement is the “variation phrase” – the improvised solo. Hodeir’s twofold division of the variation phrase is among his most influential contributions to jazz theory. Using tenor saxophonist Coleman Hawkins’s 1939 recording of “Body and Soul” as an illustration, he writes that Hawkins’s first chorus exemplifies a “paraphrase” – “the main notes of the melody clearly correspond to those of the theme” – and the saxophonist’s second chorus represents a “chorus phrase” – “the only thing the theme and the variation have in common is the harmonic foundation.”

Because a paraphrase will, de facto, conform to an underlying harmonic structure just as a chorus phrase does, the two differ only in their degree of divergence from the pre-existent melody. Like most subsequent authors, Hodeir’s criteria for identification are ad hoc; he offers no strict, objective guidelines as to how closely an improvisation’s notes need correspond to a pre-existent melody in order to qualify as a paraphrase.

The paraphrase/chorus phrase binarism also has a performer-oriented aspect, since, in addition to his purely external observations, Hodeir speculates about the improviser’s creative process. He implies that a paraphrase improvisation resembles a pre-existent melody because the performer uses this melody as a guide – the solo is conceptually derived from the melody. Conversely, if the solo is based solely on a harmonic structure, presumably its melodic content otherwise emerges from the performer’s imagination, or at least from any source besides the pre-existent melody. Hodeir evinces his theory’s performer-oriented component when he writes that a chorus phrase improvisation “looks like a variation, but it does not arise directly from any melodic theme” (emphasis added). He even uses an organic metaphor in likening a harmonic structure to a “humus,” which produces a “melodic flower.”

Schuller’s conception of “thematic improvisation,” generally defined

There is now a tendency among a number of jazz musicians to bring thematic (or motivic) and structural unity into improvisation.

Gunther Schuller begins his oft-cited 1958 article on tenor saxophonist Sonny Rollins by restating Hodeir’s distinction, and confining his own scope to the chorus phrase category. He underscores the performer-oriented dimension of Hodeir’s scheme, citing the earlier author’s explanation that “freed from all melodic and structural obligation, the chorus phrase improvisation is a simple emanation inspired by a given harmonic sequence” (emphasis added). Schuller sees Rollins’s playing as a notable exception to the criticism that “the average improvisation is mostly a stringing together of unrelated ideas.” Interestingly, while Schuller regards this customary situation negatively (though he concedes it “is not altogether deplorable”), Hodeir, to the contrary, favorably considers...
it one of the genre’s “most original” contributions to music: “[the chorus phrase] exploits no given figure. It includes no repeats. The only thing it sticks to are the basic construction and the harmonic foundation from which it springs. This freedom is what makes us prefer it to jazz’s other forms of melodic expression.”

Schuller never unequivocally defines his article’s titular term, “thematic improvisation.” Still, we can infer an approximate meaning from the quotation reproduced above, or from his statement that, in Rollins’s playing, “thematic and structural unity have at last achieved the importance in pure improvisation that elements such as swing, melodic conception, and originality of expression have already enjoyed for many years.” Unlike Hodeir’s categories, “thematic improvisation’s” defining characteristic – its unity – appears not to hinge on its conceptual derivation (i. e. whether it “arises from” a pre-existent melody, or only a harmonic structure). Instead, unity is measured solely with respect to a piece’s internal organization. Schuller illustrates that Rollins unifies his improvisation on the theme “Blue 7” by subjecting melodic figures to developmental procedures (which are described by terms like “evolves,” “reworks,” “combining,” and “overlapping”). The conceptual derivation of the figures in question seems to be of lesser relevance.

In the quotation given above, Schuller mentions three sorts of unity: “thematic,” “motivic,” and “structural.” While the latter category refers generally to a piece’s internal, autonomous structure, the first two terms have no fixed, conventional meanings. Schuller calls relationships between an improvisation and its pre-existent melody “thematic.” But he labels diverse melodic fragments “motives,” regardless of whether they are linked to the pre-existent melody. Accordingly, Schuller discusses several instances of structural unity involving improvised motives that are unrelated to the pre-existent melody (head) of “Blue 7” (for instance the motive shown in his Example 2 is identified as “an adjunct to the twelve-bar theme” which Rollins evidently adds extemporaneously). Likewise, Schuller notes that drummer Max Roach’s solo on the same recording has a “high level of structural cohesiveness” due to its being “built entirely on two clearly discernable ideas,” both dissimilar to the head.14

Schiller’s conception of “thematic improvisation,” strictly defined

What Sonny Rollins has added conclusively to the scope of jazz improvisation is the idea of developing and varying a main theme, and not just a secondary motive or phrase which the player happens to hit upon in the course of his improvisation and which in itself is unrelated to the “head” of the composition.15 [Original emphasis]

In contrast to much of his commentary, Schuller’s summary remarks advance a narrower concept of thematic improvisation, limited to solos displaying relationships to a pre-existent melody. In this stricter sense, thematic improvisation, though Schuller deems it a subset of Hodeir’s chorus phrase category, shares an essential attribute with the latter’s concept of paraphrase: both are related to the head (the distinction will be addressed below). Still, what Schuller values above all is structural unity in itself. While thematic improvisation in the stricter sense involves an additional sort of unity (that is, between the improvisation and the head, as well as within the improvisation), he never confines it exclusively to this definition.

Owens’s view of jazz improvisation

Every mature jazz musician develops a repertory of motives and phrases which he uses in the course of his improvisations. His “spontaneous” performances are actually precomposed to some extent. Yet the master player will seldom, if ever, repeat a solo verbatim; instead he will continually find new ways to reshape, combine, and phrase his well-practiced ideas. An awareness of these melodic ideas allows the listener to follow a solo with great insight into the creative process taking place.16

The pivotal insight of Thomas Owens’s 1974 dissertation on alto saxophonist Charlie Parker is that jazz musicians reuse various melodic units in separate improvisations. Though they are now usually called “formulas,” Owens originally labeled these units “motives” (he adopts the current standard term in a more recent work).17 He therefore uses the term “motive” in a more restricted sense than Schuller, for whom it can denote any given musical unit (particularly one that recurs within a single piece). Since motives (formulas), according to Owens, are usually heard during harmonic (chorus phrase) improvisation, they constitute a possible source for melodic material which – unlike Hodeir’s paraphrase improvisation or Schuller’s thematic improvisation (in the stricter sense) – is not based on a head.

Tretter’s application of Lord’s theory to music

If the singer has accumulated a repertory of standard formulas, each serves him when his knowledge of theme and formulaic system calls for a phrase of its characteristics. They belong to the complex of habits and associations that enable the singer to compose at high speed. Lord has put it that “they emerge like trained reflexes.” But this is not to say that
the technique of oral composition depends on the singer’s retention of a stock of standard formulas which he strings together. The formulaic analysis of an oral poem is a matter, not of making a count of recurrent phrases, but of identifying the formulaic systems that regulate the verses of the poem.19

Albert Lord formulated his influential theory of oral poetry after observing modern Serbo-Croatian practitioners. He concluded that “the singer’s mode of composition is dictated by the demands of performance at high speed, and he depends upon inculcated habit and association of sounds, words, phrases, and lines.”20 These “sounds, words” and so forth clearly mirror Owens’s description of a jazz improviser’s “repertory of motives and phrases.”21 Lord called a singer’s habitual phrases “formulas,” crediting his teacher Milman Parry with having originated this use of the term.22

Leo Treitler, the first scholar to apply Lord’s theory to music, theorizes about the transmission of Gregorian chant melodies prior to the invention of musical notation. But while Owens concentrates on identifying and enumerating recurrent motives (formulas) in Parker’s improvisations, Treitler focuses instead on the underlying “formulaic systems” that govern non-literate musical performances.23 Arguing that “we require an understanding of oral transmission as a normal practice whose object and effect is to preserve traditions, not to play loose with them,” Treitler likens an improviser’s use of a formulaic system to “elaboration and variation upon a Grundgestalt.”24

Treitler is less concerned with dissimilarities between separate versions of chant melodies than with the conceptual musical models—common to independent realizations of a given chant— that remain unaltered when transmitted between performers. In other words, Treitler is interested in the “chant itself,” embodied by those musical features that performers reproduce consistently, and not the unique variations associated with any specific rendition. In contrast, Owens focuses on Parker’s individual mode of spontaneous expression, rather than the invariant harmonic structures that provided a Grundgestalt for the saxophonist’s “elaboration[s] and variation[s].” Most subsequent applications of Lord’s theory to jazz favor Owens’s perspective—they concentrate on identifying a performer’s habitual formulas, and analyzing their use.25

Kernfeld’s revised scheme

For the purposes of description [jazz improvisations] may be regarded as falling roughly into three categories, though in practice a player may use several or even all in the course of a single improvisation, often overlaying one with another. Paraphrase improvisation is the ornamental variation of a theme or some part of it, which remains recognizable. Formulaic improvisation is the building of new material from a diverse body of fragmentary ideas (either in response to a theme or independently). And motivic improvisation is the building of new material through the development of a single fragmentary idea (again either in response to a theme or independently).26

Barry Kernfeld’s 1981 dissertation consolidates several of the above authors’ categories into a four-part taxonomy. Categories (1) and (2) restate Hodeir’s original typological distinction. Category (4) simply applies a name to the procedure Owens discusses: “formulaic improvisation.”

Category (3), “motivic improvisation,” draws on the work of Schuller and other theorists who valorize structural coherence (which Kernfeld characterizes as “association of musical ideas,” “continuity of development,” and “relation of linear process”).27 Kernfeld notes that previous authors have employed discrepant definitions of “motive” and “formula,” and that a strict, yet practical, definition of either has proven elusive (he offers no rigorous solution, preferring a flexible approach).28 Whereas Owens initially used “motive” synonymously with “formula” in the latter term’s presently accepted sense, Kernfeld opts for “a definition of motive that exaggerates the contrast to formula.”29 Furthermore, for Kernfeld, motivic improvisation does not necessarily involve structural connections between an improvisation and its pre-existent head. In this respect, it differs from Schuller’s (tighter) concept of thematic improvisation. Instead, Kernfeld subscribes to Ekkehard Jost’s view of motivic improvisation as a process of “motivic chain-association” in which “one idea grows from another.”30 “Motivic improvisation” therefore refers to any improvisation containing musical units that undergo variation procedures. The musical units (motives) in question need to be derived neither from the head nor an improviser’s formulaic repertory; evidently, they may be invented spontaneously.

Kernfeld’s four-part taxonomy

(1) Paraphrase improvisation: A pre-existent melody recognizably shapes pitch selection, rhythm, and contour.
(2) Chorus phrase improvisation: Primarily harmony and harmonic rhythm shape pitch selection.
Modal Improvisation. Performances may also be analyzed in terms that cut across the categories already drawn ... The defining characteristic of modal improvisation is that it explores the melodic and harmonic possibilities of a collection of pitches, often corresponding to one of the ecclesiastical modes.... [A] typical feature of modal improvisation is ... harmonic stasis.32

Kernfeld’s *New Grove Dictionary of Jazz* entry, “Improvisation,” discards the chorus phrase label, probably because formulaic and motivic improvisation are both essentially subsets of Hodeir’s broader category. He also modifies his definitions of formulaic and motivic improvisation, expanding each to allow for relationships to the theme (pre-existent melody). This serves to explicitly align motivic improvisation with Schuller’s more general concept of thematic improvisation, in which musical units that undergo developmental procedures may or may not be related to a pre-existent melody. That formulaic improvisation might also be related to the head is, until now, an unmentioned possibility. But it seems quite probable that an improviser’s musical formulas (either individually or in combination) may, on occasion, resemble parts of the head, whether by happenstance or conscious intent.33

In his earlier study, Kernfeld formulates his categories quite rigidly. Here he is more flexible, stressing that the three categories (paraphrase, motivic, and formulaic) are not discrete, but that “two or more may be in operation within a single improvisation, often simultaneously.”34

Though Kernfeld addresses modal improvisation substantively in his earlier work, only in his *Grove* article does he elevate it to a new category alongside the three retained from his original taxonomy. “Modal improvisation” is, however, distinct from the other labels in that it describes an improvised passage’s overall pitch content. Unlike Kernfeld’s remaining terms (and all the other labels discussed in this paper), it does not identify an improvisation’s conceptual origin (head, repertory of formulas, or newly invented material), nor structural relationships within the solo, or between the solo and the head. (In a more recent publication Kernfeld contends that modal improvisation is especially conducive to motivic improvisation because its “static harmony affords an opportunity for an improviser to state and vary motives, a task that ... is not easily taken up in the context of conventional jazz harmony.”35)

Martin’s revision of Kernfeld’s original taxonomy

(1) The paraphrase improvisation. Here the solo is clearly an embellishment of the original melody. This is conceptually the least problematic.

(2) The chorus phrase improvisation. The solo in this instance follows the form and harmony of the original melody, but is not based on its motives.

(3) Motivic improvisation. The solo is fashioned from motivic references heard in the original melody.

(4) Formulaic improvisation. The solo repeats melodic ideas heard in other improvisations. Persistently recurring ideas are called “formulas.”36

Before positing an alternative taxonomy, Henry Martin restates, and subtly revises, Kernfeld’s original four-part scheme. While Kernfeld’s later writings present the categories as potentially overlapping, Martin regards them as largely discrete. Martin’s most significant revision is to limit motivic improvisation to solos with discernible relationships to the pre-existent melody. This reorients Kernfeld’s original definition, which privileged structural connections between elements of the improvisation itself, but without necessary relationships to the head. Martin’s notion of motivic improvisation is in this respect closer to Schuller’s thematic improvisation in its stricter sense. By viewing chorus phrase improvisation as unrelated to the original melody—“not based on its motives”—Martin casts it as a more limited remainder category.37 Yet he still evidently allows that chorus phrase improvisation—containing neither paraphrases of the pre-existent melody nor “motivic references” to that melody—may include developmental procedures akin to Kernfeld’s original definition of motivic improvisation (or Schuller’s more general conception of thematic improvisation).

Martin’s three-part taxonomy

(1) Paraphrase improvisation: obvious relationship to the head in which the underlying melody is accounted for much of the time; more simply, embellishment.

(2) Thematic improvisation: relationship to the head, which at some times may be clearly discernable, but at other times more abstruse.

(3) Harmonic improvisation: the melodic qualities of the head do not seem to affect the solo motivically.

... Use of formula by the improviser is common to all three types of improvisation.38

Martin proposes a new, three-part taxonomy, geared toward a specific analytical concern: connections between an improvised solo and its pre-existent melody. His first category leaves Hodeir’s definition of paraphrase improvisation basically unaltered: an embellished rendition of the head. The second category,
“thematic improvisation,” also describes a solo-head relationship—in this case the connection is either “clearly discernable” or “more abstruse.” Martin’s “harmonic improvisation” is defined negatively; it describes any improvisation (or part thereof) not readily assignable to either of the other categories.

Martin’s conception of thematic improvisation resembles Schuller’s original view (in its stricter form) insofar as both authors highlight relationships between an improvisation and the head. But Schuller generally draws attention to relationships that are fairly explicit, not abstruse. Martin, taking an exclusively external interpretive perspective, allows for comparatively equivocal structural connections that may be entirely incidental. (The performer’s intent, usually being unverifiable, is deemed of no analytical relevance.39) Martin leaves open the question of how to distinguish thematic improvisation’s “clearly discernable” solo-head relationships from the “obvious relationship” found in paraphrase improvisation. (One potential distinguishing feature may be that in paraphrase improvisation the composed melody’s pitches reappear at or near their original location within the musical form, whereas in thematic improvisation they do not.40 But this means of differentiation is not invoked by Martin, who occasionally identifies pitch connections as “thematic” (rather than paraphrases) even if they satisfy this additional criterion.41)

Martin’s decision to dispense with formulaic improvisation as a separate category—he argues instead that “use of formula...is common to all three types of improvisation”—also reflects his preoccupation with connections to the head. Since, as Kernfeld notes, formulas may resemble the head, they are compatible with both paraphrase and thematic improvisation. (Again, from an external perspective whether such relationships are intentional is immaterial to their analytic significance.) For Martin, if formulas are unrelated to the pre-existent melody, they fall under the category of harmonic improvisation.

Where Martin differs most from writers like Schuller and Kernfeld is in his reduced emphasis on developmental procedures per se, irrespective of the head’s influence. He acknowledges that “my use of the term ‘thematic improvisation’ is broadened from its prevailing use, which refers to development of foreground motives....[1]Improvisation need not be explicitly developmental in order to be considered thematic.”42 On the whole, Martin is concerned even more with an improvisation’s conceptual origin than with its internal organization.

Conclusion

In reviewing the above taxonomies, I have sought to pinpoint each label’s claims regarding a jazz improvisation’s (1) conceptual origin, and (2) structural organization (specifically, whether it exhibits internal unity). Briefly put, Hodeir’s categories are concerned with (1); Schuller’s with (2) in the more general sense and both (1) and (2) in the stricter sense. Formulaic improvisation as conceived by Owens pertains to (1). Kernfeld’s various categories deal with either or both (1) and (2), while Martin’s preferred scheme addresses (1) first and foremost, and (2) secondarily.43

As I see it, there are six basic conceptual sources from which a jazz musician may derive an improvised melody. The first, and most general, is the harmonic structure (“chord changes”) upon which the improvisation is based. In mainstream jazz styles this harmonic structure is usually an obligatory, omnipresent source of reference—it constantly underpins an improvisation, even though the relationship may sometimes be conflicting rather than congruent (such as when a soloist implies harmonic substitutions, or plays “outside” of the pre-set harmonies).44 While, in Kernfeld’s words, the chord changes “shape pitch selection,” they by definition lack any purely melodic content. That is, they present multiple, simultaneous, sequential pitch selections—rather than a monophonic melody—and have no durational content beyond their harmonic rhythm, which is usually heavily tied to the music’s meter.

A jazz musician may derive an improvised melody from any of five further sources. The three most prevalent are a theme’s pre-existent melody (if there is one); the performer’s repertory of formulas; and his or her spontaneous inspiration, which may engender new melodic material, conceived “in the moment.” Admittedly, this last category is disputable; it could be argued that a soloist never truly creates ex nihilo. Still, musicians sometimes speak of a manner of improvising that does not involve formulas or other pre-established elements (other than the chord changes).45 A solo improviser may, usually less frequently, draw upon two additional sources: quotations from other pieces, and figures played by other musicians in the same ensemble (accompanists or other soloists).46 The latter procedure—the use of material initially played by the soloist’s colleagues—is characteristic of interactive collective improvisation. Since they are comparatively rare, for the sake of simplicity these last two phenomena will not be addressed in what follows.

No matter which of the above sources an improviser uses, he or she may additionally employ developmental procedures that create structural unity.47 Given that a theme’s chord changes are obligatory and can thus be taken for granted, we can label types of improvisation according to which of the three other main conceptual sources (pre-existent melody; repertory of formulas; and spontaneous invention) they involve. And we can also distinguish in each case whether or not developmental procedures are evident. This suggests a six-part taxonomy that draws together most of the labels detailed so far:
1) Paraphrase improvisation: derived from the head. Slightly clarifying Hodeir's original definition, this describes an improvised melody that retains pitches from the head at or near their original formal location.

2) Thematic improvisation: derived from the head, but involving developmental procedures that may dissociate fragments of the head from their original formal location. (This more or less corresponds to Schuller's definition in its strict sense.)

3) Formulaic improvisation: derived from the improviser's formulaic repertory. (This retains Kernfeld's label.)

4) Formulaic-motivic improvisation: derived from the improviser's formulas, which undergo developmental procedures. This is a new category, hitherto unacknowledged. Though an improviser's habitual formulas are generally fairly stable in their appearances, they potentially may recur under modification during a given improvisation.

5) Chorus phrase improvisation: derived from spontaneous invention. This label is defined more strictly than Hodeir's original formulation; it more closely resembles Martin's revised definition, but is further restricted to cases which lack developmental procedures. It is thus a smaller category — any non-developmental (non-unified) improvisation that is not based on formulas or the head.

6) Motivic improvisation: derived from spontaneous invention, and involving developmental procedures. This most closely corresponds to Kernfeld's original definition, not Martin's revised version, but it also excludes cases in which developmental procedures are applied to elements of the pre-existent melody (these are considered thematic improvisation).

While these six categories are fairly discrete, in practice the scheme will not entirely obviate ambiguity. For instance, it is still possible that an improviser's formulas may happen to resemble elements of a theme's pre-existent melody, blurring the distinction between categories (1) and (3), and (2) and (4). And I have neither provided strict, objective definitional criteria, nor attempted to quantify such criteria. How free can a paraphrase be while still qualifying as such? Without quantifying developmental procedures, how can we adequately determine the threshold between categories (1) and (2), (3) and (4), or (5) and (6)? These questions remain unanswered.

The field of jazz analysis hardly needs yet another taxonomy, such as the amalgamated six-part scheme presented here. Indeed, to dispense with these sorts of cumbersome labels altogether seems a tempting option. But such theoretical models have proven sufficiently durable that they ought not to be dismissed too hastily. By assessing them as thoroughly as possible, we can better appreciate their merits, as well as their limitations.

### Notes

1 John Brownell, in an article that deals with several of the authors to be considered here, writes that "the cataloguing of phrase types, and the creation of motivic taxonomies has been a preoccupation of many models of jazz improvisation" ("Analytical Models of Jazz Improvisation," *Jazzforschung* 26 (1994), 13).


3 A later formulation by Martin Williams may help to clarify this point. Williams's scheme more or less replicates Hodeir's (though Williams does not cite him). Williams writes: "There are three kinds of variations — those that involve rhythm, which are intrinsic in jazz performances...; those that involve embellishing or paraphrasing a written melody, either decorative or subtracting from it or both; and those that involve the invention of new melodies within a harmonic outline" (*Where's the Melody?: A Listener's Introduction to Jazz* (New York: Pantheon, 1966), 9). Hodeir's "theme phrase" seems to correspond most closely to Williams's first category — variations that involve (only) rhythm. Williams describes such performances as "entailing some changes in the values of the notes and some personal interpretations" (ibid., 10). These alterations create a sensation of "swing" (which Williams acknowledges is an elusive concept: "it is better to hear and feel swing than to attempt to define it" (ibid., 12)). The most reasonable explanation of this category is as an exposition of a pre-existent melody that involves comparatively limited rhythmic modifications (perhaps without adding new pitches), and deviates less extensively from that melody than a "paraphrase."


5 Some jazz improvisers attest that they continually refer ment ally to the pre-existent melody while improvising. For instance, pianist Bill Evans comments that "I sort of feel that the essential melody is always there, exerting an influence. It's there in spirit" (Jim Aikin, "Bill Evans," *Contemporary Keyboard* 6 (June 1980), 54, quoted in Gregory Eugene Smith, "Homer, Gregory, and Bill Evans: The Theory of Formulaic Composition in the Context of Jazz Piano Improvisation," (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1983), 156).

6 Hodeir, *Jazz: Its Evolution and Essence*, 157. Hodeir explores his theory's performer-oriented claims in a chapter entitled "Musical Thought," which affirms that "musical thought has two roads to follow...in jazz—the interpretation of a pre-existing melody or the invention of a new melody" (ibid., 159). Robert Walser has recently critiqued the "discourse of interiority" employed here by Hodeir on the grounds that such "evocations of an inner emotional realm" are historically and culturally contingent adjuncts of post-Enlightenment European notions of artistic autonomy (Walser, "Deep Jazz: Notes on Interiority, Race and Criticism," in *Inventing the Psychological: Towards a Cultural History of Emotional Life in America*, ed. Joel Pflaster and Nancy Schnog (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 272).


8 Hodeir, *Jazz: Its Evolution and Essence*, 144, quoted in Schuller, "Sonny Rollins and the Challenge of Thematic Improvisation," 6. Schuller amends Hodeir's statement by substituting "chorus improvisation" for "chorus phrase." This is probably to obviate any confusion that might arise from the more unconventional location selected by Hodeir's translator.
made the most thorough attempt to construct and apply a precise, unambiguous definition of musical formula in jazz improvisation ("Homer, Gregory, and Bill Evans").


30 Kernfeld, "Improvization," 2nd ed., 321. See also Kernfeld, What to Listen For in Jazz, 146.

31 Such resemblances could be incidental (unintended by the performer) or intentional (a performer might highlight serendipitous similarities between his personal formulas and the theme upon which he improvises). Additionally, a musician might compose a theme based on his formulaic vocabulary, and then improvise upon that theme. Schuller mentions that a melodic fragment from Rollins's theme "Blue 7" that reappears during the saxophonist's solo is also heard on Rollins's earlier recorded solo on another theme, "Vired Blues." This suggests that the melodic fragment in question may be formulaic in origin (Schuller, "Sonny Rollins and the Challenge of Thematic Improvisation," 7 (footnote); discussed in greater detail in Kernfeld "Adderley, Coltrane, and Davis at the Twilight of Bebop," 8-9). (Rollins also plays the same figure during his concluding a cappella cadenza on "Moritat," which, like "Blue 7," appears on the album Saxophone Colossus.)


35 Kernfeld, What to Listen For in Jazz, 150.


37 From Martin's perspective, "formulaic" improvisation may still be a subset of "chorus phrase" improvisation, but the latter is entirely distinct from "motivic improvisation.


39 Ibid., 36-37.

40 On this point, see J. Kent Williams, "Authors' Responses to Forte's Questions." Annual Review of Jazz Studies 9 (1997-98), 104-5.

41 See, for instance, Martin, Charlie Parker and Thematic Improvisation, 45, 47. Here, in mm. A2-3 of Parker's second take of "Red Cross" (Example 3-2), Martin labels a dyadic motive as "thematic," though the pair of pitches in question occur at more or less the same formal location in the composed melody and thus could also conceivably be considered a subtle paraphrase.

42 Martin, Charlie Parker and Thematic Improvisation, 135, n. 4.

43 By characterizing structural unity per se as "secondary" to Martin's scheme, I mean that techniques of thematic improvisation will often, as a matter of course, give a solo self-contained unity. Clearly, multiple references to the head are likely to be interrelated by virtue of their common source.

44 Of course, this paper has not dealt with free improvisation, in which improvisers may not use a fixed harmonic model.

45 For some musicians' statements on this topic, see Paul Berliner, Thinking in Jazz: The Infinite Art of Improvisation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 268-73.
46 In even rarer instances an improviser may be inspired by sounds originating outside of the ensemble altogether, such as audience noises or ambient sounds. These may be loosely grouped with intra-ensemble interactive procedures, since in either case a soloist draws upon literal sounds emanating from external sources.

47 Like many of the concepts discussed in this paper, musical "development" is not easy to define precisely. One general, practical formulation is Arnold Schoenberg's definition of "variation" as "changing a number of a unit's features, while preserving others," leaving unquantified the extent of such changes (Style and Idea: Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg, ed. Leo Stein, trans. Leo Black (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), 287).

48 An additional possibility, not covered by categories (1) and (2), is that an improviser may play a single reference to a theme's pre-existent melody that neither occurs at its original formal location nor undergoes developmental procedures. In this case, the reference functions like a solitary quotation of the theme being performed.

49 On jazz musicians' techniques of modifying pre-established musical ideas (such as formulas), see Berliner, Thinking in Jazz, 184–89.

50 One alternative is a Schenkerian analytical model, which, Steve Larson argues, is preferable to a "misleading" dichotomy between "variations that are based on the melody of the theme and ... variations that are based solely on the harmony of the theme" (in essence, Hodeir's original distinction) ("Swing and Motive in Three Performances by Oscar Peterson," Journal of Music Theory 43/2 (1999), 286).
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JAZZWISSENSCHAFTLICHER KONGRESS 2003 IN GRAZ – EINLADUNG UND PROGRAMM

In diesem Kongress soll unter dem Generalthema „Der Einfluss der europäischen Musik auf die Entstehung und Entwicklung des Jazz (in Amerika und Europa)” der jazzspezifische Stellenwert der europäischen Musiktradition herausgearbeitet werden. Analytische und historische Untersuchungen zur themenrelevanten Rolle der barocken Funktionsharmonik und Melodiegestaltung und des europäischen Diskantierstiles im Allgemeinen, die strukturellen Gestaltungsmittel von Impressionismus und Expressionismus, die Verarbeitung der Tonalität der abendländischen Kunstmusik im Jazz (Emanzipation der Dissonanz), die Annäherung zur europäischen Avantgarde sowie die Relevanz bestimmter Wurzeln in der europäischen Folk-Musik, aber auch Randbereiche wie die Filmusik oder der europäische Schlager stellen Aspekte zu diesem Themenkreis dar. Die Referate werden in einem eigenen Kongressband des Jahrbuches Jazzforschung / Jazz Research (Bd. 36, 2004) publiziert werden.

Ich darf alle Interessierten herzlich einladen, sich aktiv in die Veranstaltung einzubringen und verweise auf das am Samstag, den 5. April, stattfindende Konzert mit den beiden Formationen „Glawischning/Schreiber“ und „Gesing/Rennert/Tang“ sowie auf das nachfolgende Kongressprogramm.