

1. Title, Background and Relevance

1.1 Title: From “reduced” to expanded listenings: productions of musical communication in contemporary New York

1.2 Background and Relevance

This research investigates musical listening as a communicational phenomenon, ~~and intends,~~ ~~within~~ the proposed scholarship period, ~~it ethnographically investigates to focus on how~~ certain types of ~~production of~~ musical listening ~~are produced to be ethnographically analyzed~~ in contemporary New York. But what do ~~we~~ mean by the terms listening, communication and ethnography?

Listening does not seem to be a clearly circumscribed phenomenon if we ask which area of knowledge it belongs to. In fact, it has been studied from ~~multiple~~ plural perspectives: “in philosophy, theology, music, acoustics, psychology, physiology, education, interpersonal communication, ecology, anatomy, astronomy, sociology, history, poetry, art history, and many other fields” (Sterne ~~TERNE~~, 2005, p. 65). Some distinctions may be useful in order to specify ~~the our~~ focus, such as the classic one between listening and hearing – stated, among others¹, by Barthes (1982). Hearing can be understood as the physical act of ~~sensibility~~ relating acoustical impulses to ear vibrations and its connections to the nervous system, and can be studied in terms of physiology and anatomy (DRUMRIGHT; KING; SEIKEL, 2010). But listening goes beyond audition and hearing: it is a psychological act of attention, understanding, or, to put it in a word, sense.

The very fact that we can distinguish between indexical sounds (the ‘wild’ sounding of the footsteps of a predator), ~~meaningful sounds~~ (verbal speech, which is codified) and musical sounds is an effect of a previous and broader communicational production of sense² (not only a structuralist application of sense). In this doctoral dissertation project, ~~my our~~ effort is ~~to think through of~~ musical listening as a (specifically) communicational phenomenon.

This is not a new ~~appr concern~~ ~~examination~~. Many music scholars cannot avoid speaking in terms of communication – for instance, Nattiez (1990) and Tagg (1982), ~~while and~~ communication cannot avoid ~~talking speakign~~ in terms of music – as in Eco (1976) and Barthes (1982) —not to ~~speak of mention~~ the common sense idea that music is communication³. ~~The recent bloom of~~ Sound Studies ~~recent bloom — we think of~~ ~~exemplified by the work of~~ Jonathan Sterne, Emily Thompson and Trevor Pinch, ~~for example —~~ additionally intensifies the discussions concerning media and music. ~~My Our~~ ~~effort purpose~~, therefore, is not simply to ~~think of~~ ~~examine~~ listening as communication but ~~to think of approach~~ it via a certain understanding of communication. ~~I will discuss this approach after first,~~

¹ Schaeffer (2003) leads the distinction further towards four types of phenomena (*ouïr, écouter, entendre, comprendre*). Chion (2012) classifies three types of listening: causal, semantic and reduced. Barthes’ distinction has been chosen here for its (initial) simplicity.

² We speak of communicational production of sense to surpass the idea of an application of preexisting significations, which could lead to a stagnating use of the linguistic distinction between *langue* and *parole*. Beyond and before structured sense, communication may study the production and restructuration of language systems (whether verbal or non-verbal), in the space of pre-sense identified by Kristeva (1974).

³ This has been a topic of extensive theoretical debate dating from, at least, the XVIIth century, with Boileau (LEVI-STRAUSS, 2010). Our account of it is in Lucas (2017).

Comment [S1]: This is what we call in English the “royal we.” It is ok, but is not very commonly used these days. I would change everything to either I or a sentences that rearranges the subject so you don’t have to use we. For example: But what do the terms listening, communication, and ethnography mean? You use it throughout, so maybe it’s not worth it you don’t have time to change it at this point but just FYI (for your information).

Comment [S2]: I think you’re going with Chicago Style citation? We don’t capitalize the full word, just the first letter, and for Chicago style there’s no p. just the commas (Sterne, 2005, 65). You could also use APA style (Sterne 2005:65).

Same goes for the references list. Here’s Chicago Style Latour:
Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the social: an introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [S3]: or “... act of sensibility, relating acoustical...”

Comment [S4]: but the indexical footsteps of predator are also meaningful... speech is abstract meaningful in a way indexical ones aren’t quite. You could say symbolic sounds.

Comment [S5]: this is a current academic idiom...to think through. Think of is a little too lig for what you’re proposing.

Comment [S6]: add a couple of the dates of their works here.

~~which will have to be discussed here. But, first, we must~~ address^{ing} the relevance of ~~my~~our object of research: the contemporary production of musical listening.

Against any universalizing theses that formalize musical listening as a repeatable phenomenon, with clearly defined parameters, it seems to us that listening, today, is a localized effect of different *a posteriori* signification systems and practices⁴. I use the term “practices” in the sense of Kristeva’ (date) research on literature’s signifying practices, avoiding the term “system.” Systems, historically linked with the structuralist approach of Saussure, propose stable, regulating, entities (such as English grammar and syntax). Meanwhile, practices allow for differentiation within the development of the system. In linguistic jargon, the dimension of *parole* (speech) problematizes the dimension of *langue* (language) each time it takes place. Practices contain, develop and restructure systems. Similarly, ~~That is to say, listening,~~ if we investigate the traces listening^{it} leaves through accounts of particular listening practices, listening becomes multiple, by (the accounts of listening), is plural—which is why I use the terms and concept of ~~we will speak mainly of~~ listenings.

When one listens to classical music, the parameters for signification *may* still be the same^s those Adorno reflected upon when he developed a typology of listening types. These, ranging from the exemplary music specialist, capable of recognizing and reconstituting the whole of the *oeuvre*, towards more “degenerate” listenings such as the amateur’s, who enjoys listening even though he knows nothing of musical syntax, not to mention the completely unwary listener’s (ADORNO, 2009). ~~An even more traditional kind of listening undoubtedly still exists, if we are to listen based on the classical aesthetic parameters of the beautiful, the sublime (KANT, 2007), etc. But when we~~ When it comes to investigate the listening of sampled music⁵, ~~for example~~ however, it is evident that the parameters for listening are not these traditional—normative ones (nor are they new universal parameters). As shown in previously published works (LUCAS, 2017), the music by the Australian group The Avalanches, for instance, couples engages with its listeners in more playful, interactive and investigative forms of listening. This is not to say that music, by itself, generates listenings. On the contrary, music is but one of the aspects of a material communicational network that determines various possible listenings as its interpretants;⁶ it allows various distributions of listening in specific communicational roles.

This is ~~what we mean by~~ the meaning of “expanded listenings,” ~~which, in contrasts to the known e with~~ the concept of “reduced listening” brought forth^{ward} by Pierre Schaeffer (2003) and further theorized

⁴ ~~This will be a central concept to our project. We use the term “practices” in the sense of Kristeva’ research on literature’s signifying practices, avoiding the term system. That is because a system—historically linked with the structuralist approach of Saussure—, the object of linguistics, for instance, is a stable, regulating, entity (such as English grammar and syntax). Meanwhile, practices reinsert the movement of differentiation of the system in their development. As if, to use linguistic jargon, the dimension of *parole* (speech) problematized the dimension of *langue* (language) each time it took place. Practices contain, develop and restructure systems.~~

⁵ ~~By that we mean pieces of m~~Music that are wholly constituted byof pre-existing materials which are sampled and [“]sewn[”] together to form new music, ~~such as we can find in the whole of The Avalanches’ productions.~~

⁶ The concept of interpretant is used in a peircean (PEIRCE, 1992, CP 5.594) meaning: that to which a sign gives rise. We use that concept to surpass the notions of listening account and listening indexes we tried elsewhere, in an effort to encompass translations of listening in a wider manner. Listening, Szendy (2008) also recalls, can never be simply transmitted: we are only offered communicational translations (whether verbal or not) that relates to a certain aspect of the object.

Comment [S7]: I would move this or most of into the text, like this:

Comment [S8]: I know what you mean through context but this word is strange...maybe something like distracted?

Comment [S9]: I would cut this since this is such a contested phenomenon, and anyone familiar with ethnomusicology will take issue with the use of “traditional” here, since this was always an elite practice.

Formatted: Footnote Text, Left, Indent: First line: 0"

by Michel Chion (2012). Schaeffer's notorious effort was to reduce listening ~~towards to~~ its phenomenological existence. This phenomenology of listening ~~tried-sought~~ to reach the most fundamental and independent elements of the sonorous phenomenon as listened to. ~~If we t~~My methodology turns this perspective on its head. Drawing on authors and concepts such as Derrida's (1982), dissemination, Kristeva's (1974) intertextuality, Genette's (1989) transtextuality, and Bakhtin's (2016) dialogism, I, re-assuming take up the semiotic axiom that a communicational phenomenon is less of a clearly-defined text than a palimpsest-like object with multiple crossings and intertextualities.⁷ ~~we may be able to~~ As such, this project investigates the "layered nature of the sonorous objects and auditory experience" (DAUGHTRY, 2013, p. 3), the several mediators that produce a determinate listening.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

~~We I~~ set out, thus, from the epistemological notion that communication is a matter of the production of sense. This is not such a polemic definition, of course, since communication has a strong tradition of semiotic perspectives. My approach draws on this history, specifying ~~The specificity of my our approach is to think of~~ communication as coupling (LUHMANN, 1996). Communication brings together, and runs through, different, heterogenous materialities. No material is, *per se*, communicational.⁸ ~~They Material~~ becomes communication when coupled, assembled in a network. My project seeks to describe the elements in this network to understand multiple listenings. ~~that we intend to describe.~~

Comment [S10]: or something like that

Music is this but one of multiple ~~Among these~~ materialities of communication; it is ~~, music is~~ not solely determining (as if listenings could be a pure, phenomenologically reduced, experience of reception). Music is, however, ~~But it is~~ one of the most important mediators in the communicational chain of production of musical listenings. Thus the importance of sound studies and ethnomusicology⁹ for this research. It follows from the definition above that communication is an intrinsically ~~an~~ inter- and transdisciplinary phenomenon.

If listening is a matter of communicational expansion, and communication is a matter of coupling, ~~these couplings~~ produce certain layers of ethnographically analyzable materials. I We thus intend to focus, during this proposed nine month period, ~~not on all communicational couplings, but mainly~~ on the relations of music to with different phenomena in a palimpsestic layering (DAUGHTRY, 2013).

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Comment [S11]: think this should be one paragraph

Comment [S12]: specify... these couplings doesn't tie to the expansive part of communication that listening is. Maybe "the expansive couplings of musical listening produces..."

Comment [S13]: ?

Musical listenings, today, are more as mediated than as ever. ~~and I~~ this is somewhat contrary to the common sense that states that music is now closer to the listener ~~nowadays~~ due to more transparent mediations. As Serge Lacasse's (2000) research on recorded musical paratextuality also recalls, much is at stake, here, beyond and before recorded the phonogram's sound: "from the cover to

Comment [S14]: not sure what you mean by this

Comment [S15]: ?

Comment [S16]: the quote seems to refer to only recorded sound, so this seems like a contradiction/ is nuclear. Do you mean other textualities like writing or scores or things like that? If the Daughtry quote includes those kinds of things, say so somehow.

⁷ ~~We imply, here, the tradition that comprehends authors and concepts such as Derrida's dissemination (1981), Kristeva's intertextuality (1974), Genette's transtextuality (1989) and Bakhtin's dialogism (2016).~~

⁸ ~~Here, we are I draw here from~~ inspired by Latour's (2012) works in on sociology: the social is not pre-given but ~~we~~ must be (re)assembled.

⁹ ~~My Our~~ intended U.S. Host Institution is the New York University Arts and Sciences ethnomusicology program at New York University Department, under the advisory of Prof. Martin Daughtry.

the sample to the parody to the pastiche, these implicit or explicit intertextual relationships are so fundamental to music as to constitute one of its enabling conditions” (DAUGHTRY, 2013, p. 9).

There seems to be, in fact, a proliferation of different modes of listening, related both to traditional media (we think of ~~phonograms~~~~recordings~~, audiovisual materials, written criticism, spoken rumors) and to the new forms these communications assume on the internet. ~~The~~~~is~~ expression ~~(modes of listening)~~ has been used by one important interlocutor of this research (STOCKFELT, 2013). Although Stockfelt’s focus is on the differences among ~~these~~ modes of listening and their (in)adequacies, ~~I~~~~we~~ build on his work, seeking to understand ~~plan to lead his thesis forward, toward~~ the production of ~~these~~ multiple modes of listening. ~~I~~~~We~~ do not intend, however, to reach yet another classification of major types of listenings or listeners. On the contrary, the idea is to map certain “microproductions”² of listening, focusing on listening interpretants in ~~their~~~~its~~ specificities, and identifying, primarily, in what ways these listenings disrupt pre-existing, established modes of listening. Again, these modes are as dependent on the media and technologies that ~~process~~ mediate them as on the music to which they are related. All these aspects participate ~~in~~ ~~the~~ communicational production of listening.

~~Take~~The Avalanches’ sample-based⁴ music serves as an example: it is only when this flux of music has been collectively analyzed in portals such as *WhoSampled*¹⁰ that it becomes perceptible that musical listening, here, has a quest-for-origins aspect. The question of which original recording has been used in a certain piece ends up building rigorous references of knowledge shared by the community on forums like *Reddit*¹¹. Sampled-music listening is, in some cases, no longer solely musical. Expanded listenings arise and leave traces in multiple communication materials.

It is important to note that investigating listening in the digital space does not mean that the research will be restricted ~~itself~~ to digital materialities. Quite the contrary, ~~it~~ seeks ~~we~~ want to map the transduction¹² pathways across different types of media that produce listenings. These chains of transducers are “pluritemporal”² like a palimpsest, articulating materials whose origins are just as relevant as ~~their~~~~its~~ effects. In this sense, listening to Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony today (~~one of our first case studies~~) may still connect the listener to historical accounts and to the traditional concept of musical criticism, even though this latter practice has been deconstructed in more recent media forms (in a way that is dispersed but identifiable ~~in~~ at blogs, record shopping portals, social media, sound studies books, etc.). The important thing is to identify the differences among these communication forms as to their capacity to express, but also to limit, musical listenings. The coupling of several communication forms is what we expect to describe in the final analyses: each listening practice has its own (in)audibilities. Each of them is filled of “moments of inscription and erasure that lie beneath acoustic phenomena and auditory practices” (DAUGHTRY, 2013, p. 3).

¹⁰ <https://www.whosampled.com>.

¹¹ <https://www.reddit.com>.

¹² Transductions, according to Sterne (2005, p. 22), are transformations of one kind of energy to another (from acoustic to electromagnetic to digital and back to acoustic sounds, for instance). The author uses this concept to define sound media.

Comment [S17]: see comment above..

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [S18]: micropausas hahaha

Comment [S19]: ?

Comment [S20]: This is the first time I learn you're primarily going to be investigating digital spaces

Comment [S21]: I'm confused because I thought you were going to do ethnography in NY...

Therefore – to specify one last time ~~the definition~~~~our notion~~ of communication – it is not the purpose of this research to ~~understand~~~~inquire~~ musical's meanings or ~~the sense behind~~ a listening's final ~~structure or sense hiding behind this a listening~~ structure, but to ~~inquire~~ ~~explore~~ the production of listening's communicational possibilities and limitations. An oft-quoted motto by Niklas Luhman is that we can never conclude, but only connect, and it is in this sense that ~~we talk~~ ~~I invoke~~ of a communicational expansion of listening. The communicational production of listening comes before listening, but also after it, through an extensive web of mediators that configure a palimpsestic listening as its object.

Another concept that should be clarified is the notion of production. ~~Several times, up to this point, on debates about this project within the scientific community on communication, sound and music, the concept was scrutinized.~~ It must be split into two different ~~forms of~~ comprehensions. On the one hand, the classical notion of production, in communication studies, ~~will be~~ ~~is~~ conceived of as one of the poles of the communicational process. Traditionally, this processes ~~will be~~ ~~has been~~ thought of as a model ~~which connects~~ ~~relaying~~ emitter, channel and receiver in the transmission of a message. Production, thus, would be on the side of the emitter, whilst listening would be on the opposite, receiving pole. However, ~~poststructuralists ideas of production~~ ~~we are trying to~~ ~~complicate~~ ~~exify~~ this approach ~~by favoring a post-structuralist idea of production~~. Kristeva (1974) has shown that it is a production of sense, or a production of conditions for communication, that ascribes ~~these kinds of~~ communicational roles (sender, channel, receiver, message, etc.), which are frequently taken as pre-determined. ~~Because~~ ~~there is a production of~~ ~~these roles,~~ ~~s;~~ ~~there is a production of~~ ~~listening~~ ~~that is~~ not reducible to the role of the emitter, the author, or, musically, the composer or the musician. Deleuze and Guattari (2010, pp. 11-20) also explore this alternative view of production: within a given ~~mode of~~ ~~production~~ ~~mode~~, a false consciousness arises which distinguishes production from its products. The challenge is to think of a sole production of productions. Or, in ~~this~~ ~~our~~ case, to investigate the production of listenings beyond and before the “tripartite” (NATTIEZ, 1990) models, ~~such as that of sender, channel, receiver,~~ ~~which sometimes~~ ~~menace~~ ~~threaten~~ to stagnate ~~our~~ thought on ~~a~~ ~~communicational processes~~. Music does not simply come from an author; listening does not simply begin and end in a pure phenomenon of reception. Each listening is already a part of a new production of listening¹³. ~~It is this productive layering that I ethnographically operationalize, via the concept of acoustic palimpsest (DAUGHTRY, 2013), in the effort not to presuppose who is producing and who is receiving.~~

~~We tried, up to this point, to show that listening is a matter of expanding, communication is coupling and ethnography is layering. As to the listening practices we are going to deal with, and how – this will be further presented in the methodology section. In the remainder of this section, we explain the project's affiliations and relevance.~~

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Comment [S22]: Don't think you need this paragraph.

¹³ ~~It is this productive layering that we wish to operationalize, ethnographically, via the concept of acoustic palimpsest (DAUGHTRY, 2013), on an effort not to presuppose who is producing and who is receiving.~~

It has become clear by now that this project draws heavily on topics of interest in sound studies, a field which has been ² ~~topics of interest. Sound studies have been an~~ important field in connecting music and communication studies. The field's ~~Its~~ origins ~~may~~ range from Attali's (1977) and Murray Schafer's (2011) work on sound, ~~on the one hand,~~ to ~~and~~ media and materialities of communication authors, ~~on the other, such as~~ like Friedrich Kittler (1999) and Hans Gumbrecht (1994). Within sound studies, much concern has been recently ~~was~~ raised ~~in recent times~~ around musical listening, in such ~~with~~ works by Szendy (2008), Thompson (2002), Erlmann (2010), Bijsterveld et al. (2014) and Martin Daughtry (2015). The most widely recognized *opus*, however, is definitely ~~remains~~ Jonathan Sterne's (2003) volume T ~~on~~ *the Audible Past*, a consolidated reference, nowadays ~~at this point~~, among sound and communication researchers in Brazil.

This project intends to contribute to this field of debate, in which I ~~we~~ have been an active participants, In Brazil it has been developed by ~~whose origins can be attributed to works by~~ Michael Herschmann, Felipe Trotta, and Simone Pereira de Sá, in Rio, as well as ~~and~~ Heloísa Duarte Valente, in São Paulo, just to name a few. The communication, sound and music studies area has grown to comprehend a few several conferences ~~events and~~ working groups, ~~the~~ such as including the Compós² Sound and Music Studies,¹⁴ Intercom's Music and Communication Group,¹⁵ Comúsica,¹⁶ Musicom,¹⁷ and MusiMid.¹⁸ Most importantly, we ~~my work has developed by participating in the~~ working group ~~would like to mention~~ GEIST,¹⁹ I ~~helped organize~~ ~~and~~ its recent International Congress Powers of Sound, which ~~which we helped organizing. This event~~ brought music and sound scholars Prof. Martin Daughtry (NYU) and Ph.D. Shannon Garland (UCLA) to Brazil.

However, my initial disciplinary ~~the background of our research has its roots~~ can be found in ~~on~~ communication studies proper (with a BA ~~coming from an~~ Social Communication degree; habilitation on Journalism), and more specifically ~~in~~ the epistemological approach to ~~of~~ communication from the ~~via~~ semiotic tradition. This is the ~~My research thus plans to strengthen other~~ field of ~~dialogue in this field,~~ s we plan to strengthen, within which my ~~our~~ works has ~~ve~~ been nested and to which they've ~~it has~~ contributed over ~~in~~ the last ten years. This project is one of the byproducts of the collective enterprise by the Intercom Research's Group ~~of Research on the~~ Semiotics of Communication, the participants of the national Journey of Collective Research ~~Groups of Research in~~ Semiotics, and, first and foremost, our Research Group ~~of Research~~ on Semiotics and Communication Cultures, GPESC²⁰. (*Grupo de Pesquisa Semiótica e Culturas da Comunicação*).

Comment [S23]: I think it would be good to something more specific about each of these words...very short, like a frase or noun...

Comment [S24]: add dates to specific works

Comment [S25]: I think you mean jornada (?)

¹⁴ Grupo de Trabalho Estudos de Som e Música da Compós.

¹⁵ Grupo de Pesquisa Comunicação, Música e Entretenimento da Intercom.

¹⁶ Communication and Music Congress - Congresso de Comunicação e Música.

¹⁷ Meeting of Researchers on Communication and Music – Encontro de Pesquisadores em Comunicação e Música

¹⁸ International Meeting on Music and Media – Encontro Internacional de Música e Mídia

¹⁹ Group of Research on Images, Sonorities and Technologies (*Grupo de Pesquisa em Imagem, Sonoridades e Tecnologias*).

²⁰ This propositive group has been a site of maturing and collectively publishing in dialogue with all of the other Brazilian strains of semiotic research, such as estimated scholars Lucrécia D'Aléssio Ferrara, Irene Machado and Lúcia Santaella, not to mention international work as in our recent a(na)rchaology of media volume (CONTER; MELLO, 2017) with Michael Goddard and Jussi Parikka.

It was GPESC's communicational perspective, focusing on the couplings of communication rather than on its transmission, that led to the transdisciplinary need for an ethnomusicologically-sharpened approach ~~to on~~ this research. In this regard, the current project is already an effect of the dialogue ~~I have begun~~~~we are maintaining~~ with Daughtry's and his texts, and intends to further explore his perspective of a politics of listening and ~~a~~ methodological approach ~~of -at~~ palimpsestic ethnographic listening (DAUGHTRY, 2013, 2015).

~~We mentioned~~~~In addition to~~ sound and communication studies as ~~our -the~~ main areas of academic ~~formation, this project also contributs to a action. We should also add a sub-area to which we are contributing:~~ listening studies proper. The state-of-the-art²¹ ~~I we have~~ developed for this topic has investigated Brazilian ~~academic~~ production (mainly on communication) and concluded that there is a lack of vertical studies on the concept, although it is widely used as a term. Several authors ~~I we~~ have already mentioned constitute a dispersed ~~d~~ tradition on musical listening, such as Adorno, Schafer, Schaeffer, Sterne and Daughtry. In this sense, ~~I we~~ intend to start developing, ~~along -with~~ ~~in~~ ~~conversation with NYU graduate students and my -Martin's students and our~~ network of ~~research~~ group ~~and personels~~~~s and researchers~~ in Brazil, an archive of explorations of modes of listening and ~~listening's~~~~sits~~ communicational production in an international open-access database, contributing to future research and artistic endeavors on listening.

2. Objectives

2.1. General objective: to investigate musical listening in terms of its communicational production.

2.2. Specific objectives:

2.2.1. To develop a mixed methodology based on semiological tradition and on ethnographic and ethnomusicological techniques, in which our U.S. advisor specializes, in order to investigate the communicational production of listenings.

2.2.2. To widen the dialogue between communication, on the one hand, and sound studies, ethnography and ethnomusicology on the other. Institutionally, the research aims at deepening the collaborations among Brazil's several groups of research we attend (GPESC, GEIST, MusiMid, Intercom's GT for Music and Communication, Comúsica) and NYU's Department of Music, via Prof. Daughtry and his students, by constructing an international database of listening practices.

2.2.3. To describe listening practices, focusing on their communicational production, in contemporary New York. The first planned investigations are to be

2.2.3.1. on the production of musical listening in NYU;

2.2.3.2. on the production of jazz listening;

2.2.3.3. on the production of symphonic music listening.

²¹ Being still unpublished, ~~I we~~ offer this study in the following link: https://pt.scribd.com/document/419690371/Estado-Da-Arte-State-of-the-art?secret_password=r5esK3Sgje9xzVUGTUzf.

3. Methodology

As already mentioned, one of our primary objectives is to elaborate a transdisciplinary methodology, connecting our communication-oriented, semiologically-founded investigation on the signifying practices of production of listenings with an ethnographic and ethnomusicological approach. Although the practices we have been investigating in Brazil so far are mainly digitally-based, the challenge of the next phases of research is to approach signifying practices that move, communicationally, from digital to analogue and beyond. Listening practices are produced in a coupling of acoustic materials, technological reproduction media, places in which it takes place, analogue paratexts²², and many other possible layers of transduction.

The methodological connection we will be investing in is Daughtry's (2013) notion of palimpsest. Even though his discussion focuses on the objects of listening themselves – “acoustic palimpsests” such as rerecorded magnetic tapes, with its erasures and reinscriptions bordering on the audible realm – he suggests that “the palimpsest might be best employed as a research methodology” (DAUGHTRY, 2013, p. 27).

Listening will not be thought of as a simple matter of reception, relegated to the receiving part of the classical communication model (emitter – channel – receiver of a message), as we concluded it is commonly thought of. We intend to analyze, on the contrary, the production of such roles in a wider communicational coupling of heterogenous materialities. A “palimpsestic listening” (DAUGHTRY, 2013, p. 24) that cannot be reduced to the listener's role. It is a matter of expanding – communicationally – the idea of listening to encompass its production in a network of materials to be ethnographically collected in field investigations.

Communicationally, some methodological concepts have been fundamental to our research. Kristeva's notion of intertextuality as a condition for the production of sense and Bakhtin's dialogism as the breaking up of individualized transmission into a collectively-founded communication. Also, intersemiotic translation (JAKOBSON, 2015 and PLAZA, 2008) has been helpful to identify types of transduction.

Take, for instance, the case of *Funk 150* listening we have already started to investigate intertextually. This sped-up²³ subgenre of *funk carioca* is often made available in the form of “podcasts”, “mixtapes” or “*sets mixados*”²⁴. That is, a (40-minute or so) single audio file, uploaded to music sharing websites such as *SoundCloud*. These pieces proliferate intersemiotically in several directions: they are produced by DJs that stitch pre-existing songs into one continuous flow. The songs they use are, most of the times, themselves versions of current popular songs played by mainstream radio. These songs' lyrics may be recreated in explicit language, usually thematizing sex, drugs and crime. The recognition of the original songs, as well as the identification of sound markers of

²² Paratextuality was first studied by Genette (1989), being translated to music and sound studies by Lacasse (2000) and explored, ethnographically, by Daughtry (2013).

²³ 150 refers to the BPM measuring on this vein of *funk carioca*.

²⁴ None of these terms retain their traditional uses.

(geographic) identity become all the more fundamental to this listening practice in view of the possibilities of expression listeners have on the aforementioned website (the commentaries may be made relating to a specific point in time of the “set mixado”). A coupling of music, media and presence that produces a dialogic listening we termed post-digital²⁵.

Or the case of *Beethoven's Ninth Symphony* listening, an ongoing case study. An intertextual approach led to a preliminary map of listening-producing territories (blogs, magazines, customer reviews, traditional criticism, record guides, liner notes, social media commentaries, music-sharing technologies and more). None of these investigations, however, went on to presential investigation, which will further add a layer of complexity to our object of research.

Our intention, in the proposed scholarship period, is to explore, on the basis of a combination of these semiotic principles and ethnomusicology, the communicational production of listenings setting out from New York. Some of our investigation fields, and the materials we are aiming at, preliminarily, are:

- a) *The production of musical listening within NYU*. We will be attending the Graduate School of Arts & Science, which we intend to investigate in terms of the musical habits of its community. We are specifically interested in the Waverly Labs investigative and compositional activities, and on the Avery Fisher Listening Center's Immersion Room possibilities for *in loco* research on focus groups.
- b) *The communicational production of Symphonic listening in New York*. Lincoln Center is an important mediator of symphonic music life worldwide. We intent to explore its performances and the New York Philharmonic Archives. These host collections of programs and press clippings, not to mention visual materials and musical scores, in which we can find communicational indexes for the production of listening just as much as for the production of performances. Another source of material will be the Brooklyn Theater Playbills and Programs Collection and the Morgan Library & Museum's collection of musical manuscripts. As for early symphonic music, New York University offers us the possibility of exploring the Noah Greenberg Collection of Musical Instruments, related to the department's ensemble for early music, the Collegium Musicum.
- c) *The communicational production of Jazz listening in New York*. Jazz is one of America's most important genre, and its listening is produced by the communicational coupling of materialities such as the records and live performances but also textual criticism, magazines and online circulation. We will focus our investigations on the National Jazz Museum in Harlem and the Schomburg Center in New York Public Library, which together provide a plethora of resources for a communicational research. We shall also undertake a field research on New York's contemporary jazz scene, which is to involve current agitators such as Smalls Jazz Club, Mezzrow Jazz Club and

²⁵ Rasmus Fleischer's (2015) notion of post-digital music focuses on the passages from digital to actual, presential music playing. In *Funk 150*, listening online is referred to presential, geolocated party listenings. These produce new reworkings of the musical material, filling it with musical tags and indexes that specify its identity. The is once again listened to online and remixed in view of the upcoming performance.

Fat Cat, as well as consolidated spaces such as the Village Vanguard, Birdland Jazz Club and Blue Note Jazz Club.

4. Timeline

- **September 2020** - Moving to New York and getting to know the NYU campus; first meetings with the North American supervisor Martin Daughtry to discuss the research activity plan and participation in his orientation meetings; contact with the curators, librarians and organizers of the libraries, museums and music institutions that are to be researched; consolidation of the schedule of activities.
- **October to December 2020** –Getting to know Prof. Daughtry’s advisees. Enrolling on graduate courses. Gathering of research materials on the NYU campus, relating to the objective 2.2.3.1 described above. Studying our ethnographic and ethnomusicological references, under Prof. Daughtry’s advisory, for methodological research.
- **January 2021 to March 2021** – Gathering of research materials related to objective 2.2.3.2. Determining the pertinent listening interpretants to be collected. Exploring such listening accounts and paratexts for symphonic music at NY Philharmonic Archives, Brooklyn Theater Collections and the Morgan Library. Investigating the early symphonic music activities at the Collegium Musicum. Developing a methodological approach mixing communication studies and ethnography, ethnomusicology and sound studies (discussing it within Prof. Daughtry’s research group).
- **April 2021 and May 2021** – Gathering of materials related to objective 2.2.3.1. Field research on listening habits at jazz clubs in New York. Investigating the National Jazz Museum and the Schomburg Center archives for listening paratexts, accounts and general interpretants. Redacting the methodological part of the dissertation.
- **June 2021** - Reviewing the research notes and listing of the research material; Establishing the transduction links between heterogenous materialities (live listening habits, verbal accounts, textual interpretants, etc.) for each of the production practice analyzes. Discussing of the research results and planning for the final writing of the doctoral dissertation with the American supervisor Prof. Martin Daughtry; Returning to Brazil to write the final version of the dissertation.

Throughout the academic year, we are to enroll, if available, on the following graduate courses, all of which are hosted at NYU Music Department: *Global Musicologies* with Prof. Hannah (Hyun Kyong) Chang, *Musical Value* with Prof. David Samuels, *Sound Technologies and State Power* with Prof. Brigid Cohen, *Ethnomusicology: History & Theory* and *Sound and Environment* with Prof. Martin Daughtry, not to mention the *Dissertation Proposal Advising*, also with Prof. Daughtry.

5. U.S. host institution preference

Our preferred institution was chosen mainly because of our ongoing cooperation with Prof. Martin Daughtry, Associate Professor in the Department of Music of New York University. Martin’s texts were a source of inspiration for our research on listening from the beginning, and his work among our group GEIST, in the first semester of 2019, has straightened our personal and academic

connection. We are currently interested, mainly, in the ethnographic and ethnomusicological techniques he and his advisees – all of which will be interested in discussing our research, in his words – are using to approach listening.

Since we decided to apply for New York, our empirical research objects, most relevant to the current analytical part of the development of our doctoral dissertation (the theoretical part of it having been almost completely established), started shifting to incorporate the pulsating communicational life of this global city. The resources found, in terms both of material and personnel, in the *Programa de Pós-Graduação em Comunicação* here in Rio Grande do Sul's Federal University (*UFRGS*) are more exclusively related to communication studies proper, and our town, Porto Alegre, has a remarkable, but considerably less globalized, cultural and musical life (which has been investigated, I should add, in a recent volume we worked in²⁶). New York City and New York University offers us both a specialized department and environment for Music and a plethora of cultural and musical institutions that range from academic to cultural, museological and bohemian life – all of which confer consistency to the layered nature of our communicational objects of research.

We intend to explore NYU's facilities and social environments (some of which have already been mentioned) for ethnographic research on how musical listening is produced, mainly the Music Department, its Waverly Labs for Computing and Music, the Noah Greenberg Collection of Musical Instruments and Collegium Musicum, and the NYU Steinhardt's Jazz Studies program. We are most interested in the functioning and communicational flow of Avery Fisher Listening Center, in the Bobst Library, which also offers a collection of musical books, periodicals, audiovisual and recorded sound sources. As for the city of New York, it presents important sites of investigation for the production of Jazz listening – such as the National Jazz Museum in Harlem and live performing on Jazz Clubs – and of Symphonic listening – such as the Lincoln Center activities and its valuable media archives.

²⁶ *Mapeando cenas da música pop: cidades, mediações e arquivos, volumes I & II*, organized by Adriana Amaral, Michael Goddard et al. (2017 and 2019)

Bibliography

- ADORNO, T. *Introdução à sociologia da música*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2009.
- ADORNO, T. *O fetichismo na música e a regressão da audição*. In: *Textos escolhidos (Os Pensadores)*. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1996.
- ATTALI, J. *Bruits: essai sur l'économie politique de la musique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1977.
- BAKHTIN, M. *Os gêneros do discurso*. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2016.
- BARTHES, R. *L'obvie et l'obtus*. Paris: Ed. du Seuil, 1982.
- BIJSTERVELD, K. et al. *Mechanical sound: technology, culture, and public problems of noise in the twentieth century*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2008.
- CHION, M. The three listening modes. In: STERNE, J. *The sound studies reader*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- DAUGHTRY, J. M. Acoustic palimpsests and the politics of listening. *Music & Politics* 7, Number 1, 2013.
- DAUGHTRY, J. M. *Listening to war: sound, music, trauma and survival in wartime Iraq*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- DRUMRIGHT, D.; KING, D.; SEIKEL, A. *Anatomy & Physiology for speech, language, and hearing*. New York: Cengage Learning, 2010.
- DERRIDA, J. *Dissemination*. London: The Athlone Press, 1981.
- DELEUZE, G.; GUATTARI, F. *O anti-édipo*. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2010.
- ECO, Umberto. *Tratado geral de semiótica*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1976.
- ERLMANN, V. *Reason and resonance: a history of modern aurality*. New York: Zone Books, 2010.
- FLEISCHER, Rasmus. How music takes place: excerpts from 'The post-digital manifesto'. In: e-flux Journal. *The internet does not exist*. Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2015.
- FOUCAULT, M. *A arqueologia do saber*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 1995.
- GENETTE, G. *Palimpsestos – la literatura en segundo grado*. Madrid: Taurus, 1989.
- GUMBRECHT, H. U; PFEIFFER, K. L. *Materialities of communication*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- JAKOBSON, R. *Linguística e comunicação*. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2015
- KANT, I. *Critique of judgement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- KATZ, M. *Capturing sound: how technology has changed music*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.
- KITTLER, F. *Gramophone, film, typewriter*. California: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- KRISTEVA, J. *La révolution du langage poétique*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1974.
- LATOUR, B. *Reagregando o social*. Salvador: Edufba, 2012.
- LACASSE, S. Intertextuality and hypertextuality in recorded popular music. In: TALBOT, M. (Org.) *The Musical Work: Reality Or Invention?* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, C. *Olhar escutar ler*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2010.
- LUCAS, C. B.. Mapeamento, Cenas Digitais, Intersemiótica: o caso Avalanches. In: AMARAL, A. et al. (Org.). *Mapeando Cenas da Música Pop: Materialidade, Redes e Arquivos Volume II*. João Pessoa: Marca de Fantasia, 2019.
- LUCAS, C. B. *Significâncias da música sampleada*. Dissertação de mestrado. PPGCOM-UFRGS. Porto Alegre, 2017.
- LUHMANN, N. *Introducción a la teoría de sistemas*. México: Universidad Iberoamericana, 1996.
- NATTIEZ, J. J. *Music and discourse: toward a semiology of music*. Princeton University Press, 1990.
- PLAZA, J. *Tradução intersemiótica*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2008.
- SCHAEFFER, P. *Tratado de los objetos musicales*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2003.
- SCHAFER, R. M. *A afinção do mundo*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2011.

- STERNE, J. Hearing. In: SAKAKEENY, M. *Keywords in Sound*. Durham: Duke U.P., 2005.
- SZENDY, P. *Listen: a history of our ears*. Nova Iorque: Fordham U.P., 2008.
- STOCKFELT, O. Adequate modes of listening. In: COX, C.; WARNER, D. *Audio culture: readings in modern music*. Bloomsbury, 2013, pp. 88-93.
- TAGG, P. Analysing popular music: theory, method, practice. In: *Popular music*, n. 2, 1982.
- THOMPSON, E. *The soundscape of modernity: architectural acoustics and the culture of listening in America, 1900-1933*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002.