



Program

Author(s): Fabiano Araújo Costa, Vincenzo Caporaletti, Laurent Cugny

Source: *RJMA – Journal of Jazz and Audiotactile Musics Studies*, English Notebook, No. 1, (April) 2018

Published by: Centre de Recherche International sur le Jazz et les Musiques Audiotactiles (CRIJMA), Institut de Recherche en Musicologie (IReMus), Sorbonne Université

Stable URL: <https://www.nakala.fr/nakala/data/11280/cc140a68>

RJMA (*Revue d'études du Jazz et des Musiques Audiotactiles*) is an international multilingual scientific journal whose present first issue is presented in four languages simultaneously (French, Italian, Portuguese and English), through four Sections, or “Cahiers”.

The complete set of “Cahiers” is available online at: <http://www.iremuscns.fr/fr/publications/revue-detudes-du-jazz-et-des-musiques-audiotactiles>.

How to cite this article:

ARAÚJO COSTA, Fabiano, CAPORALETTI, Vincenzo, CUGNY, Laurent, “Program”, translated by Noé Cugny, *RJMA – Journal of Jazz and Audiotactile Musics Studies*, English Notebook, No. 1, CRIJMA – IReMus – Sorbonne Université, (April) 2018, pp. 1-7. Available at: <https://www.nakala.fr/nakala/data/11280/cc140a68>.

Program

Fabiano Araújo Costa, Vincenzo Caporaletti, Laurent Cugny

The establishment of a *Journal of Jazz and Audiotactile Music Studies*, as well as the *Centre de Recherche International sur le Jazz et les Musiques Audiotactiles* (CRIJMA) testifies to the productivity of international exchanges of knowledge and the exposure of diversified musicological and cultural approaches, as well as the modalities of autonomous and independent thought. The idea of RJMA and CRIJMA stemmed from the observation of two interrelated aspects of research in musicology.

The relation between the musical and the cultural

As Vincenzo Caporaletti noted at the beginning of text 1, the inclusion of music within realities that lie well beyond the music strictly speaking comes today as an undeniable fact. What has been coined as New Musicology resulted from a reaction to the long period in musicology during which a certain positivism in musical analysis based on the most prominent medium, musical score ruled as the predominant ideology. This New Musicology took on the task to demonstrate the plurality of issues caused by this approach, and to highlight the potential productivity, widely ignored until then, of comprehending a musical object within larger spheres: social, anthropological, cultural, symbolic, political, etc. This major turn of events has since then flourished into many subdivisions and caused incalculable consequences. Among those, a profound change in hermeneutics and in the standards of extraction of meaning from music (not solely from the written element as it was previously conceived, which is a fundamental shift). With this new understanding, the privileged medium, musical score, and the common practice of its analysis have been put into perspective, if not declared as *personae non gratae* within the field of investigation. Those who continued to value these approaches have been gathered under a separate field, now known as *music theory*, which has been cut off from the now-new musicology field (or *critical* if not *radical*). Though we acknowledge the many products resulting from this vast endeavor, we also believe that this method must expand its horizons in order to prevent the risk of closing ourselves in. (In text 2, Laurent Cugny brings forward a number of shortcomings observed along the evolution of this approach).

Our project was born out of the will to propose a larger horizon of investigation, taking into account the diversity and complexity of musical and cultural expressions of the 20th and 21st centuries, in relation to decisive technological advances such as we can observe in jazz and other styles associated with it (which will be broken down in next segment). These mutations created new inter- and transcultural dynamics, at the economic, political, but also creative levels.

It aims at creating a new space for the practice of musicology of these musics adopted by many researchers in the whole world, characterized to search for meaning as well in the music's content as in its cultural identities, and not to choose between both. Such a practice is rather oriented toward comprehensive hermeneutics combining analytical, historical and socio-anthropological approaches rather than a hermeneutic decentering. In short, the will is to avoid letting the object and its substance serve as simple pretext for the highlighting of a certain external meaning.

Hence, the notion of autonomy must be revisited. We do not advocate for a return to the mythical autonomy of the music championed by former musicology, but rather an autonomy of what we will call the *musical*, i.e. what, in the very end, cannot be reduced to anything else than music. A relative, non-absolute autonomy that reserves room for everything in music that touches not on sound but on meaning, identity, culture, environment etc., one that considers the intractable nature of a certain substance, musical in essence. Accordingly, this proposition comes as a positive response to the occasional question of the ontological practicability of the “purely” musical, in both its relativity *and* its irreducibility. Though such a break between musical and non-musical decidedly poses a problem and must be questioned, it appears to us as if its negation has caused the simple dissolution of the musical aspect.

But it is the correlation that is most important. Though the New Musicology has certainly demonstrated once and for all that the musical could not be considered with a mythical purity, and could not be inspected while ignoring what was around, before underneath it etc., we thought that these elements of “around,” “before,” and “underneath,” could not, when it comes to the music, be understood completely without considering a sense of musical that is nothing but musical (see examples noted by Laurent Cugny in text 2, and by Fabiano Araújo Costa in text 6). This proposition appears to us only the more viable since the music we study predominantly does not rely on musical score — symbolic object of former musicology and its epistemological nearsightedness — or on the representations of the musical that it implies, as well from a production as analytical standpoint. The primary objects of musical practice, among which are musical score but also today the practices of recording, are subject to a primary questioning, which was elaborated in part by the Audiotactile Music Theory¹. Hence, no “return to analysis” or of “return to musical score” but rather a reconfiguration, a dynamic consideration of all levels.

The question of domains

The three initiators of this project stand as jazz practitioners. The elder two (Caporaletti and Cugny), much like many of their colleagues who started in the 1970s, have gone through phases of pop and/or progressive rock of that decade before immersing in jazz. This *childhood of the art*, though characteristic of a generation, is still present today among the majority of jazz musicians who have included in their initiatory journey other forms of music, whether it be pop or rock of their era, blues, rhythm’n’blues or soul music, certain forms of world music, some Brazilian popular musics and many others.

It has been common in the last decades to mention *métissage*, interbreeding (without a clear definition of this notion), but we observe that the term has served as a marker of value. The multi-cultural quality of a given music, granted by a form of *métissage* or another, seems necessary for the said music not to be stamped as identitarian, i.e. affected by the most vicious form of sclerosis, unless it belongs to the field of traditional music, where the value sign reverses, with the character of identity becoming vehicle for authenticity. It is within this context that the question of definition, of jazz for example, has come to be suspected. An attempt to define jazz would be the product of discriminatory will, aiming at excluding all evolutive forms.²

The matter of definition, i.e. of determining what is the “inside” of jazz, comes with its symmetric “outside.” During the movement that saw postmodernism in the academic sphere widen the realm of what they valued, jazz was certainly the first music outside of Western art

¹ The Audiotactile Music Theory (AMT) has been proposed and developed by Vincenzo Caporaletti in numerous writings (Vincenzo Caporaletti, *I processi improvvisativi nella musica. Un approccio globale*, Lucca, LIM, 2005; *Id.*, *Esperienze di analisi del jazz*, Lucca, LIM, 2007; *Id.*, *Swing e Groove. Sui fondamenti estetici delle musiche audiotattili*, 2014; *Id.*, *Introduzione alla Teoria delle musiche audiotattili*, Roma, Aracne, 2018). To address it, one can, in this issue, refer to text 1.

² In this case, the spectrum of Hugues Panassié’s paranoid drift and of his conception of « real jazz » is evidently present (on this question, see Laurent Cugny, *Hugues Panassié – L’oeuvre panassiéenne et sa réception*, Paris, Outre Mesure, 2017).

music to receive acknowledgment, thus giving legitimacy to its object as well as its study. Not only is it unthinkable to be surprised today by the academic study of jazz, pop or rock music, it is even hard to imagine any music being initially turned down for being what it is. (A director of research at the Sorbonne refusing to direct a doctoral thesis on symphonic metal on the basis that it simply “isn’t music” would be under serious prejudice.)

Remained the question of how to group these forms of music that seemed to have common traits but could not fit in the previously established categories of written art music on one side and traditional music on the other. In France, among other labels (*musiques actuelles*, *musiques amplifiées*, *musiques à succès...*, etc.), the one based on the notion of “popular” prevailed. And thus one speaks of “*musiques populaires*”, often keeps the English expression “popular music.” Though questions of labels must be put into perspective, they keep a certain operationality. In France, Italy or Brasil, the “contemporary music” label is applied to written art music starting approximately from the 1970s — and arguably up to WWII — meaning it is neither totally contemporary, nor does it encapsulate all of today’s forms of music, but this doesn’t generate debate as the metonymical delimitations are widely understood and accepted. The same could be said of the “popular” designation, though it appears more and more problematic with the common urgency to cross the limits implied by the denomination, most often synonymous of “non -art” on one side and “non traditional” on the other.

The term “audiotactile,” coined and used by Vincenzo Caporaletti without interruption since the 1970s, addresses this question in two ways. First off, it substitutes a positive meaning, and above all it globally recasts and merges, on one side endogenous procedural aspects, such as swing, groove, improvisation, extemporization, musical interaction, and on the other, exogenous aspects. The latter is understood in a perspective articulated with endogenous procedural aspects (for example starting with cognitive and cultural aspects of anthropological mediations such as scoring, phonography or audiotactile principle) rather than in an isolated way. Therefore, the various musics are grouped according to terms of process and practice, rather than through ideas of supposedly popular commencement or reception, which are generally difficult to identify. To take a few example, among musics that would be spontaneously placed in the field of popular music, tango, when considering the status it gives to score, it is in reality a lot closer in terms of cognitive mediation and practice to European art music. One can think, too, of the music of Astor Piazzolla or of albums such as *Maitia Peré* et *Urubu* by Antônio Carlos Jobim, or as well, to remain in the South-American sphere, of the hyper-density of Hermeto Pascoal’s music and of the experimental contribution of members of “Grupo Música Nova” in the Brazilian tropicalism of the 1970s. These latter also attests to transcultural dynamics, so complex that they overflow the limits implied by the use of the popular (see remarks proposed by Fabiano Araújo Costa about the field of Brazilian Popular music in text 3).

Secondly, we avoid the rigorous aspects of criteriology for strict definitions of each form of music: one music or the other can or cannot enter the field of jazz, but we can note that it functions, procedurally, in a very close way. (One might think of all the transcultural recordings of the ECM label, gathering jazz musicians and non-jazz musicians, all potentially Norwegian, American, Brazilian, Pakistani or other.) This comes without the need to turn down characteristics from each music when composing the final picture, if given the chance to define them. (The task becomes legitimate again, if one feels the need to execute it.) Thus, by asserting that jazz exists, that audiotactile music exists, that music exists, that musicology exists, we do not assume a retroactively identitarian position, but call for a second look at both sides of the room.

The Centre de Recherche International sur le Jazz et les Musiques Audiotactiles (CRIJMA)

It is above all for these reasons that three researchers — Brazilian (Fabiano Araújo Costa), Italian (Vincenzo Caporaletti) and French (Laurent Cugny) — have decided to join efforts to create a digital, multi-lingual journal, and extending the approach to the idea of a center for studies, virtual and international. International out of vocation and virtual, because this center does not have physical quarters outside of the implantation of numeric servers within the *Institut de Recherche en Musicologie (IREMus)*, a research team counting Laurent Cugny as a member.

This center proposes to create a digital platform where the following will eventually be available:

- A digital journal, *Journal of Jazz and Audiotactile Music Studies*, which will function according to current models of research journals.
- The publication of unpublished or previously printed documents in digital format.
- A selection of texts deemed important for the history of jazz and audiotactile music, some of which are limited in access (e.g. esempio Ansermet 1919³, certain articles published in the first series of the *Cahiers du jazz*, released between 1959 and 1970, Keil 1966 and 1987⁴, Lewis 1996⁵, etc.)
- A bibliographic database on specialized research literature.
- A database on jazz in France, which could be followed by its equivalent for other countries.
- Finally, conferences will frequently be organized for “physical” exchanges of knowledge.

With only one issue today, for financial and logistic reasons, only the journal is allowed to emerge today. Other issues will, we hope, progressively be worked out. These activities evidently call for more, since the CRIJMA’s vocation is to join forces and to diversify its activity. All propositions and feedback will be examined with great benevolence.

The Journal of Jazz and Audiotactile Music Studies: what program?

The journal offers to gather research excerpts on jazz and audiotactile music in most current languages. These texts will be, for some of them and as much financial and human means will allow it, made available in multiple languages, in the form of dedicated notebooks, to ensure the largest distribution possible.

For the remaining content, it will follow the model of current existing research journals. The journal has a [scientific comitee](#) and will seek a reader base accustomed to the largest number of languages possible. The field of research includes all forms of music with production processes falling within audiotactility as defined by Vincenzo Caporaletti in numerous texts and here in text 1. All approaches are welcome, without exclusivity.

In this first issue Fabiano Araújo Costa, Vincenzo Caporaletti and Laurent Cugny lay down certain theoretical foundations, and three examples of philological and analytical nature are proposed (see editorial). But the publishing in the journal and the participation in CRIJMA

³ Ernest Ansermet, “Sur un orchestre nègre”, *La Revue romande*, Lausanne, 15 octobre 1919, n. 10, pp. 10-13.

⁴ Charles M.H. Keil, “Motion and Feeling through Music”, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 24, No. 3, Spring 1966, pp. 337-349; *Id.*, “Participatory Discrepancies and the Power of Music”, *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 2, No. 3, August 1987, pp. 275-283.

⁵ George Lewis, “Improvised Music after 1950 – Afrological and Eurological Perspectives”, *Black Music Research Journal* 16 (Spring 1996), pp. 91-122.

activities imply in no way a complete adhesion to the principles formulated, which only represent an epistemological proposition. On the contrary, this new initiative seeks to open up as much as possible the field of research on these already diverse forms of music, in terms of language and approach, as formerly expressed.

Considering the subjects to be treated. In the introductory chapter of *From the Erotic to the Demonic — On Critical Musicology*⁶, published in 2003, British musicologist Derek B. Scott described the Critical Musicology program, as breaking away from New Musicology. He notably wrote:

*Critical musicologists in United Kingdom were united in agreement that one of the biggest problems that faced musicology was the collapse of the binary divide between pop and classical. It was the importance accorded to this perception that set them apart from the New Musicologists of the United States, who tended (with few exceptions) to concentrate on canonic works. The disintegration of high and low as aesthetic values had, of course, been theorized for some time by anthropologists, poststructuralists, and sociologists of culture. Yet what was urgently needed was a new theoretical model capable of embracing the values and meanings of all musical practices and musical texts. A model ready to engage with, rather than marginalize, issues of class, generation, gender, and ethnicity in music and to address matters such as production, reception, and subject position, while questioning notions of genius, canons, universality, aesthetic autonomy, and textual immanence.*⁷

The formulation of this last sentence can be read as a rather transparent rhetorical exercise. Under the terms of “*engaging*” and “*questioning*” lays the distinction of the good subjects (class, generation, genre, ethnicity) from the bad ones (genius, canons, universality, aesthetic autonomy, and textual immanence.) The first component of the sentence speaks synecdochically: the supposedly “marginalized” subjects (were they really still really marginalized after the already-aged emergence of New Musicology?) are called on, not only to occupy the center of the questioning, but to occupy the *entire* space of the questioning. Because the last part of the sentence, example of antiphrasis, invites us to “question” the present subjects while letting us understand the opposite: we should *not* question them.

Contrarily, we think that each is legitimate, including those that were *de facto* marginalized by cultural musicology, may it be New, Critical, Radical, Relational⁸ or other. We are thus tempted to take Derek Scott’s word literally and question these subjects.

- The genius: why, among ten or twenty Kansas City saxophonists, a thousand or ten thousand New York musicians or American musicians, do we listen and examine Charlie Parker before the others? Is it a result of power, of manipulation, in other word of something arbitrary and non-musical?
- The canons: why Louis Armstrong, Duke Ellington, Benny Goodman, Django Reinhardt, Charlie Parker, Miles Davis, Ornette Coleman, Wayne Shorter, Brad Mehldau, James Brown, Stevie Wonder, The Beatles, The Rolling Stones, Jimi Hendrix, Pink Floyd, The Police, Nirvana, Antônio Carlos Jobim, João Gilberto, Chico Buarque, Jacques Brel, Georges Brassens, Léo Ferré? Here, again, is it a matter of power, of market, of suspicious identitarian reflection?
- Universality: if today’s teenagers of Kansas City, Johannesburg, Beijing, Roma, Rio de Janeiro, work on the same Charlie Parker solos while others play the opening riff of ‘The White Stripes’ “Seven Nation Army” until exhaustion, is it an illustration of the

⁶ Derek B. Scott, *From the Erotic to the Demonic – On Critical Musicology*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2003.

⁷ *Id.*, Kindle 102-111.

⁸ Cf. Georgina Born “For a Relational Musicology: Music and Interdisciplinarity, Beyond the Practice Turn”, *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 2010, pp. 205-243.

alienation of the dominated, contaminated by a distilled ideology of triumphant American imperialism?

- Aesthetic autonomy: will Louis Armstrong's solos still generate so much emotion after 80 years, simply because they only reveal one identity (of class, generation, gender or ethnicity), their creator's?
- Textual Immanence: Would that very emotion really have nothing to do, as Amiri Baraka suggests, with the "notes" that, insignificant in themselves, only reveal the "black psyche"?⁹

The question then becomes: should these subjects remain unspoken for an eternity of musicology, regardless of the directions taken by other tendencies? We think otherwise.

Likewise, the historic works have followed a tendency to be marginalized by this environment. Yet, they show great vitality, notably in the field of biography, of jazz history outside the U.S., of oral history, demonstrating different approaches, like *histoire culturelle* (the French way, different from cultural history). The explorations linked with cognitive sciences, but also with psychology in music, the relations with philosophy (not limited to the *French Theory*) and with the didactics of music are equally welcome.

Thus a call for publication is launched for the No. 2 issue, to be released in 2019. No theme is established, no etiquette is determined in advance. All texts, in all languages¹⁰, dealing with audiotactile music — jazz, rock, pop, blues, soul music, world music, Brazilian popular music etc. — or on aspects of audiotactility potentially identifiable in forms of music belonging to other realms, namely to other processes — whether by way of performance, recording, reception, transmission or other — as well as on the products.

Fabiano Araújo Costa
Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo – UFES
Fundação Capes

Vincenzo Caporaletti
Università di Macerata
Conservatorio di Musica "Santa Cecilia" di Roma

Laurent Cugny
Sorbonne Université – Faculté des Lettres
Institut de Recherche en Musicologie

Translation Noé Cugny

⁹ Amiri Baraka *The LeRoi Jones / Amiri Baraka Reader* (Harris, W., ed.), New York, Thunder's Mouth Press, 1999, p. 182.

¹⁰ The evaluation of all texts will however depend on our ability to find competent evaluator in the language concerned.

Bibliography

- ANSERMET, Ernest, “Sur un orchestre nègre”, *La Revue romande*, Lausanne, 15 octobre 1919, No. 10, pp. 10-13.
- BARAKA, Amiri, *The LeRoi Jones / Amiri Baraka Reader* (Harris, W., ed.), New York, Thunder’s Mouth Press, 1999.
- BORN, Georgina, “For a Relational Musicology: Music and Interdisciplinarity, Beyond the Practice Turn”, *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 2010, pp. 205-243.
- CAPORALETTI, Vincenzo, *I processi improvvisativi nella musica. Un approccio globale*, Lucca, LIM, 2005.
- *Esperienze di analisi del jazz*, Lucca, LIM, 2007.
 - *Swing e Groove. Sui fondamenti estetici delle musiche audiotattili*, Lucca, LIM, 2014.
 - *Introduzione alla Teoria delle musiche audiotattili*, Roma, Aracne, 2018.
- CUGNY, Laurent, *Hugues Panassié – L’oeuvre panassiéenne et sa réception*, Paris, Outre Mesure, 2017.
- KEIL, Charles M.H. “Motion and Feeling through Music”, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 24, No. 3, Spring 1966, pp. 337-349.
- “Participatory Discrepancies and the Power of Music”, *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 2, No. 3, August 1987, pp. 275-283.
- LEWIS, George, “Improvised Music after 1950 – Afrological and Eurological Perspectives”, *Black Music Research Journal* 16 (Spring 1996), pp. 91-122.
- SCOTT, Derek B. *From the Erotic to the Demonic – On Critical Musicology*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2003.