**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Tullis Rennie's Muscle Memory: Listening to the Act of Listening

Waters, S. (2015). Tullis Rennie's *Muscle Memory*: Listening to the Act of Listening. *Contemporary Music Review*, 34(1), 22-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07494467.2015.1077563>

Published in:
Contemporary Music Review

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

Copyright 2015 Taylor and Francis.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Contemporary Music Review* on 01 Oct 2015, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/07494467.2015.1077563>.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Tullis Rennie's *Muscle Memory*: Listening to the act of listening.

Simon Waters

This paper explores a recent, broadly 'electroacoustic', fixed medium composition by Tullis Rennie, which uses his background in ethnographic fieldwork to explore (in this case through auto-ethnography) modes of listening, and the role of technologies in mediating this listening. Muscle Memory: A conversation about jazz, with Graham South (trumpet) (2014) begins to answer questions about how one work can comment on and analyse or critique another through its own agency as music, bringing composition and ethnography together in fruitful collision, and illuminating the human capacity to manipulate and be manipulated by musical activity. The paper uses the piece to test the extent to which four functions, identified by Simon Frith (1987) as crucial to the meaningfulness of popular music may, in the context of ubiquitously-technologised music, have broader application than he originally intended.

Keywords: Modes of listening, Ethnographically-informed composition, Music's supporting technologies, Social functions of music.

Opening: listening to listening

Imagine that you're overhearing two friends talking animatedly about something they love. The atmosphere is relaxed. Music is playing quietly in the background, and is in fact the subject of their conversation. They're talking about their love of Miles Davis's music and then, without warning, Davis is in the room with them – no, with us – playing his trumpet. Of course you know that isn't possible, because you share their love of Davis enough to know that he died in 1991, but nevertheless, there he is. So, apparently, begins a recent fixed medium composition by Tullis Rennie¹ which I will explore here because of the remarkable confidence with which it foregrounds questions of musical meaning, of modes of listening, and the role of technologies in mediating this listening. The 'point of view' of the listener – the listening *home* – is both precise and fluid, focusing attention on the act itself, then just as assuredly drawing us in to the 'material' of the work. The title, *Muscle Memory: A conversation about jazz, with Graham South (trumpet)* (2014),² conceals a conceit, for the conversation referred to is not only that of language, but also of the multiple *musical* interactions which are instantiated by the piece. In particular I use the work here to test the extent to which four roles which Simon Frith (1987) identifies as crucial to the meaningfulness of popular music may have broader application than he intended, being helpful not only in understanding 'popular uses of "serious" music' (1987, p. 149) but music in general.

Rennie's piece is remarkable in the proficiency with which it combines fragments from Miles Davis's orchestrated recording of *So What*³ with recomposed material which overlays digitally manipulated aspects of that original with 'live' trumpet improvisation, framing the whole within the narrative conceit of two friends – the composer and the trumpeter – listening to and discussing recordings by Davis. As the work therefore inevitably has an auto-ethnographic leaning, my approach here has been to accrete further layers of parallel narrative by recording the composer and myself listening to and talking about the piece in studio conditions,⁴ and by combining my transcription of key moments from this discussion with my own observations of the work in performance at the 2015 Sonorities Festival,⁵ and subsequently.

Listening in performance we 'drop in' to the conversation, as if arbitrarily, as if instantly transported to the inner circle of an intimate conversation which has already

been going on for some time. The two friends, in relaxed but animated conversation, are listening to music; indeed music is their (but perhaps at this point not our) explicit focus. We are listening to two guys talking about something that they love *as* they listen to it, and we therefore become rapidly complicit in *their* act of listening. We are simultaneously listening to them, and listening at one remove to what they are listening to. But of course our entire listening experience is also framed by the fact that this is a *piece*, a *work*. We are sitting in a performance space listening to a piece of soundscape, sonic art, electroacoustic composition, documentary – which of these is as yet unclear. There's a sense in which, initially, we are simultaneously in the place of the performance, yet unsure of where we are, or of the status or mode of our listening, without this being in any sense uncomfortable or disorientating. Compositionally then, the piece is already addressing the different ways in which we habitually listen. The composer as ethnographer is documenting a conversation between two people, one of whom happens to be himself. For the composer the excited, non-neutral mode of listening is set in paradoxical juxtaposition with the dispassionate observer mode, the mode of the ethnographer (or perhaps all auto-ethnography is already 'excited'). As Rennie phrases it in the programme note to the work: 'The piece acts as a meta-text, revealing various layers to the act of listening'. Where 'we' are; where 'you' are; where 'the listener' is; where something is taking place; how listening is handled – becomes a primary focus of the work for all its participants. Attention is precisely managed. Practice and documentation operate in a symbiotic, mutually interpenetrating loop.

So let's return to the two friends, listening to music, searching for CDs in their collection. The conversation turns to the medium of delivery of the music: of the CD as a mode of storage, of musical categorisation and of filing and then, suddenly, Miles Davis is in the room, playing the trumpet. It's a remarkable 'trompe l'oreille': clearly someone playing the trumpet is in the 'same space' as the conversation. The 'music listened to' moves forward: a root/fifth/maj 7th figure is 'captured' and looped, without our seemingly having left the logic of 'listening to CDs in the background', and this advances on our consciousness through repetition. But we have been artfully prepared for this motif, as the first time we hear it isn't at one remove, from the CD, but in an anticipatory sung version from the composer moments earlier in the conversation (2'07"). This flags up another narrative strategy which recurs in the piece: that of anticipation, which is deferred, and its eventual realisation just outside the bounds of immediate memory – so that our listening is moved into durational rather than rhythmic cross-reference. This is the pacing of a storyteller: of a knowing construction of audience response. (I'm writing this account, incidentally, from memory at this point. Although I've heard the piece perhaps five times I already have a map, I hope accurate, of its various sections and transitions).

We'll return to the recording medium of the music listened to 'behind' the conversation, which as it moves forward into consciousness also seems to gain 'grain' and 'bloom', as if replayed from vinyl on a turntable. The composer attributes this liveliness and presence to the fact that the recording in question is a live recording: 'there's a level of hiss to it ...'. The role of the technologies involved both in fixing music in a particular historical moment, and re-instantiating it in the now, becomes another explicit subject of the musical fabric. One is encouraged to interrogate the piece through the various nestings of technology which support it, and which allow the construction of depths and windows through which our attention is guided and refocused.

The primary 'trompe l'oreille', beyond the shock of the trumpeter's sudden presence in the space of conversation and listening, is the manner in which the trumpet playing subsequently elides with and pulls forward the now modified, looped material from the background CD. Suddenly we are listening solely and explicitly to *music* instantiated in the moment of its making. Ambiguities about its 'liveness' or otherwise are placed in abeyance. The layer of experience in which the composer and his friend

were conversing and listening has, at least for now, been erased entirely. (That the trumpeter is, in fact, the friend in the conversation – recorded not in the ‘conversation space’ but in the space in which the ‘real’ performance is taking place *now* – is but another aspect of the care with which the interleaving of listening spaces has been managed compositionally).

Frith and the social functions of music

But before pursuing this line of enquiry further, I’d like to reflect on the serendipitous match between the compositional goals of the piece as I read it, and a set of tools for thinking through musical meaning which are at first sight not intended to deal with this type of musical making. In his seminal paper which I read on its publication in 1987 and which only seems to gain in resonance as it ages (and I do), Simon Frith identified four ways in which popular music can be said *to mean* for its audience. As a model for understanding music’s capacity to generate social meaning, the paper has a clarity which distracts the reader from the cautiousness of its claim: that this is a way of understanding *popular* music – defined by Frith as music stored in or distributed through recordings. But Frith was writing before the consolidation of what I have elsewhere characterised as ‘sampling culture’ (Waters, 2000), although certainly aware of Jacques Attali’s (1977) formulation of a final utopian ‘political economy’ of music – ‘composition’ – by which the latter meant each individual’s capacity to construct the soundscape to and of her own life.⁶ Surely, in a world where recorded music is ubiquitous, *all* music must in some sense share the capacity to generate such meanings.

Frith’s first ‘social function’ of music is ‘answering questions of identity’ (1987, p. 140). ‘The pleasure that pop music produces is a pleasure of identification – with the music we like, with the performers of that music, with the other people who like it’ (1987, p. 140). *Muscle Memory* starts from exactly this premise. Composer Rennie’s identity is at least partly constructed through a love of Miles Davis, which is so palpable that it brings him into the room. Rennie is aided in this conjuring act by long-term friend Graham South⁷ who not only shares a love of Davis but is a proficient trumpet player. The business of identity formation is about the relationship between friends, and the piece is also an explicit portrayal of friendship.⁸ Rennie is also a brass player (a trombonist) and describes his early musical experiences, which were not of jazz, thus:

Brass playing was something very early on in my life, because at the age of five I learned the piano, and it was ... too many things at once: it was learning notation, and it was *two* hands, and *reading* music, and it took quite a long time to get anywhere, and it was also quite hard to play in an ensemble – so I missed out on the social aspect – so taking up a brass instrument was the solution to that ... The trombone was a quick fix, because I could already read the treble clef, and you only play one note at once. So in comparison it was much easier. I’d already got a sense of rhythm, so then I could accelerate [in achievement] quite quickly.

Rennie adds: ‘And brass instruments pick *you*. I started off on the trumpet, and a week later I went back and got a euphonium – because of the size of the mouthpiece I couldn’t really make any decent noise out of a trumpet’. Adaptation to mouthpiece size then led Rennie to his current instrument, the trombone. The significance of this story lies in the extent to which musicians tend to self-identify as such relatively early, and that a relationship with a particular instrument is also formative of identity to an extent not often appreciated by non-players. It also points up the crucial link between tactility and sound: the *Muscle Memory* of the title refers to the familiar sense of a point at which one

ceases to be aware that one is doing something and is just ‘in the doing of it’ – almost as if it were ‘being done to one’. But the reference is not only to this literal sense understood by instrumental musicians, but to the sense of mind regarded as embodied, as post-Cartesian, as co-extensive with the physical and the bodily. Musicking (Small 1998) is a crucial route to understanding this contiguity.

Frith’s second social function is ‘to give us a way of managing the relationship between our public and private emotional lives’ (1987, p. 141). Although Frith concentrates on pop music’s capacity to articulate those aspects of interpersonal relationships where language fails, there are other instances of human experience for which language is also simply inadequate, and Rennie cites an example from *Muscle Memory*: ‘Graham says something, and he tries to explain what he means, and he ends up just ... *wwwwwwhhh* ... making a noise’. In a more nuanced sense, performing music is itself a means of managing that public/private emotional relationship. I have often quipped that I began to play the guitar and bass as a ‘dance-avoidance strategy’. Playing the music to which others listened or danced was a socially-sanctioned negotiation around one kind of physical awkwardness, allowing participation without embarrassment or shame. And to crudely paraphrase Jonathan Impett⁹ (also, coincidentally, a brass player), the primary mode of musical knowing is musicking. All the (linguistic) discourse around music is somehow inadequate in the face of the act itself.

This reading of Frith’s ‘second function’ – the way in which we deal with powerful emotion for which we have inadequate verbal articulacy – is somewhat broader and more metaphorical than he perhaps originally intended, and is doubtless informed by my shift towards a sense that his analysis is applicable not only to popular music, but to music *per se*. The ‘binding’ effect of shared listening – of something within or about a relationship which can’t be expressed in talk – may be as palpable a response to a Ravel string quartet as to a love song.

The third of Frith’s social functions is also key to *Muscle Memory*. To ‘shape [...] memory, to organize our sense of time’ (1987, p. 142) – by both intensifying a sense of the present, and by managing our attention to time passing at every level from milliseconds to decades – is a precise description of the strategies employed in the piece. The composer is organising his own, and our, sense of time passing. He is remembering his own life, and ‘marking’ it against certain key events. As Rennie’s programme note for the piece puts it, the piece ‘demonstrates what any obsessive knows: how many memories can be held within a single moment on one track from one record, and how much influence that can have on one’s own musical identity’. During *Muscle Memory* the composer visits precise, formative moments such as that at which a particular recording was bought, and these are also remembered by South, who contributes and reifies other common memories, and in doing so, the bond between them.

Frith continues by adding that ‘music in itself provides our most vivid experience of time passing. Music focuses our attention on the *feeling* of time’ (1987, p. 142: italics added), on ‘anticipation and echo, around endings to which we look forward, choruses that build regret into their fading’ (1987, p. 142): strategies exemplified here by a discussion about the Gil Evans Orchestra’s late entry in a particular performance of *So What*, in which the speed of bassist Paul Chambers’s introduction leaves the whole band unprepared. Having set up the expectation (between 1’55” and 2’50”) that we will hear this, its appearance is actually deferred until 8’03”, by which time our attention has shifted elsewhere. This deferral is a key compositional and narrative strategy. Both conversation and musical material lead us to anticipate an event which doesn’t occur until two thirds of the way into a twelve-and-a-half minute piece. Technically, anticipation is constructed by repetition and harmonic control. A typical example (from 5’37”), to which I’ll return, loops a languid rising A/E/G# figure in the bass under a sustained G# drone, the anticipation of harmonic resolution frozen into stasis by the slowly cycling rhythm.

This composerly management of time happens at many levels: the participants are talking about themselves and their own biographies; they are bringing recordings which encapsulate a particular (historical) moment into the ‘now’ of the narrative – presenting them to each other, and to us; moments of these existing recordings are ‘frozen’ or looped and brought into new use (while simultaneously referring explicitly to their origins in a previous performance). The composer is ‘getting inside’ the recordings through looping and granular synthesis and temporally restructuring at a detailed level. He is literally ‘taking moments’ and manipulating our sense of time – some of this to do with ‘freezing’ time – creating a paradoxical state of rhythmic/spectral/harmonic stasis through carefully judged lengthening and micro-repetition. Some of the manipulation of prior material is more ‘structural’, reinforcing the cycling D and Eb modes of the original *So What* to create a mimetic alternating formal structure over which South can improvise ‘Miles-esque’ trumpet lines.

South’s trumpet material, despite the power of its first, unexpected entry into the conversation, is initially, for the most part, gentle and exploratory, but around 5’05” the range and scope of the playing intensifies considerably, placing the instrument in an increasingly conscious solo relationship with the supporting material. For the composer, this cumulative structure, moving inexorably towards purposefulness, ‘mirrors the conversation. We start off kind of meandering around, and then we find a CD, and then we remember something else that happened, and it gains traction as we link or “click”’. There is an accumulation of emotional power. Having been dropped into the world of the two friends, we are drawn in and carried by the excitement and animation of the developing conversation, which explores the nature of the friendship’s origins in a shared love of music in unguarded detail. There is passion in both ‘telling’ and ‘showing’, evident through both the recounting of music’s embeddedness in their lives and through explicit musical intervention.

For the final third of the work the musical activity remains quite intense, swells in the supporting loop which happen several times (notably at 10’18”) serving to bring the ‘background’ forward, in support of the most virtuosic section of playing which South contributes. At the opening, the composer intends:

Clear distinctions between the conversation we’re having, listening to the record, and then some ‘new’ music, [but] towards the end it starts to blur a bit more. Some of the loops and the [...] overt ‘we are listening to a record’ bit begin to be not so clearly defined.

The piece ends with more conversation, which is almost arbitrarily cut. As listeners we know that the conversation continues, but we are no longer party to it.

The fourth and final of Frith’s ‘social functions’ is ‘something more abstract than the issues discussed so far, but a consequence of all of them: popular music is something possessed’ (1987, p. 143). *Muscle Memory* explores this through both its foregrounding of the technical apparatus of music’s commodity forms – initially through the work’s explicit reference to searching for CDs in a collection (the shop in which a particular CD was bought is excitably remembered),¹⁰ and later in the discussion of the merits of vinyl and analogue recording technologies. The piece foregrounds technology too through its use of digital processes to transform material in both the time and frequency domains through an act of composition: ‘Composition’ here manifests itself in the utopian form predicted by Attali (1977), and referred to above, as a composer’s engaged ownership and management of their own acoustic environment and the events within in. Frith talks about music fans ‘own[ing] their favourite music in ways that were intense and important to them’ (1987, p. 143), and the entire framing device of *Muscle Memory*, the impassioned conversation, reinforces this incorporation of music into self. Ownership is here

demonstrably ‘an important aspect of the way in which everyone thinks and talks about ‘their’ music’ (1987, p. 143).

All four of Frith’s categories are therefore foregrounded in *Muscle Memory* as deliberate acts of musical making. The piece is *about* Rennie’s friendship with South, it’s about his personal history, it’s about his love and ‘ownership’ of music in general and that of Miles Davis in particular. And the act of formulating this into a composition uses this personal love to open up an invitation to a collective celebration of ‘how music works’. It proposes a series of musical ‘homecomings’, or realisations, each with a window into a further sense of musical meaningfulness. If a composer is interested in notions of musical meaning, and lives in a society where most musical experience is recorded, by definition, then perhaps inevitably they choose to make a piece which is *about* the act of recording and the act of listening, incorporating things which already exist. And looked at through the lens of Frith’s four functions of popular music, the manner in which these propensities for meaning are compositionally foregrounded (and the viability of Frith’s analysis for music *per se*, now that all music exists to at least some extent in the domain of recording and repetition) is clear.

Talking about listening

The first clear idea we hear when we drop into the conversation which opens *Muscle Memory* is composer Rennie saying: ‘I think the idea for me, was that music has some significance in terms of us’. The intimacy between the proponents in the conversation is flagged, and the listeners are implicated in the work’s purpose, simultaneously. As Rennie reflects on the work later: ‘That’s really important, that gap. I think that, although we know that we’re being recorded, the listener knows that it’s not staged’. It’s about two people who really care about each other and they’re using their shared love of music as a negotiation of the unsayable in a friendship; the difficulty in voicing the ‘us’ is precisely its authenticity. It’s hard to talk about this ‘us’. But this reluctance to speak it is compensated for by the mutual love of music which unfolds. There’s no reluctance to *act* ‘us’. ‘Have you got any Miles Davis CDs?’ asks Rennie (South has over forty). Asked where they are in his collection, South sardonically suggests that the composer should perhaps look under ‘D’. That South’s collection is alphabetically ordered is both an endearing glimpse of his personality, and of the difference between the two friends.

Rennie’s consciousness of the layers of reuse and cross-reference is made particularly explicit when he and I re-listen to the piece in the studio. At around 2’25” he comments: ‘I love this orchestration ... *this* music is self-referential because it’s a live orchestration of the original piano intro’. At the live trumpet entry at 3’14”, which he has set up by the deliberate intervention of a slowly-cycling loop, Rennie comments: ‘to me that’s slowing down ... that gives everyone a [break] ... because there’s been such a lot of information’. At 3’58”, another decisive compositional intervention takes the ‘live’ trumpet sound and suddenly and dramatically expands the listening space, the trumpet receding into a spectral ‘wash’. Although technically achieved through the addition of reverb and the gradual addition into the reverb of other components, the listener at this point is drawn into a virtual environment *not of* the listening room: a more distant ‘recessed’ layer, upon which the composer re-inscribes the ‘live’ trumpet as soloist. ‘It was really important to me that it was quite dry, and quite close, so it sounds like he’s *there*’. By 4’30” the background layer has become more prominent and sufficiently established that as listeners we fuse this and the trumpet into singular and unproblematic ‘musical listening’. We are no longer *listening with* the two characters in the diegetic space of their narrative, but are instead *listening to* ‘directly’. We are aware that there is

still some relationship with *So What*, and the music's anticipation-building strategies mean that we are also waiting.

As Rennie and I re-listen to the piece he comments that by 5'38" he is 'trying to pull the [original] record and [...] the orchestration and the orchestra back [into our attention]'. By gradually reintroducing the cycling A/E/G# bass figure and other components until at 6'02"–6'15" there is a moment where Davis and South are briefly joined in virtual duet, the former 'frozen' in alternation between two pitches (and by subtly increasing the reverberant space around the 'live' trumpet), Rennie ensures that all of the various sources become integrated in our listening. A dramatic drop in level associated with a key change and a shift in the spectrum of the 'accompanying' material (6'39") prepares us for another 'drop' (7'06") at which Rennie peels away all the layers of recomposed material, exposing the original Miles Davis recording, and suddenly we are again *listening with*. Rennie and South are in the room talking, indeed South's recounting of drummer Max Roach's protest during a (this?) live concert recording¹¹ draws our attention into the conversational narrative and away from musical listening. This is again a deliberate compositional ploy. 'To me it shows that *that* record encapsulates some level of history *in itself* – the fact that *that* night, *that* gig was recorded', as Rennie puts it in our subsequent conversation, where he talks of the re-introduction of his dialogue with South thus:

I always think it's a surprise ... I think, [at least] I hope you've been convinced for long enough [as listeners] that we're going to go off somewhere else [explicitly musical] that you sort of forget that this [conversation] is happening.

A short space at 8'01" precedes the denouement, which, as listeners, we had anticipated but have been unable to hold in mind since the moment at 1'53" where Rennie and South described the orchestra's inability to co-ordinate a crucial entry after Paul Chambers's bass intro. Now the two protagonists collapse into laughter and our attention turns once again to the detail of the Miles Davis recording, where a short, rhythmic, loop-like phrase around 8'10" underpins their continuing conversation. It also provides the bridge into the next main section of recomposition, with Rennie reinforcing and transforming the loop-like qualities from 8'28" until the digital qualities are again foregrounded (by superimposing internal delays, time-stretching, and actual looping). 'The idea is to have that really overt loop give you [the listener] time to transition' to what Rennie regards by 8'50" as 'our version of the standard ... [We wanted] just to let it swing ... just to see what would happen [...]. It keeps the same harmonic function [and AABA modal scheme] as the original'. Rennie indicates that at around 10'08" he wanted to pull back [dynamically] before building the piece up again in a mirroring of the manner in which Davis does so in the original recording. Soon after 11'00" the material again 'recedes', as if into the background, or even into a past, which for once makes the final re-entry of the conversation between the main protagonists unsurprising.

The tenor of the final conversation is around the technologies involved in the recording, and perceived differences between analogue and digital approaches. Rennie's 'final' contribution to the 'ongoing' conversation within the work is:

You can hear how the valves are on the edge of their limits in the microphones, everything's sort of peaking in the red but they can kind of deal with it because there's headroom. It's not just, like, numbers [...] so there's a bit of, like ... *sizzle* in the sound, especially when the big bands are playing, like in those Gil Evans recordings. You get that thing where it's just *hot*.

Rennie adds, in later conversation with me 'when you listen up close, and you start to magnify and take samples from even a digitally-mastered CD version of the tape you can

still hear that quality [of tape or valve saturation]’. When we discuss how much better recording companies have become at transferring analogue material transparently to CD Rennie interjects: ‘[it’s] funny that, because we talk about that [in the piece] ... about whether he’s got the *re*-issues, because those Columbia reissues came out and they were loads better. They were worth getting’.

Closing

Rennie (2014) has described his compositional approach as broadly ‘socio-sonic’ in its combination of ethnography, field recording and electroacoustic or spectromorphological sensibilities. *Muscle Memory* is distinct from much of his more politically explicit work involving protest in Barcelona, Belfast and the favelas of Rio,¹² the auto-ethnographic element here allowing him to bypass sensitivities about ‘cultural appropriation, voyeurism or [...] “protest porn”’ which he has voiced elsewhere (Rennie, forthcoming). His goal of ‘maintain[ing] a creative and analytical relationship to both materiality and sociality of sound’ (Feld & Brenneis, 2004) is therefore perhaps most successfully achieved in *Muscle Memory*. Thanks to Frith we have some criteria for establishing how this success is achieved.

Although obviously not entirely without recourse to language, *Muscle Memory* begins to answer questions about how one work can comment on and analyse or critique another through its own agency as music. It also demonstrates how a work can marshal autobiography and ethnography to illuminate the human capacity to manipulate and be manipulated by musical activity. It explicitly engages multiple modes of listening and points of view: documentary ‘field’ recordist; participant observer; soundscape composer; ‘amateur’ musicologist and music lover; DJ and remix artist¹³; spectromorphological composer – and allows the listener to explore different modes of listening through these multiple and nested points of view such that this becomes the primary formal concern. The listening *home* (the *point* of view) is contingent and transitory as we move through the scant twelve and a half minutes of the piece, so the listener is constantly becoming re-involved with, and made conscious of, the act of listening.

Bibliography

- Attali, J. (1977) *Bruits: Essai sur L'Économie Politique de la Musique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Born, G. (2005). On Musical Mediation: Ontology, Technology and Creativity. *Twentieth-Century Music* 2(1), pp. 7–36.
- Feld, S. & Brenneis, D. (2004). Doing Anthropology in Sound. *American Ethnologist* 31(4), pp. 461–74.
- Frith, S. (1987). Towards an Aesthetic of Popular Music. In R. Leppert & S. McClary (Eds.), *Music and Society* (pp. 133–49). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rennie, T. (Forthcoming). Power Struggles: The Explicit and Implicit Politics in Composing with the Sounds of Protest. *Leonardo Music Journal* 25.
- Rennie, T. (2014). Socio-Sonic: An Ethnographic Methodology for Electroacoustic Composition. *Organised Sound* 19(2), pp. 117–24.
- Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening*. Hanover: Wesleyan/University Press of New England.
- Waters, S. (2000). Beyond the Acousmatic: Hybrid Tendencies in Electroacoustic Music. In S. Emmerson (Ed.), *Music, Electronic Media and Culture* (pp. 56–83). Aldershot: Ashgate.

¹ Rennie is a composer, electronic musician, trombonist and DJ. He has worked in various musical guises across the UK and Europe for the last 13 years, and has more recently undertaken performances and projects in both South America and Korea. He is a founder member of Insectotrópics – a multimedia performance collective based in Barcelona, and is currently completing a PhD in Composition at the Sonic Arts Research Centre (SARC), Queen's University Belfast.

² An audio file of this piece can be retrieved from the Contemporary Music Review website at XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

³ From the 1962 album *Miles Davis at Carnegie Hall* (Columbia CL1812 in its original mono vinyl manifestation) featuring Miles Davis's Quintet with the Gil Evans Orchestra in a live recording from 19 May 1961.

⁴ On 7 May 2015 in SARC. Unless otherwise indicated all citations from Rennie originate from this recording.

⁵ On 23 April 2015 in the Sonic Lab at SARC.

⁶ Rennie (forthcoming) refers to composition as a 'framework for [the resolution of] contradictory elements' and a site for the negotiation of 'mutual understandings' which explicitly involves the audience as 'multifaceted and independently minded individuals', citing Georgina Born's (2005) 'redistribution of creative agency' as a goal.

⁷ Harrogate-born trumpeter Graham South is based in Manchester and works in several different musical settings. Since graduating from the University of Manchester, where he completed a Master's degree in composition, he has forged a successful career as an orchestral trumpeter, freelancing with ensembles such as the Royal Liverpool Philharmonic, the BBC Philharmonic and Manchester Camerata. As an improviser, he is a featured soloist with the award-winning Beats and Pieces Big Band, with which he has toured extensively throughout the UK and Europe.

⁸ Rennie writes, in his programme note for the piece: 'Graham and I met aged 18, in the first few days of us both beginning a music degree at the University of Manchester. There's a chance we were both even geekier then than we are now. We haven't really stopped talking about music since'.

⁹ Jonathan Impett. 'The Work-Without-Content: Giorgio Agamben and the Shape of the Contemporary Musical Artefact'. Paper presented at the Music and Philosophy Study Group Second Annual Conference, King's College, London, Sat 21 July 2012.

¹⁰ The composer recounts memories of being nineteen: 'By pulling out that record we remember that he'd bought it when he came to visit me, when I was at my parents' one summer and we went into Derby record-shopping'.

¹¹ South erroneously assumes at this point that Roach was involved in the *Miles Davis at Carnegie Hall* recording, and that the protest took place during *this* recording.

¹² These include *Manifest* (2012–2013), *The Metropolis Sounds* (2013), *Selarón: A Great Madness* (2013) and *Carioca Sound Stories* (2015) and his collaboration with the Rio-based collaborative community art project *Som de Maré* (2014): <http://somdamare.wordpress.com>. The first three of Rennie's works are retrievable from: <http://tullisrennie.bandcamp.com>. The fourth (an audiovisual work) is at: <https://vimeo.com/121400457>.

¹³ In conversation Rennie is emphatic about the extent to which electronica and dance music borrow from jazz.