Narrative, Interpretation, and the Popular Song

Keith Negus

The value of narratives in human understanding of the world is widely recognized. The importance of narrative is apparent in varieties of everyday storytelling as well as in written fiction, drama, spectacle and ritual, visual art and film, architecture, legal proceedings, scientific reports, and political theory, to provide only a partial list indicative of the range. Yet the popular song—one of the most pervasive narrative forms that people encounter in their daily lives—has been almost entirely ignored in the vast literature on narrative.\(^1\) Whereas narratological methods have often featured in the interpretation of Western art music\(^2\) and film music,\(^3\) and literary approaches to lyrics have sometimes emphasized a poetics of storytelling,\(^4\) theories of narrative have rarely been foregrounded in the study of popular songs.\(^5\)

In this article, I will focus on narrative to explore practices of interpretation in both scholarship and everyday discussion about popular songs. I will emphasize the intersubjective interpretation of song meanings and advocate an “intercontextual” approach to the understanding of song narratives, drawing from research that emphasizes how our knowledge of the world is cumulative and always in a process of becoming through time. Overall, I argue for a musicological hermeneutics of the intersubjective production of value, belief, and judgment. In developing this theme, the structure of this essay journeys from textuality through intertextuality toward intercontextuality. I shall illustrate how popular songs participate in the wider cultural dialogues through which historical understanding is narrated, and explore how songs connect with more personal expressions of self and individual identity.

I begin with a sympathetic critique of David Nicholls’s sustained attempt to begin addressing these issues in an essay that signals its intent in the title—“Narrative Theory as an Analytical Tool in the Study of Popular Music Texts.”\(^6\) I will diverge from Nicholls’s analytical...
method by suggesting that the application of narrative theory to popular music must inevitably and fruitfully move beyond the world of the text and allied media to a much wider universe. I shall briefly summarize his approach as I move toward a critique and outward from the text.

Nicholls starts with what he calls a “control level,” level 1, where “there is no story per se in the lyrics, and as a consequence there is no element of narrative discourse in the musical setting.” At level 2 are songs with lyrics that include elements of narrative discourse that are not supported or reflected in a “neutral” musical setting. In contrast, level 3 refers to songs structured by a musical setting supporting the lyrical narratives. At level 4, lyrics and music are operating relatively independently and in a dynamic interactive manner to produce narrative meaning. Level 5 is characterized by a complex narrative conveyed through music, lyrics, visual imagery, along with accompanying prose and packaging.

Nicholls illustrates his typology by citing a range of songs, although in varying levels of detail. He fleetingly mentions the Beatles’ “I Want to Hold Your Hand” and “Relax” by Frankie Goes to Hollywood as examples of level 1 non-narrative songs, and passes rapidly through level 2, offering only the Human League’s “Don’t You Want Me,” which, despite clear narrative tensions and shifts between the lyrical viewpoints of the two protagonists of the duet, contains a “musical setting—in its unvarying melody and accompaniment textures—[that] resolutely resists any attempt at reflecting that narrative shift.”

At level 3, he analyzes Kate Bush’s “Wuthering Heights” to identify how formal properties such as “an unexpected harmonic shift” and “harmonically unstable verses” support the narrative and “reflect the restless wandering of Cathy’s spirit”—a clear assumption about the relationship between formal musical characteristics and extramusical meaning, plausibly integrating lyrical interpretation with a narratological approach drawn from the study of Western art music, and also demonstrating how songs can change tense.

At level 4, the analysis is more extensive and Nicholls explores how “instrumentation and timbre rather than melody and harmony are crucial to the narrative dynamics and semantics of the Buggles’ “Video Killed the Radio Star.” Eventually, Nicholls arrives at his fifth and highest level where “a complex narrative discourse is rendered through multiple media, including lyrics, music, prose, and art work.”

At level 5, he provides detailed analysis of The Lamb Lies Down on Broadway by Genesis and The Who’s Quadrophenia—albums from a period (1973–74) when musicians were aspiring to be taken seriously by producing conceptual musical statements and when critics used the
phrase “progressive rock” to distance such works from the stand-alone pop single (the idea of progress through increasing musical complexity is implicit in this typology). I do not dispute the intricacy of the tales that are told on these albums and their supporting prose and imagery (and in similar concept albums created during this period). Nicholls’s analysis of the construction of narrative through text and paratext in progressive rock is insightful and convincing. What I find contentious is the dismissal of three minutes of pop romance at level 1 on the assumption that meaning resides in and arises out of a composite of tangible, easily identifiable, and directly related “texts”—song lyrics, musical structures, liner notes, art work, and the self-consciously conceptual artistic statements made by musicians. My challenge, and the point I argue for, is that there are other equally complex narrative meanings that are emergent in and articulated to many single pop songs, due to their embedding in a broader social and cultural context. In suggesting that Nicholls’s approach is unnecessarily limited by its focus on musical text and identifiable supporting paratexts, I take a cue from Lawrence Kramer’s argument that narrative cannot provide a means of “illuminating musical structure and musical unity” because the very “fractious and disorderly” character of narrative disrupts the stability of a text and points outward at the real drama of performative actions (rather than the perceived drama of the music), toward the “social and cultural” tensions of the human world. Narrative ineluctably leads from the text to the historical circumstances through which the meaning of texts are mediated, interpreted, and contested.

II

Songs do not convey narrative meanings as texts alone or in relation to the supporting conceptual package. Songs exist in relation to other songs. The practice of songwriting and acts of interpretation are embedded within grids of intertextuality. Popular songwriters may explicitly or unconsciously draw their inspiration from other songs and sometimes unambiguously, or often obliquely, reference, acknowledge, celebrate, or comment upon these other songs. Even if the inspiration is implicit or unacknowledged, songs are heard alongside and in relation to other songs (by songwriter and listener alike). This is integral to how they narrate the world to us. I will substantiate and develop this point further by returning to Nicholls’s example of “I Want to Hold Your Hand”—a song he describes in these terms:
The lyrics of the song paint a typically static romantic cameo, in which the protagonist expresses his feelings directly to the antagonist. Although there are slight changes of perspective in the exhortations of verse 2 and the more reflective stance of the middle 8 (accompanied in the latter case by a new melodic and harmonic setting), the text merely amplifies the statements already made by the protagonist, rather than suggesting any actual narrative discourse.\footnote{Nicholls’s claim can be contrasted with a perspective offered by Barbara Bradby in an article in which she analyzes the profound influence on the Beatles of the late 1950s and early 1960s girl groups. The Beatles were open in acknowledging their love of girl group music. They performed and recorded cover versions, toured with girl groups, and the influence is evident in their lyric writing (offering different viewpoints and dialogue), song structures, harmonic sequences, and use of voices (Lennon and McCartney’s unison singing and the three-part harmony and vocal exchanges between Lennon, McCartney, and Harrison). Hence, the song “I Want to Hold Your Hand”—in terms of songwriting performance practice and contextually—arises within a set of musical and cultural chains that cannot be decoupled from the text if seeking to understand the narrative meaning of the song. Indeed, Bradby suggests that girl groups established a “discourse to which the Beatles had to respond.”\footnote{Bradby pinpoints a contrast between the more passive plea in the lyrics for “you” to “let me be your man / hold your hand” with that of an “opening narrative device, ‘Now I’ll tell you . . .’ and the semi-narrative ‘When I touch you.’” Bradby hears and reads unfolding narrative and semi-narrative features in the lyrics. These in turn are part of a broader narrative whereby the Beatles were offering a reciprocation of the girl group desire for “you” to love “me.” Girl group songs had typically presented a singer talking about a boy in conversation with peers and chorus. The Beatles engaged in dialogue with this theme, mediating girl talk to the male world, most famously in “She Loves You” with its lyric of “She told me what to say.” Bradby argues that “I Want to Hold Your Hand” presents a more tentative form of desire than the conventional male plea of “I want you,” drawing directly from the Chantels’ “Maybe,” a song containing a desire for romantic holding hands as a route toward mutual understanding. Through a nuanced linguistic analysis of address in the Beatles songs of this period, Bradby goes on to argue that the Beatles’ declarations of love in their first few hit songs did not come out of the blue nor are they simply a direct descendant of a line of male,
or even boy-group, discourse. They are a response to, and in dialogue with, the voicing in girl talk by the Shirelles of the ubiquitous female request for men to tell women that they love them.\textsuperscript{18}

Bradby’s research challenges Nicholls’s basic assumption: there is a narrative in the lyrics, the movement is not “static” as he suggests. Furthermore, the narrative acquires a sense of urgency through the way the song establishes an intertextual and social dialogue with girl group discourse. It is an ongoing story about male/female or boy/girl romance mediated by the popular song.

But the narrative is not just conveyed through the words. The lyrics of “I Want to Hold Your Hand” are heard through the “drama” of the music. Here I draw from Fred Everett Maus’s observation that listeners often “follow” the meaning of instrumental music by drawing from a pool of knowledge that allows them to comprehend “commonplace human action in everyday life,” personifying musical sounds that become regarded as characters, gestures, and intentional actions.\textsuperscript{19} Evaluating the application of narrative theory to instrumental art music, Maus suggests that “music may often be closer to drama than to prose narrative, offering enactments of stories rather than storytelling in the most literal sense.”\textsuperscript{20} The drama of the music certainly contributes to the enactment of the scene in “I Want to Hold Your Hand”—providing an instrumental and rhythmic dynamic that may be heard as “a drama of interacting agents.”\textsuperscript{21}

These musical elements have been discussed by a number of authors, with much comment devoted to the moment where the vocal melody rises an octave on the lyric “hand” as the chords move from E minor to an ambiguous B chord (various analysts and musicians have identified this chord as a B, B minor, B7, or B5) and then to C. This is a pivotal instant of drama and animation in the song’s narrative. When he recalled writing the song with McCartney, Lennon referred to the inclusion of a particular chord (one he did not specify) in this sequence, remarking that it “made the song.” Walter Everett identifies it as a “deceptive” E minor.\textsuperscript{22} But Dominic Pedler disagrees and insists that Lennon was referring to the movement to the B chord, arguing that it is this that gives this passage “propulsion.”\textsuperscript{23} Ian MacDonald also believed Lennon to be referring to the B chord and described the song as so dense with incident that McCartney’s octave jump into falsetto at the end of the verse is preempted by another shock four bars earlier: a plunge from the home key of G major onto an unstable B minor. . . . It
was exciting, unexpected, irreverent—and in practice made to seem natural by the beatific energy with which the group belted it out.24

Everett also writes of the “drama” created by the transitions between sections of the song and of how its textural, rhythmic, and motivic factors contribute to the song’s unfolding tale.25 Further drama is created through the vocals. Although Lennon takes the “lead,” the two composers characteristically shift between singing in unison and singing in harmony, with McCartney varying his harmonizing between the first and second repeated “middle 8” section—“And when I touch you.” This section also contains the dramatic crescendo in which McCartney’s vocal dynamically interacts with Lennon’s in reaching up to a faltering falsetto on the repetition of “I can’t hide”; a rising phrase that Bob Dylan famously, and perhaps not surprisingly given this euphoric moment, first heard as “I get high” and interpreted as signaling a drug-enhanced peak.26

The rhythms also contribute to the excitement, accentuated by the handclaps. On the recording, even remastered, the handclaps sound rather thin, a bit rhythmically irregular and vulnerable when compared with the later use of synthetically produced handclaps in recordings. This contributes to the sense of dramatic occasion, the handclap being a dynamic sonic presence and familiar as the most elementary way of participating in the performance of a song. The handclap is both material and symbolic, carrying associations of collective enactment, approval (applause), and a connection to childhood play. The handclaps in “I Want to Hold Your Hand” and other Beatles songs provide a signifying link to nursery rhymes and memories of childhood innocence (these are pervasive themes and influences for the Beatles).27

The above is offered as a challenge to Nicholls’s characterization of “I Want to Hold Your Hand” as a song that “contains no meaningful narrative elements.”28 The lyrics are dynamic, rather than static words on a page, and can be interpreted as narrating an everyday encounter through the interplay of sung words and dynamic, dramatically interacting musical elements. The textual narrative arises from the poetics of the lyrics, the rhetoric of the vocal performance, and dramaturgy of the music and rhythm.

Social and semiotic chains of narrative meaning connect the recording of “I Want to Hold Your Hand” (along with many other Beatles songs from this period) to the songs of girl groups and the Beatles’ male contemporaries. This is just one example of how songs continually enter narrative dialogues with other songs, whether or not it is conscious or intentional on the part of the songwriter. The popular
song, in form, practice, and character, is never reference-free; no song can be totally "original" in the sense of having no precursors. Whether anticipated by its composer or interpreted by its listener, the song will signal, acknowledge, and pay some form of homage to its sources and inspiration.

“I Want to Hold Your Hand” is integral to a broader narrative that articulates the tensions and transformations in romantic relations between boys and girls, young women and men. The song arises out of, is embedded within, and is also an intervention in the stories through which human relationships are mediated and comprehended. It is an example of how a song’s meaning is simultaneously contextual and social. Or, as I now shall argue, song meanings are intersubjective and intercontextual—and the interpreting author is part of these dialogues.

III

Although it has become commonplace for anthropologists and ethnomusicologists reflexively to locate themselves in their work, such a strategy is rare in musicology, and can usually be found in writings in which the musicologist positions her or himself sociologically. It is uncommon for musicologists to expose their esthetic preferences, musical skills, social background, educational experiences, or even the manner in which they listen to the recordings referred to in their work. Even self-defined “critical musicologists”—attuned to the theoretical and pragmatic possibilities for varied interpretation, aware that songs are mediated technologically, socially, and commercially—offer little by way of the situational context that has informed their choice of repertoire, listening strategy, and analytical approach. To pursue this, I take a critical route through three perspectives on the question of individual reception and authoritative interpretation.

I start with the concept of “subject position,” an idea advanced in musicology by Eric Clarke and Nicola Dibben when seeking to connect formal musicological analysis and critical interpretation to the social meaning of songs for listeners. Drawing the term “subject position” from its development in Althusserian Marxism and psychoanalysis (to explain the limiting and oppressive workings of dominant social structures and ideologies) and the way it was incorporated into film studies, Clarke argues that the concept of subject position allows for an understanding of how a text (a film or music, for example) is such that it “demands,” “solicits,” and “limits” the perceptions of an audience member.

Clarke uses this concept when comparing the recorded performance of “Magdalena” by Frank Zappa with that of P. J. Harvey’s “Taut”;
Dibben deploys the idea in an analysis of the songs and imagery associated with Pulp’s *This Is Hardcore* and, through this, in arguments about the impact of Jarvis Cocker’s songs. Both writers use the notion of subject position to claim a clear link between listeners’ comprehension and their analytical interpretation of “musical material,” arguing that the “features of the musical materials specify the subject-position of the song.”

Clarke describes in detail the contrasting gendered characteristics and connotations of the sonic, vocal, and lyrical qualities of the Zappa and Harvey tracks and asserts that “subject-matter and subject-position interact in a compelling manner.” Using the same concept, and citing its use by Clarke, Dibben presents an analysis of how Pulp—or specifically, Jarvis Cocker as a songwriter and singer—create a critical, if ambiguous, perspective on masculinity and pornography through visual imagery, song lyrics, use of voice, lead guitar motives, and instrumental timbres. As textual analysis of how a highly idiosyncratic musical identity containing “a bleak and ironic view of the single male” has been produced through an album package, Dibben’s analysis is insightful and convincing. However, to this textual analysis, Dibben adds theory drawn from psychoanalysis and cinema spectatorship, arguing that the “subject matter” of the album (lyrics as semantic statements, guitars as sexual signifiers, images alluding to the conventions of a male gaze in heterosexual pornography) is such that it “solicits” and “positions” the listener into a “place” from which their understanding of the music and imagery ineluctably corresponds with the interpretation of the musicological analyst. In the case of Pulp, this “subject position” is assumed to incorporate a cultural critique of various assumptions about the masculine response to pornography.

Clarke and Dibben offer astute musicological insights and plausible interpretations of the songs of Zappa, Harvey, and Pulp, respectively. But they both take large leaps outward when claiming that their musicological hermeneutic analysis has identified the content that positions “subjects,” assuming that their interpretations are comprehensive enough to contain the meanings with which all listeners will have to contend. The claim that analysis has revealed a broader subject position is asserted rather than demonstrated with any evidence of what other members of the audience may think about these songs. The claim to have identified the “position” of a unified and rather abstracted “subject” (all those listening to the recordings?) is based on little more than interpretation of the “musical materials.”

A different approach is offered by Tia DeNora when challenging the “concealed authoritarianism” of what she calls “armchair
hermeneutics,” arguing that it ignores the way people “use” music in their lives. Indeed, Clarke subsequently modified the strength of his argument in response to such an objection, claiming that a “subject position” approach can “define an area of possibilities within which different empirical individuals may take up their own particular positions.” However, DeNora’s response to such a caveat would seem to be that this is still speculative unless the “empirical individuals” are studied. Through her research, DeNora has repeatedly attempted to show how people use music in ways and in “positions” that are not so easily predicted. Instead of starting with the text or “musical materials” (the song, composition, or track), she privileges the circumstances. For example, she writes of how many people turn to music when dealing with difficult moments of tragedy or loss in their lives—one of DeNora’s respondents listened to a Brahms concerto when recalling aspects of her relationship with her father after his death; the novelist Anthony Burgess listened to Beethoven when working out a plot for a novel; a track carefully constructed in a studio by George Michael was incorporated into the ritual of selecting and purchasing clothes.

If Clarke and Dibben are concerned with the determining character of songs and music—the way “texts” influence values, knowledge, and esthetic understanding—DeNora instead finds reflexively aware, freely active citizens: “Listeners are by no means simply ‘affected’ by music but are, rather, active in constructing their ‘passivity’ to music.” If Clarke and Dibben seek to highlight the significant impact of a subtle guitar timbre or a quirkily vocalized turn of phrase, DeNora downplays the defining qualities of songs or concertos, inadvertently perhaps, allowing them to become little more than a secondary means toward some more significant sociological end. This is because she wants to move the argument “to a far more general notion of how different types of musical materials may afford different actors different things at different times.” Yet, it then seems as if any type of music can stand in as a resource or device in a whole range of situations, and this is how it acquires its sociological value. Music becomes a means for working through an emotional difficulty, physical task, habitual routine, or intellectual problem. It appears to be no different than other “resources” we might have at our disposal, such as drinking a glass of wine, walking through a forest, smoking a cigarette, or swimming. There is something salutary in this sort of approach. After all, not everyone wants to spend inordinate amounts of time debating the meaning and influence of a lone cadence, poetic phrase, or guitar riff. But for those of us who do, and for those of us who want to argue that it is important because there is a quite profound connection between the esthetic qualities of a
symphony or song and social life, then DeNora’s approach comes close to breaking the connections by siding with the user’s viewpoint.

An attempt to retain the link to the musical text and to acknowledge De Nora’s emphasis on the varied uses of music by subjects has been offered by Chris Kennett when proposing that the meaning of any recording is variable and indelibly mediated by “the temporal, demographic, attentive, local and task-related particulars of the listening situation. . . . [These] . . . conspire to dilute the analytical meanings of the well-parsed text to such an extent that the absolute sound recording ceases to exist as an object of analysis.” Critiquing Richard Middleton’s wish to avoid “monological” interpretations of songs (he also targets analysis by Allan Moore and Philip Tagg), Kennett argues that “personal listening” is all that scholars can legitimately offer: “One interpretation of a recording is just that—one person’s nonnormative way of understanding a musical text, arrived at through several immersive, concentrated listenings (through hi-fi speakers or headphones, without interruption or diversion) to the recording at home, or in one’s office—and nothing more absolute than that.”

Kennett initially supports this position with reference to observations of the musical preferences and listening strategies of visitors to a wine shop in which drum and bass is playing. He illustrates his case further through what he calls an “idioethnomusicology” of Herb Alpert’s “Tijuana Taxi,” heard as the Leyton Orient football team trot on to the pitch prior to games in East London, the musical content comprehended though this ritual. Contextualizing his understanding of the song’s meaning in relation to the unsophisticated tactics of the football team, and supporting this interpretation of the music with some highly personal details about himself (including his class background, a disability, schooling, his parents, selective life experiences and obsessions, along with knowledge of sport and wine), Kennett seeks to illustrate in detail the formation of his “personal” musical analysis. His overall point is that “the listener’s demography or prior lived experience” will “change the very nature of the text.”

The ironic catch in such an idio-autobiographical, obsessively existential analysis is that Kennett has arrived at such a meaning through constant social interactions—it is not quite as “personal” as he would claim. Kennett acknowledges that “the only people with any likelihood of sharing much of an overlap with my analysis of the song are fellow Orient fans.” However, I would question his use of the term “sharing” here. As humans we can share in, and reach a broad consensus about the meaning, value, and ethical or political significance of many texts, artifacts, and practices without necessarily sharing the same demography.
or prior lived experience (this is, after all, how an understanding of language is acquired). We may never have seen the Leyton Orient Football Club play, but we may empathize with this interpretation of “Tijuana Taxi.” Despite Clarke’s claim that the “musical materials” can reveal the possible interpretations of subjects, I doubt whether an analysis that started with the musical materials of “Tijuana Taxi” would have led to the Leyton Orient football stadium in East London—which is, in many respects, Kennett’s point.

If Clarke and Dibben avoid such variable interpretations by positing a subject position that corresponds to their analysis of selective musical materials, Kennett evades the way that many people can share a similar understanding of a song but be different in all manner of personal quirks and idiosyncrasies. If Kennett makes the conditions of listening (a wine shop or a football stadium) dominate his interpretation—“the listening experience becomes the text”—Dibben and Clarke offer an abstract placeless context: did they listen at home, in the office, in a car? If Kennett’s fandom and esthetic choices are conspicuous due to their elevated presence, Dibben’s and Clarke’s preferences are conspicuous by their absence. (I might infer that Dibben is a fan of Pulp, that Clarke is a fan of P. J. Harvey but not Frank Zappa, but neither make it part of their argument.) This issue is not tangential or extraneous. Both Simon Frith and Ian Maxwell have argued, adding weight to Kennett’s point, that the selection of music and musicians as objects of study and academic analysis is informed by tacit if often unacknowledged value judgments, personal preferences, and passions. In Maxwell’s terms, it is the “curse of fandom”—a burden that poses problems and possibilities.

At the core of these contrasting positions are questions about how musicology moves outward from “the musical materials” or “text” to social circumstances, and acknowledges that such contexts are informed by personal as much as scholarly commitments to processes of interpretation.

One way of disrupting such movements, drawing from narratology, might be to make a distinction between the “point of view” presented to any listener through a text, and the way this may or may not construct a “subject position” as a set of sonic, social, and semantic possibilities from which a self may “negotiate” that text. The term “point of view” refers to the vantage point from which the story is conveyed, described by H. Porter Abbott as the “the lens through which we see characters and events in the narrative. Frequently, the narrator is our focalizer. Just as we hear her voice, we often see the action through her eyes.” For example, in Lennon and McCartney’s folk-style ballad “You’ve Got to Hide Your Love Away,” the narrator of the song is worrying that he...
might have lost his love, and the listener hears an exchange between
the narrator and the “clowns” that are telling him to hide his love. We
hear the clowns (“Hey! You’ve got to . . .”) from the point of view of the
narrator. In the country blues-inflected “You’ve Got a Friend in Me,”
the narrator sings from the point of view of the toy Woody addressing
the child Andy in Toy Story 1. In later films in the Toy Story series, the
song is included, performed in different styles and arrangements, to rep-
resent the viewpoint of all Andy’s toys. The song is also used in various
ironic, intertextual, and self-referential ways—for example, adding a
degree of pathos to the narrative of Andy’s growing up and eventual
farewell to toys along with the family home.

In considering the point of view, I do not need to assume that the
track sung by John Lennon or the Toy Story film song constructs a posi-
tion for listeners, and I can acknowledge that the songs—if rendered by
other performers on albums or in concert—may offer potentials for alter-
native interpretations. I might hear the narrator of the Beatles’ song as
telling me, a listener, to hide my love away (the performance, instru-
mentation, arrangement, or vocal intonation along with my casual dis-
tracted attention while queuing for a drink may lead to such an
interpretation). Or I might hear it as an interior dialogue, the narrator
talking to himself. Taken out of its location within the films, “You’ve
Got a Friend in Me” may be used to convey a sense of friendship
between adults, or between children and an animal pet, rather than a
toy and a boy. The song’s ambiguity allows for these different interpreta-
tions. Indeed, the craft of songwriter Randy Newman, skilled in the art
of irony and versed in screen music, and the song’s use across three films
by animation company Pixar, adroit at creating life histories and emo-
tions from animated images, is a reminder of the poetic possibilities of
ambiguity. In a book first published in 1930, William Empson explored
the interpretive value of ambiguity, referring to “any verbal nuance,
however slight, which gives room for alternative reactions to the same
piece of language” whereby “alternative views might be taken without
sheer misreading.” Empson argued that “the machinations of ambiguity
are among the very roots of poetry,” and they certainly pervade the
creation and comprehension of popular songs. Yet, as Umberto Eco has
also stressed, there are “limits of the act of interpretation.” It is mis-
leding to declare that all we can offer is an endless plurality of personal
listening. “You’ve Got a Friend in Me” is not a song conveying dialogues
from the French Revolution of 1789; it is not a song in support of the
destruction of toys or the culling of badgers; it is not about moonlight
on a stormy sea, nor does it refer to the tensions between the Romulans
and Vulcans. It might perhaps be possible to explain the circumstances
within which an individual may interpret the song in one of these ways—the internet provides plenty of examples of misheard lyrics and eccentric understandings of songs. But these endure as ironic anecdotal oddities—rather than convincing contributions to discussions about songs and their social resonances.52 When considering the multiple interpretations of personal listeners, we cannot evade questions of plausibility, “misreading,” and “overinterpretation.”53

In the remainder of this article, I argue for the adoption of an intermediate position: an approach that is attuned to the limitations of both the authoritative, monological, objective, definitive, or dominant interpretation and the pluralist, solipsistic, subjective, individual, or personal perspective. I also argue for a series of related hermeneutic and analytical shifts; from position to process, from personal and subjective to interpersonal and intersubjective, and from the located and spatial context to the historical and temporal intercontext. From metaphors of static places and locations to metaphors of movement and change—from interpretations that are fixed to locations—the clothes shop, the academic study, the football stadium—to interpretations that are changing, in process, moving through time.

IV

In developing my argument in this direction, I am drawing from Paul Ricoeur's wide-ranging philosophical investigations in which he has stressed how self-understanding is realized through narratives that give order to the uncertainties and unknowns of our temporal existence. We comprehend ourselves and the world we inhabit through the stories we tell.54 Our narratives include the telling of our social encounters; hence, Ricoeur’s approach implies that “all communicative action must be hermeneutically grounded because it is always intersubjectively mediated.”55 Such a Ricoeurian notion of intersubjectivity attempts to “preserve the uniqueness of self-identity while at the same time bridging the gap between self and other.”56 Although his philosophical reflections were developed from a detailed study of literary fiction and history, Ricoeur argued for an inclusive approach to narrative, imagination, and history for a “complementarity” and a “convergence of the different modes of narrative discourse” whereby “the intersubjective field of temporal experience” bridges and connects “the most ‘fictional,’ such as tales, romances, dramas, novels, and movies, to the most “empirical,” including histories, biographies, and autobiographies.”57

Ricoeur’s hermeneutics constitute just one strand within a considerable body of writing that starts from Edmund Husserl’s argument that
any “objective” understanding of the world is “intersubjective.” Though there are various debates in this literature and different inflections for the term, in this essay I draw on Nick Crossley’s suggestion that a focus on intersubjectivity allows for a consideration of “the fabric of social becoming,” a metaphor suggesting “a certain material basis, a corporeal intertwining.”

Such a process of becoming is also implied in a related concept, that of “intercontextuality” as developed by David Bloome and his colleagues in studies of how classroom learning takes place cumulatively over time (days, weeks, months, years). Understandings produced in the present are the result of interactions that draw upon existing knowledge and memories, which in the process move constantly from individual to collective. The intercontextual accumulation of knowledge through time links events in such a way that “people react not only to immediately contiguous acts but also to acts separated in time and space and they may react to a set of acts.”

I illustrate, explore, and develop the value of this approach with reference to the song “Kid Charlemagne,” which appeared as the opening track on Steely Dan’s 1976 album The Royal Scam. In doing so, I tentatively retain a sense of “personal listening” as advocated by Kennett—not seeking to conceal myself in the interpretation of this song. But I also emphasize the intersubjective and intercontextual dynamics through which a shared understanding of the song is created—that my understanding can never be unique but always realized in relation to the actions, values, and views of other people. Due to this emphasis, I do not present a privileged “text” as abstracted song lyric or musical examples on a page; I want to convey a sense of how my understanding of this song has emerged cumulatively and intersubjectively. The music can be heard, and the band seen at various freely accessible YouTube sites. I hope that my overall argument stands, even for readers unfamiliar with the specific song.

Steely Dan is songwriters Donald Fagen and Walter Becker (keyboards and bass, respectively), supported by a host of accomplished varying musicians, releasing albums between 1972 and 1980, and following a long gap, from 2000 onward. In a musicological analysis of their style, Everett noted that although “nominally a rock band . . . the group’s melodic idiosyncrasies, busy rhythmic surface, and harmonic and voice-leading techniques are direct descendants of early modern jazz, making the corpus arguably the most tonally complex of any rock music with such broad popularity.” The lyrics to the songs show the influence of 1950s science fiction (notably A. E. van Vogt and Alfred Bester), along with ironists such as Thomas Berger, Philip Roth, and Kurt Vonnegut.
At the same time, the songs exhibit a knowing familiarity with and referencing of harmonic, verbal, and structural tricks from the "Great American Songbook." Of their approach to songs, Fagen explained, "We were after a theatrical effect, the friction produced by the mix of the music and the irony of the lyrics."62 The narrators are often deluded loners or dreamers, romantic male losers peering at life from the periphery. The influence of Bob Dylan is apparent, not only in a certain lyrical tone but in Fagen’s untrained, understated, dry, wry, and slightly pinched nasal vocal delivery. Although the majority of songs are narrated in the first person, they are quite obviously delivered by characters, the songwriters operating at a knowing critical distance from "confessional" or autobiographical writing.63

When I first heard the track "Kid Charlemagne," I had no clear idea what the song was "about." I responded according to my immediate points of reference at the time; so I heard a blend of disco-funk groove, insistent hissing hi-hat, and smooth bell-like resonant Fender Rhodes electronic piano mixed with the squelchy staccato tones of the clavinet (an unavoidable reference point being Stevie Wonder’s influential clavinet-driven "Superstition"). I recall vocal phrases leaping out and being intrigued by impressions of an unfolding tale of tension, anxiety, and release that was in some way concerned with marginal or criminal activity from which a central protagonist wished to escape. I had only become familiar with Steely Dan a year or so prior to the release of this track and had not been following their recordings since their first album in 1972. I was not a "fan" at the time of first hearing this song (played for me by a neighborhood friend), but I was in the process of becoming one, particularly through my engagement with the album The Royal Scam in which "Kid Charlemagne" is the opening song. My decision to use the song in teaching—an experience from which I shall draw—is inevitably based on periods of intensive listening, reading about, discussion, and reflection upon the song.

Just over thirty years after its first release, in 2007, I played the song to a group of predominantly British undergraduate music students (taking pathways in both popular and Western art music) in a class in which we were exploring the different ways that songs tell stories. At the time I was not playing it with a view to later reflecting upon and writing up the experience and thus I was initially disappointed that none of the thirty-five or so students (aged from nineteen to twenty-three) had previously heard the track. I played it once without providing any context or information. I asked if anyone would like to tell me what the song was about. I found no suggestions, no one felt confident enough to
publicly volunteer an opinion based on one, decontextualized listen within the unequal, constrained circumstances of a teaching encounter.

I then provided the class with a prepared lyric sheet on which I had made various notes relating to shifts of perspective and changes to vocal emphasis. The opening lines set the scene: “While the music played you worked by candlelight, those San Francisco nights... just by chance you crossed the diamond with the pearl, you turned it on the world.” I was attempting to introduce the class to basic concepts of narrative theory and I noted that the song begins in the past tense with a narrator seeking to occupy a second-person point of view or, more plausibly, telling the story as a first person seeking to imagine the second person’s perspective; this becomes apparent with the line “Did you feel like Jesus?” Any sense of optimism evaporates at the end of the second verse when the protagonists feels his “whole world fall apart and fade away.” The third verse shifts from the past to the present tense and evokes a situation characterized by images of debt (“Your patrons have all left you in the red”), death (“Low-rent friends are dead”), and deception. The second-person “you” is still being addressed by a first-person “I,” a detached commentator on events. The last verse remains in the present tense, but the point of view shifts; the narrator has quite clearly become an anxious participant (“Clean this mess up else we’ll all end up in jail”). Throughout the song the chorus returns with the “Get along, get along Kid Charlemagne” refrain (more or less chanted, rhythmically in unison, the harmonies mixed down). Each time, it acquires additional resonances, as the plot progresses through the verses, from its first appearance, which may be interpreted as a colloquial “Get along with you,” to its appearance after the final verse, which may be heard as “Get out of here.”

Having circulated lightly notated lyrics, I played the recording through again. The second listen allowed for a discussion and, quite quickly, a debate that moved toward an interpretation of the song. There were various opinions about just what was being manufactured—the literal production of a blend of “diamonds” and “pearls” in the lyric was quickly discounted. It was not long before the conversation reached a point where the class agreed that the song was about the production of illegal drugs. The students had quite clearly been drawing on their existing “intercontextual” knowledge of songs, references to drugs in popular culture, and a range of related experiences and information.

When the class conversation reached this point, I intervened more directly and explained how the lyrical narrative of “Kid Charlemagne” can be interpreted as making direct references to a period in the life of Owsley Stanley, who manufactured and supplied LSD to the counterculture.
during the 1960s. His identity is partially camouflaged in lyrics that evoke the name of (“Kid”) Charlemagne—setting in play associations with a historical figure, Charles the Great. Stanley, feted as the first “underground” chemist to produce LSD, was reputed to have produced and supplied over a million doses. Contemporary connoisseurs of the drug praised its apparent purity, a quality alluded to in the song’s lyrics. A further infamous incident has Stanley being arrested after his car ran out of gasoline. Whether or not this is apocryphal, the lyrics mention this (“Is there gas in the car?”). Shortly after the album’s release, the rock critic Max Bell described the stance in the lyrics as “unromantic, precise and factual” arguing that the song does not convey “any mood other than ambivalence.”

When I suggested that the drug in question was LSD and offered these background details of Stanley Owsley, I received a mixed reaction from the class. Some students were excited and intrigued by the narrative, whereas others were mildly shocked that the drug was portrayed from the perspective of a manufacturer and participant. There was some disagreement about whether the song might be interpreted as a morality tale in which the villain got his comeuppance, an endorsement of the drug or an ethically neutral and factual portrayal of the protagonists. Consistent with Bell’s view of the song’s ambivalence, such responses were also indicative of how changing attitudes toward and experiences of drugs among students have subsequently inflected interpretations of the song. John Markert’s study of “drug lyrics in popular music,” drawing on interpretations of lyrics and opinion surveys over a forty-year period, suggests that though LSD tended to be uncritically celebrated in songs of the late 1960s, an uncertainty crept in by the middle of the 1970s (when “Kid Charlemagne” was released) which then turned to more negative judgments and critical portrayals in the 1980s.

Although lyrics will inevitably play an important part in the discussion of the meaning of popular songs, the music and rhythms also aroused comment. The class included accomplished musicians, and without prompting students remarked on the use of jazz chords and judged the effectiveness of certain chord sequences. “Kid Charlemagne” opens with a repeated C7(#9) chord before dropping to an unexpected A minor, as if moving down into a song world we might not have anticipated. This is followed by what might be heard as a “predictable” Aeolian fall from A minor through G, then to F, but this is undercut by a subsequent move to a Bb7(add6) before returning to the A minor. Though the chords cannot necessarily be identified precisely on one or two listens, the disruption of this sequence (along with the opening) was heard as conveying a sense of unease and melodrama and was judged by the students as integral to the narrative. Some students
observed how the drums are used in the song to convey urgency and desperation. Also singled out was an extended virtuoso guitar solo performed by Larry Carlton that forms a bridge between verses 2 and 3: an instrumental interlude that allows for a segue from the narrator as detached observer to anxious participant, personifying the narrator’s changed demeanor and point of view—from flowing melodic calm through hesitation to anxiety.

I subsequently followed up the more or less spontaneous classroom conversation by researching exchanges about this song in various internet forums and by talking with other trained and nontrained music listeners. I have found comparable, yet often more intense and elaborated exchanges about this song among fans, individuals usually more knowledgeable of the band and aware of Steely Dan’s blend of musical characteristics, lyrical concerns, attention to details, and idiosyncratic sensibility.

Steely Dan albums are constructed with an awareness of how their songs, composed for recordings, are listened to hundreds of times by fans, which influences the insertion of musical and lyrical references to obscure jazz recordings, novels, real events, and people, along with sonic and verbal quotes, puns, and allusions. The meaning of songs and their lyrics is not acquired through one listen. It builds up from repeated listens. As I mentioned earlier, lyrics may be misunderstood or incomprehensible on a first listen. The listener might initially respond to the texture or grain of a particular voice, to the words as nonsemantic sounds to prominent key words. Lyrics assume greater significance and accumulate meaning with repeated listening, from discussions with other fans, and from reading commentaries, criticism, and interviews. Fans of all genres, musicians, and aspiring songwriters may copy lyrics into notebooks, or type them up (just as older composers copied out scores by hand), amending their versions as a result of repeated listening and conversations with others.

The interpretative activities of Steely Dan fans are evidenced in an “anecdotal survey” conducted by journalist Robert Toth. He provides an insight into the intensity with which fans listen to and follow up lyrical and musical references and illustrates the way fans think of their engagement with the songs as part of a “musical education.” Toth’s interviewees valued Steely Dan for their “irreverence and complexity,” their “cynicism and humor,” and “craftsmanship.” Most fans developed a love of the band incrementally through an ongoing process rather than through one epiphanous moment, although epiphanies—“musical awakenings”—were recounted on some of the fans’ trajectories. Toth illustrates how musicians offer a point of identification—in this case for
those who sense an affiliation to the wry, knowing “outsider” stance. He also provides illuminating examples of the time and effort committed by devotees when interpreting the musical and lyrical reference points, entailing intersubjective dialogues with others that contribute to “a special vibe among Steely Dan fans.”

During the class discussion, I had to admit to the students that I did not have answers to some of the specific questions they raised about drugs and the counterculture. Having encountered the LSD manufacturer “Kid Charlemagne,” it was but a short step to questions concerning other songs about LSD and to writings about the counterculture. The students were seeking to bring their own partial knowledge of history to bear on the interpretation of a song, and this was meeting with my own limited knowledge of songs and this period in history. For me, it was a concrete, tangible everyday experience that illustrated how songs are both imaginative fictions and part of intersubjective dialogues about history. My immediate response was to find out more—to research further details about the counterculture, and songs about LSD and Owsley Stanley.

An obvious reference point is Sheila Whiteley’s analysis of songs and the counterculture, in which she notes that though some songwriters (like novelists and poets) sought to directly evoke their experience of taking LSD, often informed by a mystical or metaphysical quest for philosophical enlightenment, far more followed a fad for creating psychedelic-sounding records. The psychedelic esthetic sought to emphasize a heightened awareness of the senses (represented through exaggerated use of echo and effects in sound production, and intensely bright timbres); a distorted sense of reality (sounds oscillating or hanging suspended before fading); the synesthetic merging of the senses and the evocation of innocent, fairy-tale or dream-like states of consciousness, conveyed through surreal lyrics, and the use of echo, reverb, dramatic and sudden edits, collages, or abrupt changes of tempo or timbre.

Any popular song that concerns the drug LSD will establish links to an identifiable body of songs. But “Kid Charlemagne” is unusual because it narrates the activities of a very specific character actively making and supplying the drug. It does not attempt to evoke the drug experience, nor does it incorporate any form of psychedelic coding. Indeed, its jazz harmonies and voicing, along with disco and funk elements, offset any overt rock elements that might be associated with the electric guitar. Musically, a distance is created from the evocation of the LSD experience.

Lyrically, the activities of the central protagonist Owsley Stanley are narrated with a degree of distance from the experience of taking the
drug and are consonant with how he has been portrayed in historical accounts of the period. In a book subtitled “LSD and the American dream,” Jay Stevens devotes a chapter titled “The Alchemist” to Stanley, claiming that *Newsweek* compared him to Henry Ford. He portrays him as a talented, eccentric, intelligent man with many theories feeding a mission to “save the world by making the purest and cheapest and most abundant LSD possible.” Stevens charts how a mixture of ideas circulating from chemistry, Eastern mysticism, and literary creativity fed a belief that “Owsley’s career as an underground chemist was graced by divine approval”—in the words of the Steely Dan song, he may well have “felt like Jesus.” Martin Lee and Bruce Shlain, in a similar way, portray a man who, in the hippie district of Haight-Ashbury, was known as “the unofficial mayor of San Francisco” and “cultivated an image as a wizard-chemist whose intentions with LSD were priestly and magical.” The backdrop to Stanley’s activities was a sharp contrast between the will to change the world “for all” through collective political engagement with civil rights and antiwar protest and the desire for “tuning in and dropping out,” which offered the individual a solipsistic “promise of transcendence of that world.”

The ironies, contradictions, and absurdities are registered in three songs of the period. Stanley had been an audio engineer for the Grateful Dead and is credited with making a significant contribution to their live sound. In 1966, the Grateful Dead began performing a song with the title “Alice D Millionaire” (a play on words that wryly cites the newspaper headline following Stanley’s first arrest, “LSD Millionaire Arrested”). Musically, a mid-paced folk-rock arrangement, the lyrics to the song address a “girl” (Alice), but there can be little doubt that the third person is Owsley Stanley, as the lyric narrates the moment when his world was falling apart and fading away, opening by evoking a protagonist living in a “world of trouble” and moving on to suggest that his secret is out, “the walls are closing in” and “the wheel of fortune has a flat tire”—another reference to the infamous car breakdown that facilitated Stanley’s arrest.

This largely sympathetic or neutral account might be heard alongside Frank Zappa’s sarcastic “Who Needs the Peace Corps?” which appeared on *We’re Only in It for the Money*, an album that pastiched the cover of the Beatles’ *Sgt. Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band* and ridiculed hippies, the counterculture, and the “summer of love.” An arch and fussy musical arrangement, incorporating references to R&B along with modernist art music, “Who Needs the Peace Corps?” opens with a naive first-person narrator declaring that he will “drop out” and go to San Francisco, purchase “a wig and sleep on Owsley’s floor,” and
continues to ridicule through images of “phony” stoned hippies and “psychedelic dungeons popping up on every street.”

A further commentary is provided in the song “Mexico” recorded by Jefferson Airplane in 1970 and written by Grace Slick. Another typically mid-paced folk-rock song, it opens with the words “Owsley and Charlie, twins of the trade,” celebrating the impact of drugs on the poetic imagination and narrating attempts to stop the transport of marijuana from Mexico into the United States. Caricaturing a man only referred to as “Richard” who aspires to be king (almost unambiguously then U.S. president Richard Nixon), it pays respect to drug suppliers and proclaims Owsley to be a “legend” for providing “righteous dope.”

Zappa’s mockery, the Grateful Dead’s melancholy, Grace Slick’s homage, and the docudrama of “Kid Charlemagne” all contribute to the cultural history of this period, mediating evaluations and commentaries on people and events, making a modest but not insignificant addition to an enduring series of (by no means consensual) narratives about the drug culture of San Francisco, its peculiarities and characters, its utopian dreams and instabilities, and its subsequent decline. “Kid Charlemagne” conveys a specific interpretation of history, provides a particular memory of events, and offers a critical commentary on a protagonist who rapidly moves from being likened to “Jesus” to being “obsolete.”

Historical knowledge and understanding of any period is acquired, accumulated, and enstoried—narrated—through a panoply of cultural forms of which songs are an important part. “Kid Charlemagne” contributes to the conversations through which the past is documented and debated. As a song, it is one cultural form playing a part in the mediation of historic events to music fans now and to future historians. The song remembers, retells, and reevaluates. It links together a particular series of events, experiences, and moments in time, dramatizing these musically and lyrically. The meaning of “Kid Charlemagne” does not reside solely in its textual characteristics: the musical or textual “materials” of this song cannot manipulatively position us as “subjects.” Equally, its meaning cannot be liberated by idiosyncratic social use or solipsistic personal listening strategy. “I Want to Hold Your Hand” or “Kid Charlemagne”—and any other popular song—is always part of an intersubjective, intercontextual conversation, during which interpretation is in progress, forever moving through the time—proffered, debated, adopted as plausible, or discarded as improbable.
I have supported this argument by drawing from classroom discussions, exchanges on internet sites, dialogues among fans, and informal talks about songs not because I seek to legitimize a fixed interpretation of “Kid Charlemagne,” but because I want to highlight the intersubjective, intercontextual, and temporal dynamic to the way songs accumulate narrative meanings as they are interpreted through repeated listens and from conversations with others. Not only does meaning continually accrue, but the interpretation of narrative moves back and forth from specific song text to other songs, to knowledge of cultural forms (art, books, films) and personal experience. Hence, I am arguing that an exploration of intersubjective dialogue and the intercontextual accumulation of meaning provides a richer understanding of the meaning of songs than notions of “subject position” or “personal listening” that tend to emphasize location and place. It also allows for moving away from fixed or static accounts of song texts, toward a recognition of the life of songs, the way songs accumulate meaning through time. A sense of this dynamic was evoked by Bruce Springsteen when replying to an interviewer who asked about the interpretation of his songs, and in particular to the way that the song “Born in the U.S.A” had been appropriated for narrowly patriotic and politically right agendas that had not been foreseen by the songwriter:

Meaning is a communal cocktail. There is no writer who writes something and then has the fascist ability to dictate how it is perceived, y’know? That doesn’t exist. And then you, as the artist, can react to your listener’s responses. You can talk about it, you can speak before it, you can play it a different way. . . . It becomes part of an ongoing conversation. A conversation that is never truly over . . . once it is released, it literally is released. It’s gone free. And as such, even though you’re its creator, you are now part of the community that is discussing, fighting, arguing, enjoying the conversation over its meaning. You may have an ace up your sleeve in that you can go out and play it a certain way on another night, but then you are simply adding to that conversation, you are never going to completely define that conversation—no one really can.77

The interesting point for me about this quote is not that it highlights the way songs are open to different interpretations, which is by now a commonplace. Instead, it is the way Springsteen acknowledges that the meaning of songs emerge cumulatively, in an unfinished way as part of an intersubjective, intercontextual, and “communal” conversation.
(which does not need to imply a “community” in any unite or shared sense of the term). Such “conversations” are typical of how the narrative meanings of songs are understood.

Narratives—the stories we tell about our experiences, observations, and imaginings—cannot be comprehended and constrained within or by any one text. Hence, my discussion of “I Want to Hold Your Hand” as an example of the difficulty of defining a “non-narrative” popular music text. Songs are produced and perceived within grids of intertextuality and intercontextuality—semiotics chains, networks of social encounters within which interpretations are proposed, debated, accepted, or rejected, a dialogue that continues into the future.

I have followed Ricoeur in arguing that we humans narrate our daily triumphs and tribulations through fictions and histories that are both personal and collective. Interpretation and narrative are intersubjective. But this does not mean that all subjects and their interpretations are equal. The sociology of cultural production provides persuasive evidence of how opportunities are shaped by social environments and institutions, structuring and mediating individual and group abilities to participate in such hermeneutics—whether the strictures of religious orthodoxies, the commercial imperatives of business, or the regulatory regimes of state organizations. Yet, to paraphrase Springsteen, such institutions and forces cannot define or control the conversation. The examples I have chosen to cite in this article are droplets from a pool of countless songs that continually cross, consume, and confuse the boundaries between fact and fiction, between the empirical and the imaginative, between documentary and drama, and between reality and its representation.

Notes

Keith Negus, Professor of Musicology, Goldsmiths, University of London, London, UK, entered higher education as a mature student, having spent many years playing keyboards and guitar in a variety of bands. He completed a PhD study of the music industry and subsequently taught at the Universities of Leicester and Puerto Rico before moving to Goldsmiths. His books include Producing Pop (1992), Music Genres and Corporate Cultures (1999), and Bob Dylan (2008). E-mail: k.negus@gold.ac.uk.

The author thanks the Universal Music Corporation for permission to quote from “Kid Charlemagne.” Words and Music by Walter Becker and Donald Fagen. Copyright © 1976 Universal Music Corp. Copyright renewed. All Rights Reserved.

1. For just one example of this neglect, see the conspicuous absence of song and music in H. Porter Abbott, The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

3. Most notable and influential here is Claudia Gorbman, Unheard Melodies, Narrative Film Music (London: BFI, 1988).

4. The application of literary criticism has been notable in approaches to the lyrics of Bob Dylan. See, for example, Aidan Day, Jokerman: Reading the Lyrics of Bob Dylan (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988); and Christopher Ricks, Dylan’s Visions of Sin (London: Viking, 2003).


8. Nicholls, “Narrative Theory as an Analytical Tool,” 302. Space does not permit an extended engagement with this specific track, but it strikes me that this characteristic quality—an “unvarying melody”—may actually contribute to the narrative tension by offering a moment that appears to be suspended or caught in the present: the ennui of that sensation of “don’t you want me?”


14. The use of existing songs as inspiration or models for “new” songs is an issue that frequently crops up in Paul Zollo’s collection of interviews, *Songwriters on Songwriting*, 4th ed. (New York: Da Capo, 2003).


30. Eric F. Clarke, “Subject-Position and the Specification of Invariants in Music by Frank Zappa and P. J. Harvey,” *Music Analysis* 18, no. 3 (1999): 347–74. Clarke draws from its use in the study of film. It is debatable whether the political imperatives that informed the development of the concept in Marxism were retained in film studies. The link to ideological critique and political praxis has almost disappeared on its journey into music analysis.


41. Kennett, “Is Anybody Listening?.”


44. “Empathy” being a key concept in Edmund Husserl’s development of the notion of “intersubjectivity.”

45. A similar idea to this notion of shared understanding is being explored and developed by Nick Reyland through his “listener-response theory” in “Listening for the Plot: Towards a Reader-Response Theory of Musical Narrativity,” Lancaster Institute for Contemporary Arts Research Seminar, 8 June 2010.


50. Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, 3.


60. Those unfamiliar with this song can readily access the lyrics at http://www.steelydan.com/lyroyalscam.html#track1.


63. For an extended discussion of this point, see Don Breithaupt, *Aja* (New York: Continuum, 2007).

64. Jocelyn Neal highlights the structural principles of songwriting in country music: repeated choruses in which the lyrical text does not change and “must continue to be relevant after the song’s plot has progressed through additional verses.” “Narrative Paradigms, Musical Signifiers, and Form as Function in Country Music,” 45.


67. Becker’s and Fagen’s songs use harmonies and voicing, and transitions to chords and keys that would be unexpected in conventional rock sequences. This may destabilize or broaden the tone, inflecting lyrics with an ominous or disconcerting mood. For further discussion, see Everett, “A Royal Scam: The Abstruse and Ironic Bop-Rock Harmony of Steely Dan”; and Breithaupt, *Aja*.

68. For an insight into fan discussions about the meaning of songs, and the way conflicting interpretations are debated and resolved, see, for example, http://www.songmeanings.net and http://www.songfacts.com.

70. Paul Clements has written of his own enthusiasm for Steely Dan’s “outsider hip” and “cult” status: “In my own case of adolescence in a small town in England, this music alongside a range of other less mainstream popular music forms represented creative aspiration (especially a career as a jazz or rock musician). . . . Steely Dan . . . represented a complex and sophisticated popular music championed in the main by a predominantly male grouping which identified with the jazz/beat lifestyle.” See “Cultural Legitimacy or ‘Outsider Hip’: Representational Ambiguity and the Significance of Steely Dan,” Leisure Studies 28, no. 2 (2009): 189–206, at 196.

71. Toth, “A World of My Own.”


74. Stevens, Storming Heaven, 313.

75. Martin A. Lee and Bruce Shlain, Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History of LSD: The CIA, the Sixties and Beyond (New York: Grove Press, 1992), 146.
