Ambiances, Atmospheres and Sensory Experiences of Spaces

MUSIC AS ATMOSPHERE

COLLECTIVE FEELINGS AND AFFECTIVE SOUNDS

Edited by
Friedlind Riedel and Juha Torvinen

ROUTLEDGE

Music as Atmosphere

This book explores the atmospheric dimensions of music and sound. With multidisciplinary insights from music studies, sound studies, philosophy and media studies, chapters investigate music and sound as shared environmental feelings.

This book probes into cutting edge conceptual issues at the forefront of contemporary discussions on atmosphere, atmospherology and affect. It also extends the spatial and relational focus towards fundamentally temporal questions of performance, process, timbre, resonance and personhood. The capacity of atmospheric relations to imbue a situation with an ambient feeling and to modulate social collectives is highlighted, as well as auditory experience as a means of connecting with feelings. In addition to original research, the volume features a first translation of an important text by German phenomenologist Hermann Schmitz, and a debate on affect and atmosphere between the philosophers Jan Slaby and Brian Massumi.

This novel contribution to the field of music research provides a strong theoretical framework, as well as vibrant case studies, which will be invaluable reading for scholars and students of music, sound, aesthetics, media, anthropology and contemporary philosophy.

Friedlind Riedel is a doctoral researcher at the *Kompetenzzentrum Medienanthropologie* at Bauhaus-Universität Weimar. Her interests include music and performing arts in Myanmar, cultural histories of listening and philosophies of music.

Juha Torvinen is Senior Lecturer at the Musicology department of the University of Helsinki. He holds the title of Docent of musicology in Universities of Helsinki and Turku. Torvinen's research interests include philosophy of music, ecomusicology and contemporary Finnish popular and art music.

Ambiances, Atmospheres and Sensory Experiences of Spaces

Series Editors:

Rainer Kazig
CNRS Research Laboratory Ambiances – Architectures – Urbanités, Grenoble, France
Damien Masson
Université de Cergy-Pontoise, France
Paul Simpson
Plymouth University, UK

Research on ambiances and atmospheres has grown significantly in recent years in a range of disciplines, including Francophone architecture and urban studies, German research related to philosophy and aesthetics, and a growing range of anglophone research on affective atmospheres within human geography and sociology.

This series offers a forum for research that engages with questions around ambiances and atmospheres in exploring their significances in understanding social life. Each book in the series advances some combination of theoretical understandings, practical knowledges and methodological approaches. More specifically, a range of key questions which contributions to the series seek to address includes:

- In what ways do ambiances and atmospheres play a part in the unfolding of social life in a variety of settings?
- What kinds of ethical, aesthetic, and political possibilities might be opened up and cultivated through a focus on atmospheres/ambiances?
- How do actors such as planners, architects, managers, commercial interests and public authorities actively engage with ambiances and atmospheres or seek to shape them? How might these ambiances and atmospheres be reshaped towards critical ends?
- What original forms of representations can be found today to (re)present the sensory, the atmospheric, the experiential? What sort of writing, modes of expression, or vocabulary is required? What research methodologies and practices might we employ in engaging with ambiances and atmospheres?

Places, Affordances, Atmospheres
A Pathic Aesthetics
Tonino Griffero

Music as Atmosphere
Collective Feelings and Affective Sounds
Edited by Friedlind Riedel and Juha Torvinen

For more information about this series, please visit: www.routledge.com/Ambiances-Atmospheres-and-Sensory-Experiences-of-Spaces/book-series/AMB

Music as Atmosphere

Collective Feelings and Affective Sounds

Edited by
Friedlind Riedel and Juha Torvinen

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2020
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Riedel, Friedlind, editor. | Torvinen, Juha, 1975– editor.
Title: Music as atmosphere : collective feelings and affective sounds / edited by Friedlind Riedel and Juha Torvinen.
Description: [1.] | New York : Routledge, 2019. | Series: Ambiances, atmospheres and sensory experiences of spaces | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2019050046 (print) | LCCN 2019050047 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Music—Psychological aspects. | Affect (Psychology) | Emotions in music. | Sound—Psychological aspects.
Classification: LCC ML3838 .M94948 2019 (print) | LCC ML3838 (ebook) | DDC 781.1/1—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019050046
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019050047

ISBN: 978-0-8153-5868-8 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-8153-5871-8 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Contents

Acknowledgements

The philosophy of atmospheres has been around for decades already. During the last ten years or so, we have witnessed an exuberant academic interest in atmospherology in music studies, too. The phenomenology of atmospheres has become a novel and intriguing approach to the multi-faceted question of music's relationship to feelings and emotive life. This volume grew out of a series of workshops on music and atmosphere held between 2012 and 2018. We would like to extend our gratitude to all the discussants and participants of these gatherings for intellectually stimulating debates.

These events include Birgit Abels' explorative workshops on music and atmosphere held in Göttingen with Andreas Waczkat, Gregor Herzfeld, Eva-Maria van Straaten and Friedlind Riedel in 2014, followed by the workshop *Music and Atmosphere – between New Phenomenology and Musicology* organised by Friedlind Riedel in the same year and funded by the Graduate School of Humanities at Georg-August University Göttingen, with invited contributions by Hermann Schmitz, Tonino Griffero, Simon Runkel, Susanne Schmitt, Birgit Abels, Friedlind Riedel and Robert Seyfert, also attended by Patrick Eisenlohr. In 2016, we organised in collaboration the symposium *Atmospheres of Listening – A Symposium on Musical Situationality* hosted at the Department of Musicology of Turku University with contributions by Birgit Abels, Kimi Kärki, John Richardson, Susanna Välimäki and ourselves. The event was funded by Juha Torvinen's research project Music, Nature and Environmental Crises (The Academy of Finland), together with the International Institute for Popular Culture and the Musicology department of the University of Turku. In 2017, the Panel *Feeling in Music and Sound: Atmosphere, Stimmung, Mood* at the biannual conference of the Royal Musical Association Music and Philosophy Study Group, London organised by Friedlind Riedel featured presentations by Andrew McGraw, Anne Holzmüller and Renata Scognamiglio. And at last, the final section of this volume on interferences and resonance between the notions "affect" and "atmosphere" grew out of a panel discussion on *Atmosphere/Affect* (2017) with the invited speakers Brian Massumi and Jan Slaby, organised by Christoph Carsten and Friedlind Riedel at the *Kompetenzzentrum Medienanthropologie (KOMA)* at Bauhaus University Weimar.

Special thanks go to the research collective of *KOMA* and to Christiane Voss and Lorenz Engel for important and erudite comments; to colleagues and fellows at the *Internationales Kolleg für Kulturtechnikforschung und Medienphilosophie (IKKM)* and numerous inspiring workshops and presentations; to Frank Heidemann for organising the workshop *Sight meets Sound*; to Jean-Paul Thibaud, Nicolas Tixier and Didier Tallagrand for organising the "Colloque de Cerisy" *L'usage des ambiances. Une épreuve sensible des situations* (2018); Andrew McGraw for organising the panel *Atmospheres of Musicking: Collective Feelings in Musical Performance and Ritual* at the SEM in 2018 workshop; and Budhaditya Chattopadhyay, for organising the conference *Affective Atmospheres: Site-specific Sound, Neighborhood Music and the Social Formation* in 2018 in Beirut.

We also express our gratitude to individuals whose scholarship significantly informs this collection: Andrew McGraw, Tonino Griffero, Hermann Schmitz, Simon Runkel, Birgit Abels, Tere Vadén and Gernot Böhme. In particular, we would like to extend special thanks to Ruard Absaroka for his tireless support and incisive comments. We are also extremely grateful to Susanna Välimäki for her important assistance in the challenging stages of the editing process.

The following chapters have appeared previously and are published here in a slightly amended format:

Vadén, Tere, and Juha Torvinen. "Musical Meaning in Between. Ineffability, Atmosphere and Asubjectivity in Musical Experience." Published originally in *Journal of Aesthetics and Phenomenology* 1 (2) (2014): 209–230. DOI: 10.2752/205393214X14083775795032.

Schmitz, Hermann. "Intensity, Atmospheres and Music." Published originally in German in Schmitz, Hermann. 2014. *Atmosphären*. Freiburg: Alber.

Above all, however, we would like to express our gratitude to the contributors to this volume for their inspiring and thoughtful chapters that have significantly contributed to the overall conceptual precision of the theoretical objective of this volume, a project that began on a quite different page and that markedly evolved in the process of collaborative editing. We thank the contributors for putting up with our editorial interventions and for bearing with us throughout.

Friedlind Riedel and Juha Torvinen

Atmospheric relations

Theorising music and sound as atmosphere

Friedlind Riedel

> There is a duration peculiar to the musical object. This duration is always movement, a movement which includes the movement of a soul fascinated by sound and immersed in a certain atmosphere.
>
> Dufrenne (1973, 184)

Q. Is there some music that is romantic or some music that isn't romantic, or can any music be romantic?

A. I think it would have to be the mood when you listen to the music – but some music is – just the appropriate song, the tone of the song and the melody because of the music kind of puts you in a cheerful mood; it doesn't have to be romantic and may be that same song when you listen to it, like when you're in a really upset mood or angry it just seems very sad, but then another time when you listen to it among your friends when you have fun, you may change your perception about the song – you know, your hearing can change even though it's the same song.

Q. Oh yes, even though it's the same song?

A. The same song can create a different atmosphere also, depending on the mood, I think.

Tia DeNora (2000, 43; A 19-year-old Vietnamese female student at an American university, discussing music as "romantic" relationships)

"More Than a Feeling"

I looked out this morning and the sun was gone
Turned on some music to start my day
I lost myself in a familiar song
I closed my eyes and I slipped away
It's more than a feeling (more than a feeling)
When I hear that old song they used to play (more than a feeling)
And I begin dreaming (more than a feeling)
Till I see Marianne walk away
I see my Marianne walkin' away

When I'm tired and thinking cold
I hide in my music, forget the day
And dream of a girl I used to know
I closed my eyes and she slipped away
She slipped away
Tom Scholz, for the American
rock band Boston, released
in 1976[1]

Whether sung or sampled, private or alien, composed, amplified, passed down, recorded or imagined, music and sound are operative forces for shaping feelings into "something more."[2] A hit tune recurring in malls and buses, a symphony in a concert hall, a jarring sound in the darkness, a call for prayer that permeates a borough, a soundtrack to slow camera movement, a marching band on a holiday or the hoot of an owl in the evening hours may all powerfully imbue a situation with a distinctive atmosphere or *Stimmung*. In fact, it seems that wherever music resounds, feelings are likely to unfold as perhaps vague, but nonetheless intrusive and pervasive, spatially extended atmospheres.

Scholars concerned with music and sound have long commented on the atmosphere, the all-encompassing mood, that tangibly manifests *qua* music and sounds. The nineteenth-century music scholar Lina Raman maintained that pianist and composer Franz Liszt, when improvising on the piano, was able to "transform the entire atmosphere in a Salon at a stroke," even moving some to tears (Ramann 1880, 85; my translation).[3] A hundred years later, ethnomusicologist Margaret Kartomi would make a similar remark about the "stirring, impelling drive" of gong-ensembles in Bali that would produce an "overpowering atmosphere" during *Pradjuritan* dances (Kartomi 1973, 195). And anthropologist and ethnomusicologist John Blacking maintained that music could provide "unique ways of feeling" as it would generate "waves of feelings" not just *in* the body but "between bodies" (Blacking 1987, 40, 76). In a recent publication, Marie Thompson and Ian Biddle explored how, in the context of political protests in Britain, popular chart music was employed "to create a particular ambience or atmosphere, via the induction, modulation and circulation of moods, feelings and intensities, which were felt but, at the same time, belonged to nobody in particular" (Thompson and Biddle 2013, 5). Such feelings, ones that exceed the individual subject, are in some musical traditions also articulated as aesthetic ideals. According to Javanese musical aesthetics, musicians should strive to develop *rasa*, a Sanskrit loanword and a musical concept referring at once to musical feeling and perception, cognition and atmospheric mood (Benamou 2010; Weiss 2010). And in Arabic, *sama* ("auditioning"/listening) describes a "holistic musical experience" that Ali Jihad Racy theorises in relation to *jaww* (ambiance), an all-enveloping feeling (Racy 1991).

Without wishing to conflate these historically and conceptually highly diverse ways of making sense of the affective capacities of music and sound, one can nevertheless see that these authors are all connected through an effort to account for one occurrence: how musical and sonic events not simply impact on individual listeners, but transform situations, collectives and milieus. Their arguments, while at times in fierce contradiction regarding *how*, *on whom*, *why* and exactly *what* it is in music or sound that exerts such transformative power, intersect through the use of a variety of related and sometimes contrasted terms: affect, mood, feeling, *rasa*, *jaww*, emotion, ambiance, *Stimmung* or atmosphere.[4] Yet they also converge in the emphatic claim that such trans-individual and environmental feelings are not simply subsidiary, but lie at the heart of music-making and listening.

Following from this, the recent collective effort to establish atmosphere, or, for that matter, *Stimmung*, as a concept in research on music, sound and auditory culture (Weymann 2005; Torvinen 2007; Thibaud 2011; Klotz 2011; Herzfeld 2013b; Böhme 2013; Abels 2013; Vadén and Torvinen 2014; Riedel 2015; McGraw 2016) is not merely a matter of suggesting a new approach to the study of music. The present volume aims for a more fundamental intervention and sallies forth with nine provocative premises: first, that atmospheric feelings are not an ancillary *effect* of music-making, but that music (making) is chiefly *about* atmosphere; second, in many situations, music and sounds are indeed heard and experienced *as* atmosphere and not simply as something that *produces* atmosphere; third, an atmospheric feeling can be noticed in a musically charged situation irrespective of how each individual might feel about it; fourth, and related to this, it is insufficient and unsatisfactory to simply identify feelings sensed in music or sound events at the level of an axiomatically individualised listener; fifth, the sonic holds some kind of affective power to penetrate situations, collectives and selves, and manifests *as* environmental atmosphere among them; sixth, atmospheres permeate overall situations and are not simply a quality of music or sound, and in this respect, atmospheres are irreducible to the auditory realm: they are multimedial and synaesthetic; seventh, both the musical and/or the acoustic are nevertheless critical dimensions of most atmospheres; eighth, categorical distinctions between "music" and "sounds," "noise" and "silence" seem obsolete when it comes to the capacity to afford or evoke atmospheres: a symphonic performance and an eerie screeching noise, a humanly and a robotically produced music (cf. McGraw 2016, can all be commensurate in their atmospheric potency; ninth and finally, there is a striking similarity between the relational structure of music, sounds and atmosphere, and so the methodological challenges they each pose overlap, prompting us, as Jean-Paul Thibaud (2011) suggests, to consider sound and music as paradigmatic for atmospheres. These key premises inform and are illustrated in the remainder of this volume.

From affect to atmosphere

But what is meant by "atmosphere"? Or, as Dora Zhang puts it, "What difference does an atmosphere make to an environment, a situation, or a horizon of

possible action?" (Zhang 2018, 121). I shall open with a working definition that builds on the vast and intriguing scholarship on atmosphere in phenomenology, aesthetic theory, urban studies, geography and social science. Following Hermann Schmitz (2005 [1969]), I propose that "atmosphere" or an "atmospheric situation" describes a "feeling" that fundamentally exceeds an individual body or conscious subject, and instead pertains primarily to the overall situation in which a multiplicity of bodies cohere. Atmosphere thus challenges a notion of feelings as being private or even as being the mere mental states of a cognizant subject, and instead construes feelings as spatially extended, environmental, collective, materially tangible, culturally inflected or "asubjective" (Vadén and Torvinen 2014). This leads to two operative distinctions: between emotion and atmosphere, on the one hand, and between affect and atmosphere, on the other (cf. McGraw 2016 126; see also Riedel, this volume).[5] While ways of conceiving of "emotion" have largely derived from, and centred on, individualised subjects as the very bearers of feelings (Helmholtz 1865, 413–16) "atmosphere" refers to an environmental and situational whole, a feeling, in other words that is out there, in the world (Schmitz 2005 [1978]).[6] For this reason, atmospheres may be encountered in, or indeed as, the world, irrespective of how one might feel *about* them. To conceive of music and sound as atmosphere in this way would mean no longer to consider musical affect in relation to personalised ears and individualised bodies, but to ask about the "cultural techniques"[7] by which music and sound are (made) environmental and through which they modulate spaces, collectives, situations and relations.

The second operative distinction is between atmosphere and affect. Both affect and atmosphere are relational concepts, and they both concern material and ideational relations (Brennan 2004; Blackman 2012; Born 2013; Massumi 2015; Slaby and Mühlhoff 2019).[8] However, even though these two notions converge in a number of significant ways, affect and atmosphere may be distinguished with regards to the particular *kind* of relational structure they respectively emphasise. While "affect" can be said to refer to the ways in which (emerging) bodies relate *to each other*, "atmosphere" allows for the ways in which a multiplicity of bodies is part of, and entangled in, a situation that envelopes it (cf. Hofmannsthal 1905; Böhme 1995; Thibaud 2002a; Griffero 2017; Runkel 2018; Riedel 2019a). Instead of asking how a body affects and is affected by music and sound, atmosphere suggests we think of music and sound using the logic of climatic states and environmental transitions (cf. Torvinen 2019). Johann Gottfried Herder caught the relational logic of climatic states in a nutshell when he wrote that climate has "an impact on the totality of things rather than on individual entities, but impacts the individual through the totality" (Herder 1869 [1785], 49).[9] In analogy, atmosphere asks how music and sounds impact on the totality of things rather than on individual listening bodies, but nevertheless impact the individual body through the totality. Such a perspective also distinguishes atmosphere from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century *Affektenlehren* that were concerned with music or sound's intrusion into the materiality of an individual human body. To talk of atmosphere is not to contradict or question the affective bi-directional stimulation of a body caught up in sound. But it adds to affect a dynamic of mediation, namely between

the environmental whole and individual bodies. Atmosphere thus might be considered a *mereological* term: it accounts for a whole-part relationship.[10] However, and unlike relational fields of affect (Massumi 2015), atmospheres are not simply fluid and emergent processes or contingent spheres of ceaseless collective becomings and flux. Atmospheres rather "integrate their dynamic features into a unitary dynamic Gestalt" (Fuchs 2013, 617). They invoke coherence – or what Hermann Schmitz in his later work calls an "internally diffuse meaningfulness" (Schmitz 1998, 177) – and imbue a situation with identity and thus difference. This internal homogeneity of atmospheres, however, is not a political or aesthetic ideal so much as a *sine qua non* for their occurrence. Thinking music and sound in terms of atmosphere thus means attending to those musical and sonic parameters that have the capacity to modulate (for better or worse) a performance situation, a scene, a religious service, a ritual, a home, a musical passage – and thereby substantiate such events or occurrences as coherent and meaningful wholes, that is, as milieus.

From atmosphere to atmospheric relations

This preliminary definition of atmosphere impels two shifts in terminology. First, following the arguments of Hermann Schmitz, Leo Spitzer and Timothy Morton, atmosphere may, above all, be considered a kind of "structure of reality" rather than a perceptual object or a medium of perception. In this vein, Andrew McGraw speaks of "atmospheric sociality" to bring into view a particular kind of social structure in relation to the spatial dynamics of sound (McGraw 2016). Following this, I have chosen in this introduction to expand – if not replace – the notion of "atmosphere" with the phrase *atmospheric relations*. "Atmosphere" as a noun tends to suggest that atmosphere is a reified object, raising, time and again, questions about its ontological status, its place in the world and its relation to a perceiver. As such, and as David Wellbery critically remarks (2003, 732), it never fully overcomes dogged thing-ontologies and subject-object dualisms. To talk of *atmospheric relations*, however, concentrates attention on the kinds of modalities, structures, relations and mediations that are vital to atmospherically charged situations, such as, for instance, environmental and mereological dynamics. Because music and sound do not simply manifest as objects *in* the world (even though they of course can be turned into objects), but as modes *of* world, they are particularly good at affording atmospheric relations. This underscores auditory experience as an acoustemology of atmospheric relations.

And there is a second terminological shift. When DJs and singers, ritual specialists and composers, listeners, dancers, instrumentalists, designers, dramaturgs or sound engineers all actively engage in mobilising music and sounds to atmospheric ends, they cultivate atmospheric relations through what Mikkel Bille calls *atmospheric practices* (Bille 2019). Some contributors to this volume analyse such atmospheric practices in detail by attending to the musical and auditory operations of constructing, composing, manipulating or curbing atmospheric relations (Turner, this Volume). Torvinen examines how musical works construct

atmospheric relations that span music and the natural environment. Importantly, the term *atmospheric practices*, no longer differentiates between perception and production. As Tragaki and Holzmüller show in their contributions, listening and immersion are not (passive) modes of perception, driven by a sensory immediacy of body and atmosphere, as often alleged by Hermann Schmitz. Rather, listening and immersion are themselves operations and affective labour (cf. Abbate 2004).

This (re)turn to relational structures, however, has to further distinguish itself in two directions. First, I am far from advocating a return to presumptions about the existence of autonomous works of art with their own internal structural logic "as though nothing else in the world existed" (Dahlhaus 1989, 95). Quite the opposite: the notion of atmosphere acknowledges that musical experiences are worldly, deeply embodied and transsensorial, and that atmospheric structures span various media (cf. Herzfeld 2013b). Second, attending to the relational structures that animate atmospheric situations also means following Schmitz in leaving behind the phenomenological project of Husserl and his central concern with *structures of consciousness/experience*, structures that concern the categorical relationship between self and world. The intriguing music scholarship by Harris Berger, who develops this particular strand of phenomenology, is very helpful here in understanding the "affective and valual quality" of "a person's relating to" the materials of expressive culture,[11] a relating he calls "stance" (Berger 2009, 16). To focus on relational structures of atmosphere is not to disregard such structures of experience. However, it significantly expands the focus beyond subject-object relations; that is, beyond the relation between person and world or body and sound, without simply extrapolating the *structure of experience* of an individualised listener onto a collective. Such a shift is particularly well illustrated by Juha Torvinen and Tere Vadén (Vadén and Torvinen 2014), who analyse structures of experience in musical listening only to then identify a logic of non-individuality and ecological interconnectedness in (the listening to) particular musical works.

It is this environmental logic of (mereological) *atmospheric relations* and the *atmospheric practices* that this volume suggests should mark the cutting edge of the concept. These terms also mark the present volume's distinctive contribution to the plethora of notions that all aim at fathoming the affective texture of sounds and music – namely emotion, mood, affect or feeling. Rooted in phenomenological, ethnographic and historical methodologies, the authors of this collection significantly add to theories of atmosphere while building on research in sound studies, music studies and media studies to further conceptualise music and sound as atmosphere.[12] For the purposes of providing a better general orientation, I have chosen to begin by tracing the term's longer genealogy with a focus on German-language music scholarship and on its conceptual predecessor – namely *Stimmung*. The aim is to chart and mobilise the rich semantics of atmosphere in order to further spell out connotations of the notion of *atmospheric relations*. I then summarise and analyse the use of the phenomenological concept *atmosphere* in current music and sound scholarship. From there, I critically explore the nexus of atmosphere and community, which leads me to expand on the mereological texture of atmospheric relations, as well as on power relations and manipulation that such relations

are conductive to. It is only then that I will turn to the comprehensive and influential phenomenological spadework on "atmosphere" produced in the 1960s and 1970s by German philosopher Hermann Schmitz, and its productive adaption by Gernot Böhme. While various authors have written instructive English-language introductions into Schmitz's thought (Böhme 1972; Schmitz, Müllan, and Slaby 2011; Griffero 2014; Kazig 2016), I will focus in depth on the conceptual roots of Schmitz's phenomenology in nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century music and sound scholarship. I treat Schmitz's oeuvre as an erudite and illuminating commentary on existing atmosphere scholarship, rather than as a conceptual starting point, and I conclude with a thorough critique of his normative notion of the *felt-body*, a foundational term in his theory of atmosphere. Ultimately, while I salvage from Schmitz his implicitly mereological notion of atmosphere, I argue for a "cultural phenomenology" that is more in tune with the seminal work of Georgina Born, Steven Connor, Steven Feld and Harris Berger, who have all striven for a thorough revision of phenomenological approaches to music and sound. This introduction ends with a brief overview of the chapters of this volume.

Genealogies and terminologies

Continuities between Stimmung and atmosphere

To claim that atmosphere is an altogether new concept in music and sound research is to ignore the longstanding scholarly preoccupation with affective stirrings, unsayable feelings, collective resonances, embodied perceptions and suggestive motions. There are numerous continuities between today's interest in atmosphere, the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century preoccupation with *Affektenlehren* (doctrines of the affections) and nineteenth-century notions of *Stimmung* (Welsh 2008, 2012; Wellbery 2003; Herzfeld-Schild 2017a, 2017b; Klotz 2011; McAuley 2019). Schmitz himself uses atmosphere and *Stimmung* interchangeably, and argues that atmosphere in part returns to those ontologies of feeling that were premised in earlier *Affektenlehren* (Schmitz 2005 [1978], see also Runkel 2018). While a closer analysis of the intriguing connections with *Affektenlehren* exceeds the scope of this introduction, I will point to some continuities between atmosphere and *Stimmung* in scholarship on music.

In contrast to atmosphere, which began as a proto-scientific concept in meteorology and medicine, *Stimmung* originated as a musical notion. It described the operation of tuning a musical instrument (*stimmen*, to tune), and as a noun *Stimmung* still refers to the state of an instrument once it is tuned. But the notion did not immediately travel from the field of organology or tuning to that of musical perception and feeling. Instead, as Caroline Welsh has meticulously analysed, *Stimmung* re-entered music scholarship as an anthropological notion from philosophy, where it had already lost its semantic moorings in the field of musical practice (Welsh 2012; see also Absaroka, this volume). Music scholars of the nineteenth century began to adopt this philosophical-anthropological use of *Stimmung*, a concept that had only emerged towards the end of the eighteenth

century, in order to account for precisely that which lay outside the structural and formal aspects of music. Already in the mid-nineteenth century, aesthetic theorist Friedrich Vischer (1861) had collapsed the terms *Stimmung* and atmosphere into the compound noun *Stimmungs-atmosphäre* (mood atmosphere), and Theodor Lipps used the reverse collocation, *atmosphärische Stimmung* (atmospheric mood), to refer to a state of feeling as well as to the character or quality of a scene, a music, or a landscape (Lipps 1906).

In an important essay, Sebastian Klotz has traced the use of *Stimmung* in the writings of nineteenth-century music scholars Hans Georg Nägeli, Adolf Bernhard Marx, Eduard Hanslick and Hermann von Helmholtz (Klotz 2011). Klotz concludes that *Stimmung* referred to precisely those musical dimensions that could not be pinned down or named. Furthermore, it accounted for the contingency and situationality of musical listening. When using the term *Stimmung*, scholars no longer conceived of music as an aesthetic object, something that represented or referred to things outside itself. Instead, *Stimmung* involved an ontologisation of music as *motion* and *play*; that is, as a force or energy that drove the listener into synchronicity by way of affecting their bodily state. The term thus emphasised transformative dynamics rather than semantic or causal relations. Hence, for Hanslick, *Stimmung* accounted for the corporal dimension of musical listening. It lingered at the threshold between embodiment and mental perception, ear and soul. As it rendered these distinctions ambiguous, *Stimmung* proved to be an epistemic challenge for musicologists. In consequence, *Stimmung* brought philosophical anthropology (in the philosophical sense of concepts of *the human*) into music scholarship, for scholars were compelled to make statements about the very nature of the listener, and thus about what it meant to be human.[13] In light of this, atmosphere extends tropes and concerns that had already been discussed in terms of *Stimmung*: a consideration of feelings and affect in terms of movement,[14] an aligning of these "feeling-states" with both musical movement and sonic vibration, and a blurring of individual emotions and environmental mood. Moreover, as Klotz emphasises, *Stimmung* demanded transdisciplinarity as it marked a central point of friction between Helmholtz's research into acoustics and Hanslick's aesthetic theory. But also from a philosophical perspective, the ontological function of *Stimmung* as disclosure (*Erschlossenheit*), a nuance employed by Heidegger but which can be traced back to Kant's use of the term *Stimmung* in his *Critique of Judgement*, is amended yet maintained when Schmitz locates atmosphere in a "pre-personal" sphere.

But what is most crucial for my argument about *atmospheric relations* is something else. Both atmosphere and *Stimmung* emphasise a relational structure of feeling. However, each term suggests a slightly different relational logic according to their respective source domains. Since *Stimmung* derives from "musical tuning," the relational logic it suggests is one of *resonance* and of a particular *process*; namely, of tuning and attuning. To understand the relational logic inherent to atmosphere it is now necessary to turn, also briefly, to the etymology and genealogy of this term.

Two meanings of atmosphere

The "*atmo-sphaera*" (Greek, ἀτμός-σφαῖρα), first defined in 1638 by polymath John Wilkins as an "Orb of gross, Vaporous Air immediately encompassing the Body of the Moon" (cited in Lewis 2012, 2), was a matter of scientific curiosity in the seventeenth century and was scrutinised at length by renowned natural philosopher Robert Boyle (1627–1691). The neologism was quickly adapted in German scholarship at the turn of the eighteenth century. But in crossing the linguistic boundary, it also traversed into another scholarly field; namely, medicine. German physician Johann Jacob Woyt (1671–1709) referred to Boyle when he attempted a definition of *Atmosphaera* in his *Gazophylacium Medico-Physicum* (Woyt 1709), a German-language medical encyclopaedia that was a standard reference of its time. Here, in much more general terms – that is, without any reference to the moon or planets – "atmosphere" referred to effluvia and material aerial substances (*Theilgen*) that inevitably "emanate from each and every body and ascend into the air" (Woyt 1709, 99; my translation). In subsequent medical and pharmaceutical texts, "atmosphere" was then primarily used to refer to human bodily "effluvial" emanations. And so at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the term atmosphere had acquired two distinct but overlapping meanings, as respectively used in meteorology and medicine.[15]

First, in the meteorological sense, atmosphere referred to the sphere surrounding celestial bodies that, in the case of planet Earth, also marked the realm or ubiquitous *medium* of existence for all surface-dwelling living beings, the pneumatic substance of life. By the early nineteenth century, this notion of atmosphere as climatic medium and sphere of collective existence was being mobilised as metaphor to refer to the intellectual and spiritual, but also moral, environments and their influence upon the individual. In this vein, Lina Ramann (1833–1912), the biographer of Franz Liszt, referred to at the beginning of this introduction, and a rare woman scholar in an age that grossly undervalued most female contributions, mentions "intellectual (*geistige*) atmospheres" as having a strong bearing on a musician's development: either hindering or stimulating the creative process (Ramann 1886). Moreover, composers were tasked with capturing, in their musical works, the "spiritual and emotional atmosphere of their era" (Specht 1921, 18). This use of a notion of atmosphere to refer to a somewhat disembodied sentiment, a mentality in which the spirit of an individual was embedded, a *Zeitgeist*, or moral environment, was not particular to writings on music, but was a common trope in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Indeed, such a decidedly metaphorical notion of atmosphere fitted all too well into the metaphysics of the humanities of the day, where music itself became a pivotal "metaphor of transcendence, something conceptual, disembodied and intangible" (Trippett 2013, 5).

Second, atmosphere referred to the aerial, elastic, magnetic or electric effluvia that emanated from and enveloped the human body, or in fact *any* sentient and non-sentient body – just as celestial bodies "cast" their own vaporous "stuff" (Woyt 1709; Adelung 1793). The individual atmospheres, in which bodies were

seamlessly enshrouded, as if by invisible aerial matter, were, in a parallel to the galenic doctrine of *humours*, indicative not only of the medical or physiological condition of a human being, but also of their feeling-states, their gender and social status (Corbin 1986). These atmospheric emanations were also mereological in that they fused the different dimensions of a person into one affective impression.[16] Rather than being ambient media of dwelling and collective existence, these atmospheres were media of *appearance* and *presence*. And instead of operating on an intellectual sphere, it was by way of material, bodily effluvia that (the character of) someone or something became spatially and somatically tangible. One's feelings could literally be smelled as room-filling atmospheres. Here, atmospheric scent and atmospheric sensuality came to stand in metonymic proximity, rather than in metaphorical distance. Moreover, in contrast to the meteorological meaning of atmosphere as ambient air which, by its very omnipresence, had no centre or location in space, atmosphere as effluvia implied the idea of a clear centre, which at the same time constituted the material source of its emanation.

When music scholars of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries used the term atmosphere in the context of musical performance or sound events, they largely mobilised this second material meaning of atmosphere (Riedel 2019b). Thus, when Adolf Bernhard Marx (1795–1866) spoke of "musical atmospheres," he referred to timbre, resonance and harmonics as the atmospheric emanations of tones. Just as the atmosphere that emanated from the human body revealed a person's character, so the essence (*Wesen*) of a tone was to be found in its "atmosphere" – namely, its timbre – without which individual tones remained "abstract and dry" (Marx 1857 [1839], 174–5). Linking both the meteorological and the medical meaning of atmosphere, Marx argued that these atmospheric "tone- and sound masses" had the capacity to transform "the entire space of air" into "resonant matter" (*mitklingende Materie*) and to powerfully "grip the listener" (ibid.), just as the emanating atmosphere of a person was capable of transforming an entire room and affecting all those present. Such atmospheric relations could also be detected in the multimedial stagings of European opera at the turn of the twentieth century. Here, too, music scholars described the relationship between stage persona and music in terms of atmospheric emanation. The acousmatic sound produced by an orchestra, hidden from sight in the orchestral pit, operated as the auditory "fluidity [*fluidum*] of a human's character" (Bekker 1934, 148; my translation). In appearing to emanate virtually from the body of the singer on stage, the sound endowed an individual character with a distinctive "music-atmosphere [*Musikatmosphäre*]" (Specht 1921, 230) or a "sound-atmosphere" (*Klangatmosphäre*) (Adler 1961 [1929], 1066; see also Bie 1913; Bekker 1934).

Atmosphere in recent sound and music scholarship

In recent years, atmosphere, *Stimmung* or ambiance have not only been systematically invoked as concepts for the study of music and sound, but a concern with the sonic has also been vital to the turn to atmosphere in social science at large and in the fields of geography and urban studies in particular. Just as Schmitz's

phenomenology of atmosphere is riddled with musical and auditory terms and conceptually indebted to music and sound scholarship (as explored later in this introduction), the Francophone school of ambiance theory that emerged in the seventies, is rooted in a turn to the sonic. At the Centre for Research on Sonic Space and the Urban Environment (CRESSON) in Grenoble, founded in 1979 by the philosopher and musicologist Jean-François Augoyard, the notion of ambiance has been explored as a means to comprehend an "environmental quality" of built and inhabited spaces. Taking issue with R. Murray Schafer's notion of *soundscape* – and long before Tim Ingold's better-known intervention (Ingold 2011) – Augoyard pointed out the visual bias inherent in the trope of the "-scape" (*paysage*). Augoyard argued that, instead of background/foreground relations, what takes precedence in the sonic is a "metabolic" interplay of near and far, of event and duration (Augoyard 1991). But it is an interest in noise (*bruit*) in particular that propels Augoyard to propose that one consider the built and inhabited environment in terms of ambiance (Augoyard 1995; Augoyard and Torgue 1995). Following this, Jean-Paul Thibaud, another key figure in scholarship on ambiance/atmosphere and sound (Thibaud 2002b, 2003, 2015), has sought to theorise atmosphere from a sonic perspective without simply "reducing [it] to its sonic component." Emphasising the mediality of ambiance, its sensorial texture and "phatic" manifestation, he argues that sound and ambiance are related in their questioning:

> of a clear distinction between the perceiver and the perceived, the subject and the object, the inside and the outside, the individual and the world. Instead of relying on a dualistic and substantialistic mode of thinking, they require an alternative to an ontology of the thing, one that considers the medium, the fluxes and the "quasi-objects" (Serres 1982).
>
> (Thibaud 2011, 8)

Over the past 15 years or so, the school of ambiance theory has joined forces with anglophone and German scholarship on atmosphere by taking up Gernot Böhme's writings on atmosphere and architecture. In drawing on both conceptual traditions (atmosphere and ambiance), scholars have written on auditory situations, urban soundscapes, sound design and urban dwelling (see Chattopadhyay 2016; Guillebaud 2015). In this vein, human geographer Paul Simpson, who has elaborated a "post-phenomenology" of musical performance (Simpson 2009), employs the notion of atmosphere to theorise sound and felt-ambiances as materially affective. Through an autoethnography of musical busking, he argues for an ecological approach to understanding the ways in which a body is not simply fleeting and emergent but thoroughly situated in the environment (Simpson 2013; see also Simpson 2016).

While this body of work has been crucial in theorising sound as atmosphere, it is only quite recently that phenomenological approaches to atmosphere as theorised by Schmitz, and aesthetic concerns with atmosphere as put forth by Böhme, have entered the various fields of music studies. Musicologist Gregor Herzfeld, in

intriguing research into the intellectual history of the "power of music," and in his analysis of the musical reception of Edgar Allan Poe's poetical works, mobilises Schmitz's neo-phenomenological notion of atmosphere (Herzfeld 2011, 2013a, 2013b). He notes that the very fact that music manifests as atmosphere is of such blatant self-evidence that music scholars have hitherto refrained from theorising it in depth (Herzfeld 2013b, 28). Herzfeld observes that musicology, having mostly attended only to the formal and structural aspects of music, has missed a most crucial dimension of musical experience; namely, music's capacity to both capture and to evoke mood or atmosphere. In order to valorise the sensorial, spatial and performative aspects of music and to approximate music as a holistic experiential phenomenon, Herzfeld establishes atmosphere as a heuristic concept in music studies. While Herzfeld's focus is on the transmediality of atmosphere in poetry and music, sound and image, Birgit Abels uses the notion of atmosphere as a spatiotemporal concept in her analysis of music at a Malaysian boat festival and of dance performances on the Micronesian island of Palau. Here Abels relates atmosphere to questions of cultural identity and embodiment. To this end, she considers music in its capacity "to evoke that shared feeling of belonging to one and the same community" (Abels 2018b, 10). She argues that, in contrast to a preoccupation with affect, the phenomenological notion of atmosphere enables music scholars to finally overcome what she considers to be an untenable dualism of body and mind (Abels 2013, 2017, 2018a, 2018b). Philosopher Tere Vadén and musicologist Juha Torvinen have also turned to atmosphere to address the highly debated issues of music and meaning, and of musical ineffability. They argue that music affords an "asubjective experience, in which the separation between subject and object is not (yet or anymore) effective" (Vadén and Torvinen 2014, 210). Hence, what is appreciated in music are not symbolic meanings but a diffuse *meaningfulness* that can best be described as atmospheric and that is characterised by an ineffability that, per definition, can never be reconciled through words. In his more recent work, Torvinen has related this notion of atmospheric meaningfulness to concerns with ecological precarity. Analysing a song-cycle by the female Finnish composer Outi Tarkiainen, he has charted music's capacity to "frame nature with shared feelings" and to operate in a mythological mode, thereby contributing to environmental awareness (Torvinen 2019, 184). In my own work, I have attended to atmospheric processes in religious musicking by taking up Schmitz's notion of "movement suggestion" to understand how religious pursuits and collective devotional feelings are entwined with musical motion in congregational singing (Riedel 2015). In a separate study of amateur musicking in southern China, I also investigate feelings of embarrassment and love in terms of authoritative atmospheres. I argue that ritualised cultural techniques for overcoming feelings of embarrassment, which are manifest in vocal timbre, also reveal the overpowering grip of non-personal atmospheric feelings (Riedel 2018). In his seminal article in the journal *Ethnomusicology*, Andrew McGraw explicitly introduces the notion of atmosphere into the field of ethnomusicology and proposes that we conceive of atmosphere not simply as spatial quality but as affective *process*. Atmosphere,

he suggests, emphasises "that our experience of music always occurs in a singular situational milieu rather than being a straightforward communication of information between author and recipient through an ether called 'society' or 'history'" (McGraw 2016, 131). Following this, he analyses how musical situations afford "atmospheres of felt-relation." And Patrick Eisenlohr, in work on Mauritius, has recently adopted the notion of atmosphere to analyse the "effects of vocal sound on listeners in Islamic settings" arguing, like Abels, that a problematic dualism of meaning and matter can be overcome by using the term atmosphere (Eisenlohr 2018a, 2018b).

Despite a plethora of interpretations, "atmosphere" in these scholarly works is adopted for its logic of amalgamation: individual and environment, matter and mind, body and self, discourse and feeling, are no longer opposites but are fused into seamless continuums. And so are all the sensual registers (and with them the different planes of media) collapsed into one synaesthetic primordial mode of affective involvement. In short, with atmosphere, scholars have sought to bring all those elements that mediate musical experience into one single frame. In turn, atmosphere, in these works, becomes a shorthand for the totality of elements and agents that come together in a musical performance and for the bodies and worlds that are drawn into resonance in an auditory situation. As such, a concern with theorising music/sound as atmosphere aligns with a greater shift in musicology away from "music and meaning" or "music and context" towards a consideration of music as performance, as well as an attendant disciplinary convergence between historical musicology and ethnomusicology (Cook 2003; Abbate 2004). But I would like to make an even more essential point here: attention to atmospheric relations and atmospheric affects as mediated in music and sounds has been pivotal to the emergence of the discipline of ethnomusicology in the first place. Or, as McGraw has put it: atmosphere speaks to a concern that has been extensively addressed within ethnomusicology; namely, that of theorising the relation between music and cultural collective (McGraw 2016; for a poignant critique of this focus within ethnomusicology, see Sykes 2018). In the following, I will turn to the work of Jaap Kunst (1891–1960), one of the field's pioneers. His emphatic use of the term atmosphere speaks to Ethnomusicology's effort to valorise the singular, affective milieu as invoked in musical performance, and points to another fundamental structure of atmospheric relations; namely, the affective experience of alterity.

Musical collectives and affective alterity: atmosphere and the project of ethnomusicology

In his extensive study *De toonkunst van Java*, published in 1933 (translated into English in 1949 under the title *Music in Java*), Jaap Kunst emphasised the affective capacity of the music that he found "among the different populations" and "tribes" in Central and East Java. Analysing *wayang* (shadow play) performances, Kunst remarked that music could "imbue the listener with the spirit of

the prevailing *patet* [musical mode] and [. . .] saturate the atmosphere with it." He went on to explain that

> in each *patet* several [. . .] melodies may be distinguished, each of which bears its own character, or rather – since they are generally akin to each other melodically, and often derived one from the other – to each of which a certain traditional "mood" attaches. As far as stage music is concerned, they are selected in accordance with the emotional atmosphere, or the situation which is interpreted at that particular moment by the *wayang* or which dominates the dance that is being performed. Since they create the tonal atmosphere of the succeeding composition one may say that they announce, at any rate to some extent, the character of that composition.
>
> (Kunst 1973 [1933], 319)

Kunst further described various musical parameters as being productive of what he called the "emotional atmosphere" or "mood" (in Dutch, *atmosfeer*): the rhythmic persistence of a drum throughout a performance, the volume and timbre of instruments (ibid., 286), harmonic tension (ibid., 273), the succession of melodies, modes and melodic phrasing (ibid., 319), the macro structure of preludes and interludes, or the sonorous qualities of gongs (ibid., 142). In Kunst's account, atmosphere was not simply an aesthetic dimension of music but critical to the process of performance itself. "Getting into the atmosphere of a piece to be played," Kunst observed, enabled affective collaboration, as musicians could "all *feel* [. . .] unconsciously" the distinctive "tension-value" of the melodic contours of Javanese and Sudanese compositions (ibid., 74).

I suggest that Kunst's use of the term atmosphere was not merely poetic, nor incidental, but strategic. The emphasis on the atmospheric feelings of music performances was intrinsic to his efforts to advocate the study of non-Western music traditions in their own right. In this endeavour, the identification and celebration of differences was crucial. In his 1952 book *Ethno-musicology*, pioneering in its (albeit hyphenated) use of the term which subsequently became an entire field, Kunst mapped musical differences on cultural differences. He provides two explanations for this approach: music, he claimed, was first bound to the specific "psychic structure" of a "race or people"; and second, music was conditioned by the "physiological parameters" of the "stereotypical" body of a particular "race" (Kunst 1974 [1953]). To make this point, Kunst used a Dutch saying to draw an explicit analogy between cultural differences and the characteristics of various animal species, arguing that just as each bird had their song, each race had their music (ibid., 2).[17] In his effort to institute ethnomusicology as a modern discipline in its own right, the atmospheric dimensions of music and sound had a curiously prominent role. Kunst argued that Malays and Papua-Australians not only differed substantially in their "outward appearance" and "spirituality," but that their music was also "markedly different." Yet instead of simply analysing these musical differences at the level of melody, scales, instruments and styles, as the earlier Berlin school of comparative musicology had been fond of doing, Kunst insisted

in *Music in Java* that "first and foremost, the difference is one of atmosphere, the characteristic details wherein the discrepancy lies being observable only in the second place" (Kunst 1973 [1933], 1). In his conclusion, it becomes clear that Kunst had a decidedly mereological understanding of atmosphere, when he argued that since "it is undeniable that the primarily important thing is precisely this experience of the orchestral sound heard as one single, pure entirety; intellectual analysis should come later" (ibid. 249–50). Arguably, Kunst's obsession with transcription and their analysis belies his own emphatic claims. Still, music, for Kunst, was primarily a question of affective experience, as opposed to the sort of formalist understandings that tended to pass over the crucial atmospheric moment of performance itself. Yet it were these performance situations, and not the differences in tonal systems and musical structures, where the kind of racial differences to the study of which Kunst sought to devote an entire discipline, became tangible.[18] Ultimately, as each bird had their song, the music of each cultural/ethnic community had their distinctive musical atmosphere.[19] Atmosphere, in short, lay at the heart of what Jim Sykes poignantly calls "the music and identity episteme" (Sykes 2018), a focus that continues to haunt the discipline of ethnomusicology, even when the concept of "identity" has been criticised and superseded by "belonging," and that of "ethnic group" by "community."

Where Kunst relied on ethnonyms to approach atmosphere as a marker of cultural alterity, Andrew McGraw (2016) has turned to atmosphere in an effort to bring into view precisely those dynamics of belonging that escape frames of reference such as ethnonyms or notions of subculture, scene, or community. Drawing on Schmitz, McGraw considers atmosphere to be something "felt all at once here and now." In this presentness, atmosphere is distinct from "diachronically durable" frames of sociality and discursive representations of belonging such as positivist categories of cultural difference. In turn, atmospheres are for McGraw located "prior to the appearance of both identity and authenticity." Comparing performances of a Gamelatron (a robotic gamelan) and a gamelan, he argues that it is music/sound as atmosphere that gives rise to emergent social cohesion, for it manifests as "a movement, an operation, a relation that can deeply intertwine even strangers." McGraw poignantly refers to these ephemeral plateaus of social affinity as *atmospheric sociality*. While the discipline "has historically taken collectivity as already constituted" and has "overwhelmingly been concerned with named groups," the notion of atmosphere allows one to write about cultural practices of musicking in a way that no longer hinges on the ethnonymic classification of those making music but instead enables research into the "synchronic and prediscursive" *production* of community through music (McGraw 2016, 141–2). In consequence, McGraw stresses, atmosphere must be understood as *process* since the atmospheric socialites that come about in collective listening are emergent, situational and fleeting.[20]

While McGraw has emphasised the ephemerality of atmospheric sociality, I have explored how atmospheric relations are operative in the *territorialisation* of communities (Riedel 2015; see also Simpson 2013). In a small pietist Christian congregation in western Germany, I traced how collective silence and

congregational singing related to processes of religious segregation. What made atmosphere useful as a heuristic notion here was the fact that difference is not simply incidental to atmospheric processes, but integral. Following Schmitz, atmospheric relations manifest most powerfully at points of alterity, that is in situations of contrast and at spatial or temporal thresholds (see also Morton 2007, 36–41).[21] This enabled me to turn the argument around: the congregational atmosphere brought about in song and silence in Sunday worship did not simply *express* identity, and thus alterity, nor was alterity an effect of an intentionally produced atmospheric affect – after all, to have such intentions would be wholly inconsistent with the stated idea that music was an offering to God and with the puritan creed that gave priority to spirit over flesh, and to intellect over affect. Rather, the service was so atmospheric *by virtue of* its (theologically justified) affective differences – not only to the sonic fabric and the musical liturgies of other denominations, but also to mundane auditory situations. Cultivating devotional silence and congregational singing in weekly repetition over generations, the worship service operated as a force that atmospherically territorialised the community into denominational difference, with a consequent sedimentation of social relations and an increasingly distinct musical culture, which in turn only intensified the atmospheric alterity of the service. Here atmospheric relations as entertained in congregational singing fed into a loop of doctrinal territorialisation and social homogenisation, and thus ineluctably contributed to the production of doctrinal alterity. Although using different terminologies, the theoretical concerns voiced by Jeffers Engelhardt, in his study of singing practices among Estonian orthodox Christians, also help one to understand the ways in which atmospheric relations, as cultivated in techniques of vocalisation, yield doctrinal and orthopractic solidification. Vocal styles not only penetrate a service with a distinctive feeling of denominational Belonging, engelhardt argues, but also demand a "right singing" (Engelhardt 2015). Fashioning the right feeling, or "hāl," is also the theme of Tamara Turner's contribution to this volume. She argues that atmosphere is decidedly not just an ephemeral feeling in the background of Algerian Sufi rituals, but is imbued with norms that channel the actions of musicians and ritual specialists.

Atmospheric relations as sonic-social mediations

In the introduction to her influential edited volume *Music, Sound and Space: Transformations of Public and Private Experience*, Georgina Born cautions that one not lose track of the fact that:

> music, sound and audio media are not invariably employed to generate positive affect or create social unities. They also animate and configure practices and spaces in which are played out social and cultural differences and divisions [. . .], and they refract an array of modes of power.
>
> (Born 2013, 46)

Similarly, in theorising music in terms of atmospheric relations, one must surely conclude that atmospheres are likewise prone to both control and division. Born locates the dynamics of difference in those moments when music fails to entrain a subject. Here, the existence of resistance and difference contradict received notions of a "biological determinacy" of affect (see Brennan 2004, cited in Born 2013, 46). Considering music and sounds as atmosphere, however, adds another plane of mediation, one that is not located in the nexus between body and sound (cf. Born 2011). This is due to the mereological or climatic dynamics that animate atmospheric relations. Even when musical affect does not resonate with an individual's emotional state, i.e. when an affect "fails" to be transmitted, the atmosphere is not simply defused. A particular atmosphere can still be *noticed* (cf. Moisala et al. 2014)[22] as a homogenising mood, one that implicates even those individuals who do not find themselves entrained or who actively resist the affective grip. For this reason, Hermann Schmitz, who defined feelings as atmospheres (Schmitz 2005 [1978]), has urged for a twofold distinction: on the one hand, between a feeling (*Gefühl*) and the "feeling of a feeling" (*das Fühlen eines Gefühls*); and on the other, between the simple noticing (*Wahrnehmen*) of a feeling and the being-affected-by-and-involved-in-feeling (*Betroffensein*) (cf. Andermann and Eberlein 2011, 91).

But how can an atmosphere be homogeneous at the same time that the affective entrainment of individual bodies is potentially heterogeneous? Timothy Morton (2007), but also Hugo von Hofmannsthal (1905), have taken homogeneity or smoothness as the one defining trait of atmosphere. In other words, where heterogeneity dominates, atmospheric relations are unlikely to unfold – unless, of course, diversity itself is emphatically embraced as a unifying ideology. Atmospheric practices (or what Morton calls *ambient poetics*) are then precisely those that imbue a situation with coherence, and which, in turn constitute the (homogeneous) sonic-social or aesthetic milieu, a dynamic that McGraw (2016) and Vadén and Torvinen (2014) have convincingly spelled out. However, instead of treating such social-material coherence as a concrete reality, as if all bodies and subjects are indeed wholly attuned to the same mood, atmospheres, following Morton, only *simulate* coherence. Instead of actually overriding differences and social discontinuities, they simulate coherence – and thus, community – where there potentially is none. To put it in Schmitz's terms, even if not a single body actually feels the feeling, the feeling may still be observable as a "spatially poured out atmosphere." With the notion of atmosphere, it hence becomes possible to account for the experienced homogeneity of a (social) situation without confusing it with the actual emotional state of each and every person present or with the social unity of a community. Instead, atmosphere only *simulates* the affective participation of all bodies (and non-human elements) in its reach. In this sense, atmospheric relations are not simply expressions of social coherence or spheres of belonging, but are social catalysts.

But how does such simulation take place? And what is the role of music and sound in this? To answer these questions, we have to turn to *atmospheric practices*

and the operational logics that animate *atmospheric relations*. Timothy Morton argues that atmospheres/ambiances are steeped in a logic of "rendering":

> Rendering is technically what visual- and sonic-effects artists do to a film to generate a more or less consistent sense of atmosphere or world. After the action has been shot [. . .], the entire shot is "rendered," so that all the filmic elements will simulate, say, a sunny day in the Alps, rather than a wet night in the tropics. This rendering, like Jean Baudrillard's idea of the simulacrum, pertains to a copy without an original. There was no "real" sunny day. Rendering nevertheless bathes all the filmic elements in the atmosphere of the sunny day. [. . .] Rendering attempts to simulate reality itself: to tear to pieces the aesthetic screen that separates the perceiving subject from the object. The idea is that we obtain an immediate world, a directly perceived reality beyond our understanding.
>
> (Morton 2007, 35)

Reflecting on the cases discussed earlier, the question that arises is: what are the musical and sonic elements of a religious service, a ritual, or a recitation that operate by way of rendering? Elements, in other words, that, following Hofmannsthal (1905), do not present themselves as musical or sonic objects and which do not directly impact at the level of the individual body, but which transform the sonic-social event as a whole and amend the affective fabric of an entire space, scene, world by instilling it with unity. While one might point to musical and sonic parameters that are prone to the operational logic of rendering – parameters such as timbre, volume, resonance, modal systems, modulations and transpositions, rhythms, repetitions and doublings of all kind – such a list of atmospheric elements of music, as if "music" was self-evidently "a thing" in the first place (cf. Born 2010) cannot be the outcome. For Hofmannsthal, for instance, even a musical motif – the very element that is most likely to be considered a musical object/subject rather than a rendering or mode – has a capacity to integrate the whole of a musical piece (Hofmannsthal 1905). In doing so, it invokes *atmospheric relations*. In short, atmosphere demands investigation into operations of acoustic and musical rendering that are specific to particular musical genres, instruments, styles, spaces or technologies.

There is one more point to be made. When considered as atmosphere, music's potential for (power) abuse and communalisation is no longer simply a question of music's intervention in the affective economy of a feeling body, but equally (and maybe primarily) lies in its capacity to modulate a whole. Whereas theories of affect have helped to understand a person's (ideational and material) relation to musical or sonic influence, atmosphere asks: what is the relation a body has to an environmental-atmospheric milieu in which it is nestled? In the case of the religious communities discussed earlier, the atmospherically simulated denominational homogeneity became itself a consumable good that could feed back into the stabilisation of the imagined religious community by grounding the latter in an experiential affective presence (Riedel 2015; see also McGraw, this volume). At

the same time, atmospheric unity might be oppressive if it convincingly simulates coherence where there is none. Here, the transgressive potency of sounds as atmosphere resides not in the acoustic infiltration of ever-open bodies, but in the pulling of a body into an affective coherence. In all this, atmospheres are deceptive; the homogeneity they suggest is ambivalent, their mode of operation subversive. Thus, atmospheric relations are far from being merely benign, life-affirming forces, as Turner argues in her chapter in this Volume. They can be conductive to genocide (Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos 2016), and concentration camps are suffused with and controlled by atmospheric relations that are maintained through music and sound, and in which both guards and inmates are implicated (Riedel 2019a). Even hell, as conceived in Burmese Buddhism, is said to feature music and thus atmospheric affect (British Library, n.d.). And prisons can be organised through sonic-atmospheric relations, as McGraw explores in his chapter in this volume.

But in order to appreciate the background to these notions of atmosphere, we need to return to a more comprehensive examination of Hermann Schmitz's "new phenomenology."

Hermann Schmitz's phenomenology of atmospheres

It is no overstatement to say that the most influential and most theoretically sophisticated contribution to theories of atmosphere comes from German phenomenologist Hermann Schmitz (b. 1928). Schmitz was not the first to consider atmosphere a potent concept with which to better understand dynamics of involvement (note also Hofmannsthal 1905; Simmel 1917; Tellenbach 1968; see also Runkel 2015). However, Schmitz's monumental multi-volume *System of Philosophy* (1967–1980), in which he elaborates his theory of "feelings as atmospheres," and which he later dubs a "new phenomenology," remains outstanding for its conceptual rigour.

A new phenomenology

To understand why Schmitz considers atmospheres to be a fundamental category of experience and human existence, it is necessary to turn to the philosophical context of his writings. Even though Schmitz writes under the umbrella of phenomenology, he seeks to significantly revise, if not abrogate, the transcendental phenomenology of Edmund Husserl (1859–1938). To distinguish his own phenomenological project from that of Husserl, Schmitz labels his as "new." Contrary to Husserl, Schmitz claims that it is impossible to simply go "(back) to the things themselves," as Husserl had famously declared (2001 [1900/1901], 168). According to Schmitz, things only come into being *in light of* something else, namely under historically, culturally and linguistically specific preconceptions. He insists that it is naïve to assume that perceptual phenomena can be stripped of metaphysical presumptions by means of the phenomenological operation of *epoché*, the "bracketing" or "suspension of judgement" that was aimed at approximating "things as they (really) are." Instead, Schmitz maintains that *everything* that is

perceived is framed according to a historically particular "abstraction base," or what he refers to in his earlier work simply as a "filter" (Schmitz 2005 [1967], 5). For this reason, Schmitz replaces the classic phenomenological notion of the "thing" (*Sache*) with that of a "state of affairs" (*Sachverhalt*) in order to account for how each thing is historically and culturally embedded in particular situations and relations (ibid.). Because of this, Schmitz's phenomenology can indeed be read as a "cultural phenomenology" (see Connor 2000) since it accounts for cultural dispositifs that animate the world of phenomena. It is due to these revisions of classic phenomenology that Schmitz resorts to the term atmosphere to theorise the affective textures of such "states of affairs."

Schmitz's definition of phenomena has quite radical consequences for the method of phenomenology itself.[23] He postulates phenomenology itself as a set of conceptual presumptions. The ultimate aim of Schmitz's phenomenology, then, is to develop a particular kind of conceptual grid, one capable of dealing with spontaneous experience (*unwillkürliche Lebenserfahrung*). To this end, Schmitz pushes the notion of the *Leib* (felt-body), that he adopts from Arthur Schopenhauer, to the centre of phenomenological analysis. In brief, the *Leib* is neither the physical quantifiable body (*Körper*), nor the immaterial self but a "*feeling* body" whose "mode of existence cannot be separated from its becoming manifest to the conscious subject" in "holistic corporeal stirrings" (Slaby, in Schmitz, Müllan, and Slaby 2011, 244). This felt-body constitutes the very "sounding board" for atmospheres (Schmitz 2005 [1969]). While it had already been widely fashionable in the mid-twentieth century to reject dualisms, what was lacking, Schmitz complained in 1965, was a productive way to fully overcome them (Schmitz 2005 [1965], 56).

Feelings as atmospheres

Schmitz systematically introduces atmosphere as a central notion in *The Feeling-Space* (*Der Gefühlsraum*), which was first published in 1969 as the fifth volume of his *System*. Conceiving of atmosphere as equivalent to the term *Stimmung* (he uses these terms interchangeably), he relies neither on the etymology nor on the historical and scientific connotations of the term atmosphere. Instead, he draws a link between feelings and phenomenological (not scientific) notions of weather, the seasons and times of the day. Building on Theodor Lipps' (1906) "spatial feelings" (*Raumgefühle*) and Ludwig Binswanger's (1933) "tuned spaces" (*gestimmte Räume*), Schmitz notably defines feelings as "spatially poured out atmospheres" (*ortlos ergossene Atmosphären*)[24] (Schmitz 2005 [1969], 343). He conceives of atmospheres as being spatially extended but not *as* spaces nor as affective *qualities* of places. Instead, he theorises them (ontologically) as "situations" (Schmitz 1998). Schmitz finds his prime musical and sonic affirmation for atmospheres in Johann Sebastian Bach's organ works and the *Wohltemperierte Klavier*, to which he elsewhere adds dance and marching music, congregational singing, whistles, noise, break-dance or the collective shouting of football fans.

Feeling-space and acoustic space. or: phenomenological acoustics

It is the "acoustic space," as known to and by early-twentieth-century sound scholarship, that Schmitz elevates as the "primary model" for his notion of atmospheres (Schmitz 2005 [1969], 185). This acoustemological take on atmosphere is unsurprising, given the strong influence on Schmitz of what, in German music scholarship of the early twentieth century, was a "spatial turn" *avant la lettre* – in particular the elaborate spatial theories of music put forth by Ernst Kurth (1886–1946) and Albert Wellek (1904–1972).[25] Indeed, it is the Austrian-German music-psychologist Wellek who provides Schmitz with arguably the most important term for his theory of atmosphere, namely "feeling-space" (*Gefühlsraum*), a term which was itself already an inversion of a 1930s musical concept, namely "spatial-feeling" (*Raumgefühl*) (Kurth 1931, 119, 135). Wellek, had coined the term "feeling-space" in 1963 to account for a genuinely *musical* spatiality, one that was not simply an imitation or representation of an extramusical spatiality. He argued that the "music-space" (*Musikraum*) was distinct from both an "acoustic space" (or listening-space; *Gehörraum*) – the space of soundwaves in the medium of air – and from a "tonal space" (*Tonraum*) – the space of relative distances between pitched sounds. "Music-space," while being set in and "feeding on" both "tonal space" and "acoustic space," constituted an irreducible "third space" that consisted neither of sound waves, nor of pitches, but of feelings. This "music-space," Wellek concluded, was thus also a "feeling-space" (*Gefühlsraum*). However, it would only become manifest in absolute music, and was only accessible to "high-musical humans" capable of sophisticated and educated aesthetic appreciation (Wellek 1963, 331). Schmitz follows Wellek when he argues that music, sounds and silence are experienced *as* spatial in their very phenomenal "suchness" (*Sosein*) due to the way they relate to the experiential space of the felt-body and not through a psychological process of association.[26] However, what sets Schmitz's theory of "feeling-space" apart from the ideas of Wellek is his concern not so much with distinguishing auditory layers of spatiality, but with introducing a new kind of spatial theory altogether. Rather than marking a "third space," music and sound provide, for Schmitz, evidence of a *particular kind* of spatial structure. While ordinary ideas of space hinge on a dimensional logic, Schmitz insists that the space of music and sound is non-dimensional. This is to say that they are indefinitely expansive, without boundaries or surfaces, without locations that can be pinned down, full of "tendencies" of expansion and contraction, yet without direction. It is this particular kind of spatiality, distinct from Euclidean space, which Schmitz labels "atmospheric." Wellek had contended that this space was specific to music alone, but for Schmitz, such non-dimensional spatiality is also characteristic of wind and water, voices and weather and, most of all, of feelings. That music and sound are so prone to instil feelings, Schmitz concludes, is due to a homology: the phenomenal (not physical or material) spatiality of the auditory, he argues, *resembles* the spatial structure of feelings: they both manifest as non-dimensional, location-less, expansive atmospheres. Moreover,

for Schmitz, the experience of "feeling-space" in music is no longer exclusive to absolute music and to aesthetically educated people, as Wellek had claimed. Instead, Schmitz insists that "feeling-spaces" also unfold in simple sounds and noises, as these equally manifest as atmospheres.[27]

Against phenomenological sensualism

But how can one *hear* music and sounds as atmosphere? Schmitz opens his volume on *Perception* (Schmitz 2005 [1978]) with a rigorous rejection of *sensualism*, the idea that the senses of the human body perceive sense data that then somehow transforms into meaningful events. But he also – and this is important – rejects *phenomenological sensualism*, the idea that each sense affords a specific mode of being-in-the-world. In this vein, phenomenologist Erwin Strauss had insisted in 1935 that the visual was distant while sound was near, and that in seeing one looked *at* the world, whereas the listener received the world, or that one could look back but one could not listen into the past, and so on (Strauss 1953; quoted in Schmitz 2005 [1978], 15). For Schmitz, such phenomenological contrasting of seeing and hearing, according to allegedly distinct sensual modes of "having world" or of being-in-the-world, is untenable.[28] He maintains that "the hearing of tones and sounds is, phenomenologically speaking, so profoundly different from the hearing of noise, that it would be problematic to categorise them both under one sense, that is in terms of the sense of hearing" (ibid., 18; my translation). Put another way, it is not the tympanum that perceives music and sounds, but the felt-body. However, contrary to the focus on nervous stimulation in eighteenth-century *Affektenlehre* (see Herzfeld-Schild 2017b), and also contrary to contemporary notions of sonic transduction (Hirschkind 2006; Helmreich 2010), the felt-body does not register sound waves and vibratory stimuli but perceives music and sounds as *Gestalt* (Schmitz 2005 [1978], 38).[29] What launches a body into dance, is the suggestive character of the auditory *Gestalt* of music and sounds.[30] Phenomenologically speaking, music, Schmitz insists, does not perform a movement itself (except when its acoustic source shifts) (Schmitz 2014, 18). Yet, music manifests as a gestalt-process (*Gestaltverlauf*) that is *suggestive* of movements as it sketches out movements in parameters such as rhythm, timbre, melodic gestures, dynamics of loudness or harmonic tension, movements that the felt-body is prone to take up. The very "medium" (Schmitz [1978] 2005, 44) in which body and sound event are related are hence not sound waves but contagious suggestions of motion.[31] He thus also refers to such suggestions of motion as "bridging qualities" (*Brückenqualitäten*). Schmitz adds to this phenomenological redefinition of listening another argument to counter a sensualist understanding of auditory perception. A perceiver, he maintains, "hears sonorities embedded in situations" (Schmitz 2005 [1978], 252; my translation). Listening is the appreciation of auditory states of affairs, in other words, the hearing of sounds and music *as* atmospheres, a "situation-listening" (ibid.). Erik Wallrup explores such listening in his contribution to this volume when he analyses how listening to music as atmosphere affords a relation to the past, for various layers of pasts are rendered present in the situational

atmosphere (see also Massumi, this volume). And in their chapter in this volume, Inkeri Aula, Milla Tiainen and Helmi Järviluoma explore how music and sound occasion meaningful situations that are shot through with memories, hopes and fears that far exceed the corporeal relation of body, sound and space. Relating the notion of *suggestions of motion* and *situation(-listing)* in a study of congregational singing, I argued that musical suggestions of motion also are "evocative of spiritual becomings" (Riedel 2015, 100). Since congregational singing is saturated with suggestions of motion that most powerfully appear in harmonic transpositions, it also sketches lines of embodied spiritual movements as worshippers seek to approach "the throne of God" in song (ibid.). Adopting much the same approach, my Göttingen colleague Eisenlohr finds similar processes in Qur'anic recitation among Mauritian Muslims, whereby various acoustic parameters such as loudness, raised pitch or vocal formants all contribute to suggestions of motion that inscribe themselves into the felt-bodies of listeners while also sketching out lines of "spiritual journeys" (Eisenlohr 2018b, 126), and Abels (2017) discusses rhythm, melody, loudness and timbre not as mere suggestions of motion but as categories where musical and physical movement align.

From Hanslick to Schmitz. from musicology to philosophical anthropology

Of course, theories of musical affect, as with theories of movement in music, are as old as music itself.[32] Scholars have long sought to systematically puzzle out the ways in which music and sound transform the affective state of a listener or of an entire audience. In his book on perception, Schmitz discusses the music scholarship on feelings at length (Schmitz 2005 [1978], 260). His critique of musicological theories of feeling becomes particularly evident in the way he dissociates his ideas from those of the provocative nineteenth-century music theorist Eduard Hanslick (1825–1904). In the seminal text *Das musikalisch Schöne* (*The Beautiful in Music*), first published in 1854, Hanslick famously claimed that it is impossible to unequivocally determine particular feelings in music. For him the only true content (or subject) of music were *tönend bewegte Formen*, "sonically moved forms" (Hanslick 1922 [1854], 59; cf. Rothfarb and Landerer 2018). Schmitz doesn't challenge Hanslick's arguments by introducing a new understanding of music. In fact, he explicitly concurs with Hanslick about the centrality of movement (*Bewegung*) in both music and feeling (Schmitz 2005 [1978], 255). When he thinks about music and sound, using the terminology of *Gestalt* theory, Schmitz even perpetuates Hanslick's emphasis on ideas of form. Ultimately, what Schmitz brings to the discussion about feelings and music and what prompts him to rebut Hanslick altogether is a radically different concept of the human. Schmitz's *human*[33] is antidualistic: it no longer consists of physical body with metaphysical inside where soul, spirit or autonomous consciousness can reside. Instead, Schmitz's anthropology (in the philosophical sense of concepts of *the human*) is monistic: his whole human is *Leib*. In consequence, he vigorously rejects Hanslick's definition of feeling as a "consciousness of a boosting or restraint of the state of our soul

[*Seelenzustandes*], thus a state of contentment or discomfort" (Hanslick 1922 [1854], 6; my translation). For Schmitz, Hanslick's definition is symptomatic of an ideology of introjection. Thus feelings, for Schmitz, rather than being "motions of the soul" or "psychic processes," as Hanslick had supposed, are out there in the world, that is, in musical and sonic events.

In making this move Schmitz comes up with a new solution to the old conundrum of *ineffability*. While the speechlessness of the listener was, for Hanslick, proof that there are no explicit feelings in music, for Schmitz it attests to the fact that feelings are not internal personal states. Schmitz insists, turning Hanslick's argument around, that the very speechlessness in which listeners find themselves only indicates that the feeling they experience while listening to music does not originate in themselves, but must be external to them – and therefore alien. It is the extraneousness and unfamiliarity of feeling, rather than the inherent vagueness of feelings in music, that makes listeners speechless. Moreover, that a person finds themselves powerfully moved yet speechless when trying to identify a feeling, Schmitz continues, is not peculiar to music. The feeling that is encountered in a landscape, for instance, appears equally unnameable yet substantive, vague yet powerful. This feeling must therefore be out there in the landscape rather than in the metaphenomenal eye of the beholder. And like a landscape, Schmitz contends, music does not simply communicate explicit feelings *to*, or arouse feelings *in*, a subject, but rather, feelings approach a listener in music as external powers that grip the felt-body. What is encountered in music, according to Schmitz, is thus a "pre-subjective form of feeling." A somewhat raw feeling in its "not yet anthropocentrically organised archetypical form" – in other words: an *atmosphere* (Schmitz 2005 [1978], 260).

A critical assessment of Schmitz's phenomenology

Since Schmitz's revised anthropology of the human as "felt-body" marks the heart of his "new phenomenology" and of his *Gestalt* theory of music and sounds, it deserves closer attention. This is particularly the case at a time when critical humanities have made us aware of the normativity and eurocentrism that have driven the production of so much cultural theory (Braidotti 2013). But what, or indeed who, is this "felt-body"? And what is the intellectual project from which it emerges and which it perpetuates? Here I would like to make only two critical observations.

New phenomenology as normative anthropology

First, Schmitz's grand philosophical project is committed to a methodological anthropocentrism in which a normative human person stands as the benchmark for an analysis of atmosphere.[34] Schmitz boldly claims that:

> every human with a normal capacity of perception and in full possession of their senses can perceive [*wahrnehmen*] darkness, silence, empty space, time

> (in sound and movement), climatic-optic atmospheres (a serene morning, a peaceful evening, or the *Stimmung* of thunder) and feelings [. . .] as well as colour, sounds surfaces and movements.
>
> (Schmitz 2005 [1978], 189; my translation)

In order for his phenomenological explanations to have general validity, Schmitz insists the perceiver of atmosphere must be of "normal sanity" (*normalsinnig*), of "normal mind" (*normaler praktischer Verstand*) and of "normal human condition" (*menschlicher Normalzustand*) (Schmitz 2005 [1969], XI, 46, 131; cf. Riedel 2019a). As contributor Jan Slaby remarks, there is in Schmitz's work no equal space for the animal, the strange, the subaltern (Slaby, this volume). Instead, Schmitz reproduces a normative hierarchy between "the normal" (Schmitz 2005 [1978], 29), or "averagely normal" (Schmitz 2005 [1967], 144), and the abnormal, the infantile, the impaired, the animal, the psychotic. All these are, like "normal humans," equally anchored in atmosphere. Yet the animal, the psychotic and the childlike are literally stuck in what Schmitz terms a "primitive present," a mode of "pre-personal" existence. "Normal humans," however, are capable of emancipating themselves from that "primitive" mode of existence and of achieving fully fledged personhood. It is consciousness, the faculty of language and the capacity for personhood, that distinguishes "normal humans" from their primitive other who is denied full access to the same subject position. On top of this, humans who deviate from his norm serve an epistemic function in Schmitz's argument. Examining numerous psychological case studies, he finds in their references to abnormality a philosophical means to approximate the "normal felt-body."

In light of this, Schmitz's "felt-body" is highly suspect, and indeed complicit in the problematic aspects of the project of classical humanism that the recent turn to affect and the body have explicitly intended to challenge. To adapt Braidotti's critique, one can say that Schmitz's felt-body appears in this perspective to be simply "another normative convention," one that turns out to be

> highly regulatory and hence instrumental to practices of exclusion and discrimination. The human norm stands for normality, normalcy and normativity. It functions by transposing a specific mode of being human into a generalised standard, which acquires transcendent values as *the* human.
>
> (Braidotti 2013, 26)

Since a normalised human body marks the point of departure of Schmitz's entire phenomenology, it comes as no surprise that his ideas about music and sound, albeit intriguing in their own terms, smack of normativity and can strike one as essentialisms rather than subtle phenomenological observation (cf. Griffero 2014, 88). When Schmitz maps musical parameters onto feelings and aligns particular musics and sounds with modes of embodiment, he perpetuates an understanding of musical affect that is precisely not situational, but universalist and normative.

A decolonial intervention

The second critical intervention I would like to make concerns Schmitz's obliteration of the difference between body and soul in the concept of the "felt-body" (Schmitz 1965, 55). At first sight, Schmitz's preoccupation seems to resonate with scholarship that has long criticised the marginalisation of the body in the humanities and that has debunked the normative logic of ontological dualisms usually referred to as the body-mind problem. Schmitz's anti-dualist endeavours share many similarities with other recent work in sound studies. He posits a felt-body that is structurally in flux, relational and emergent, and he writes against an anthropocentric concept of emotion.[35] Schmitz's contribution is indeed constructive here, albeit not entirely new (see Slaby, this volume; Wellbery 2003). However, just because Schmitz opposes ontological distinctions, his proposed anthropology of the felt-body is, of course, no less normative. Just as dualist anthropologies implied a claim to universalism, he posits the "felt-body" as a universal human condition. However, and despite the fact that various metaphysical systems outside the so-called West have equally rested on dualistic concepts of body and mind, Schmitz's intellectual enterprise of overcoming a dualist concept of the human is, of course, a deeply Western project, one inextricably bound to the ideological programmes advocated by Central European philosophers and committed to Greco-Christian ontologies. If non-Western bodies (or, indeed, any bodies) are theorised in terms of Schmitz's "felt-body" and depicted as embodying the felt-bodily wholeness that Schmitz envisions, they become *examples* in a Western struggle against what Schmitz calls "psychologistic-reductionist-introjectionist objectification" (Schmitz et al. 2011, 247). Indeed, as Gavin Steingo and Jim Sykes recently emphasised, the global South has long served as a foil for North Atlantic epistemologies. In an equation of sound and South, the global South has functioned as a counterpoise to northern logo-centrism and ocular-centrism (Sykes and Steingo 2019).[36] In a similar vein, when non-Western bodies are paraded as evidence against the alleged dictates of Cartesian dualisms that still haunt "us" (but not them?), they are once again cast as the other, even when also as the "better us." Uncritically transplanting Schmitz's phenomenology into cultural spaces of the global South risks merely extending this intellectual history of Othering.

A cultural phenomenology of atmosphere

But when the "felt-body" crumbles, is there anything left of Schmitz's concept of atmosphere? One can understand the temptation to reject Schmitz's work altogether (see the debate between Slaby and Massumi, this volume), but I would like to suggest "going with Schmitz beyond Schmitz." After all, the ultimate aim of his neo-phenomenological project is *not* the production of a conceptual grid with universal validity (even though his terminology has often been applied in that way, including by himself). Against Husserl, Schmitz insists that "new phenomenology no longer wants to lay claim to establishing something with apodictic certainty for

all eternity" (Schmitz 2009, 12; translated by Rudolf Owen Müllan). The philosophical goal of "new phenomenology" is instead one of approximating experience with ever more appropriate concepts. Thus, instead of taking concepts that aim at fathoming the experience of a *particular* human body and transplanting them onto bodies outside the Greco-Judeo-Christian tradition, (new) phenomenology must be regionalised if it wants to avoid neo-colonial pitfalls. Here it could give rise to new concepts more appropriate to historically and culturally specific experiences, regional ontologies and technological particularities. When Steingo and Sykes poignantly argue that, "the first move in any critical discourse on sound is to denaturalize and de-essentialize it" (Steingo and Sykes 2019, 3), I would like to add that a critical discourse on *feeling* sound equally needs to denaturalise the very devices of feeling (and listening), namely the human (felt-)body and ear.

This brings me back to the "phenomenological sensualism" that Schmitz had sharply criticised. When scholarship on atmosphere (including, in part, my own) rehearses a variety of emphatic assertions about ear and sound, body and music, it also implicitly makes claims to being axiomatic or universal. Common tropes include, for instance, Böhme's pronouncement that in listening we are outside ourselves (Böhme 2013, 274), Ingold's claim that sound is not the object of listening but its medium (Ingold 2011, 137) or as Thibaud put it, "With sound – as with ambiance – we are immersed in a milieu" (Thibaud 2003). Such assertions about the materiality of sound and body are deceptive with regard to their universal applicability. Yet they neither refer to historically particular sound events nor to culturally formed ears, but invoke both sound and ear in their phenomenal materiality as transhistorical and transcultural facts. Clearly, scholars employ such parlance as a rhetorical gambit, but it is revealed as normative, rather than innocently descriptive, as soon as this collective "we" enters ethnographic writing. An example of this is when a claim about "our felt-body" and its relation to sound is turned into an argument concerning a specific cultural practice. However, to the extent that such arguments remain idealist, they are open to refutation (see also Volmar and Schröter 2013): there is always scientific evidence that points in a different direction, a media constellation that subverts the naturalised relation of organ and stimulus, body and sound, a cultural technique that comes first, a philosophical or religious concept of human or ear that overthrows a naturalised materialism or a universalised metaphysicalism. Again, what is problematic about such thetic claims over ear and body, sound and space, is not only that they "elevate a set of cultural prenotions about the senses (prejudices, really) to the level of theory," as Sterne notes (Sterne 2012, 9), but that they implicitly assume a static and normalised conception of the human. Where arguments centre on a sensorial "we," the human body is ascribed with transhistorical givenness vis-à-vis an assumed unequivocal materiality of sound. Taking the senses and the phenomenological felt-body as universals of experience, such studies inevitably remain transcendental, as Rei Terada (2001) has remarked. Or, as Sterne has aptly put it, "the attempt to describe sound or the act of listening in itself – as if the sonic dimension of human life inhabited a space prior to or outside history – strives for a false transcendence. Even phenomenologies can change" (Sterne 2003, 19). Sterne's

argument can be pushed even further here. Even when it is emphatically argued that sound as atmosphere is somehow always already ingrained with cultural particularity (Eisenlohr 2018a), a "false transcendence" remains when the felt-body is taken for granted as universal fact. Such residual reliance on the "felt-body" as naturalised backdrop only (re)produces another binary opposition according to which the phenomenological body is a universal human condition, while listening, meanings and affects are culturally specific. However – to adapt Sterne – even anthropologies (in the sense of concepts of *the human*) can change.

Some of the contributors of this collection explicitly seek to debunk universalist claims about atmosphere, the body and the human (see Turner, this Volume 118). Holger Schulze argues for an anthropology of sensibility and sound that "does not stop at a thin understanding of phenomenological approaches that intend to work with a static notion of a certain situated sensing" (Schulze, this volume). Instead, he proposes a radically situational approach which recognises that the naturalisation of sensorial perception is itself habitual. In a similar vein, and instead of departing from a presumed material relation of ear and sound, Dafni Tragaki seeks to identify the specific *audile techniques* that define "heterochronic atmospheres of listening." In her account, "atmospheric listening" is not simply defined by the material condition of the sonic, but is rather an operative technique of relating to the past. In European travelogues from the eighteenth century, Anne Holzmüller discovers that it was apparently *not* the sensorial immediacy which was evocative of atmospheric relations – an immediacy otherwise widely taken for granted in scholarship on atmosphere and sound. Instead, pilgrims consciously *opted* for immersion and affect.

Shearing off the dogma of "new phenomenology," the present volume attempts to home in on efforts in music and sound studies – such as those articulated by Georgina Born (Born 2013, 24) – that have long criticised a naturalised understanding of the (phenomenological) body and that have attempted to steer the phenomenological tradition in more productive directions: towards a "cultural phenomenology" that takes "collective and impersonal life" into account (Connor 2000, 3), towards a "historical phenomenology" that acknowledges that not just feeling but also hearing/sensing is historically diverse (Smith 2000, 2004), towards a "social phenomenology" (Porcello 1998), or towards what Born (2013), in reference to Feld (1996), has called a "sonic-social phenomenology" that no longer considers the social as extraneous to music (see also Born 2010, 208; Torvinen, this volume). One can also point to a phenomenology that attends to the "paradoxes of embodiment" rather than its universals (Berger 2015); or to a "dynamised phenomenology and anthropology" (Schulze, this volume) that no longer starts from universalist claims about the human or the (felt-)body as an abstract metaphysical concept, but considers both the human and sound as situated and contingent. This directs phenomenology towards those experiences that do not fit with a spuriously coherent felt-body and its idealised modes of operation, yet without treating these as pathological, deviant or insignificant. In turn – to adapt Born's incisive call for a revision of analytical ontologies – this may allow for an *analytical anthropology* that no longer projects a particular concept

of the human into all varieties of musical situation, but that is capable of accessing and foregrounding the anthropologies "of those we study" (Born 2012, 232).

Conclusion

Thinking in terms of *atmospheric relations* is to go beyond theories of music that ultimately constrict understandings of listening, sound, and musical affect to a narrow idea of (bodily) perception, and that consider music and atmosphere as a relationality of subject and object. Rather than asking how a (felt-)body responds to sound or how a rhythm affects a body (Gallagher, Kanngieser, and Prior 2017), I argue that atmosphere directs attention to the ways in which a rhythm or sound translates itself into the environment, and in doing so, modulates a situation in its entirety and pulls all bodies within reach into a relation. This means moving on from (new) phenomenology's solipsism and from musicology's concern with individualised ears and personalised bodies. It also means not taking social or ethnic collectives as unquestioned categories of research. Instead, one can embrace the environmental and the situational as starting points of enquiry. In line with both (new) phenomenology and affect scholarship, thinking music in terms of atmospheric relations accommodates both material and ideational registers. Such an approach does away with normative ideas about the human that remain at the heart of the neo-phenomenological "felt-body." It allows instead for an *analytical anthropology* that is capable of accessing and foregrounding multiple anthropologies. The aim then is to investigate the specific musical and auditory *atmospheric practices* (Bille 2019) or operations of cultivating *atmospheric relations*, and to explore the bodies (or humans) and varied sensoriums that are fashioned in these relations, in all their historical and cultural particularities.

In contrast to the fluidity and continuity of affective fields, *atmospheric relations* describes those sonic-social structures, and their related *atmospheric practices*, that stabilise an affective field or social situation by imbuing it with homogeneity and thereby charging it with identity and difference. This affective unification, however, no longer needs to be confused with a factual social unity as if the feeling that spans an atmosphere actually translates into all bodies present. Rather, following Schmitz's distinction between noticing a feeling and being affected by it, atmospheric relations *suggest* or *simulate* coherence and thus operate as forces of social mediation. A repetition of atmospheric situations may thus feed into the stabilisation of collectives or corroborate structures of oppression. Music and sound are highly conducive here because they don't simply affect individual bodies nor collectives of individual bodies but (equally) manifest as modulations of a whole space, situation or event (Hofmannsthal 1905). In other words, atmosphere describes a mediation that is not simply social but sonic and musical (Born 2011).

This does not mean that questions of perception or the body are of no importance. They are! But I have sought to promote a terminology and conceptual frame that is more suitable for a relational and environmental ontology of music and sound as atmosphere. In fact, when Schmitz defines feelings *as* atmospheres, he does precisely this: he uses the term atmosphere as a "structural metaphor"

(Lakoff and Johnson 2003) to explicate a particular kind of *structure* of (certain) feelings; namely, that feelings are non-dimensional, non-intentional, surfacelessness or with indivisible duration. Put another way, the feelings that he wants to draw attention to have the *structure* of atmospheres rather than, for instance, of images, introjections or other mental processes. The differences in approach between Gernot Böhme and Timothy Morton illuminate this conceptual shift from a concern with atmosphere as a perceptual phenomenon existing in relation to a felt-body, towards a concern with the operations, structures and mediations that invoke and perpetuate atmospheric relations. Morton analyses literary works and asks questions about the ways in which a text "conjures up a sense of a surrounding atmosphere or world" (Morton 2007, 22; see also Torvinen, this volume). He identifies six overlapping features or modalities of "ambient poetics": rendering (discussed earlier), the medial, the re-mark, the timbral, the *Aeolian* and tone (Morton 2007, 34), the last three of which he adopts from the domains of music and sound. He thus starts with an enumeration of a set of logical operations. This contrasts with Böhme's ineluctable ontological stipulations and definition of atmosphere as "something between subject and object" (Böhme 2013). Morton, (like Schmitz), does not locate atmosphere as something between subject and object, but rather explores how "ecological writing shuffles subject and object back and forth so that we may think they have dissolved into each other, though what we usually end up with is a blur [I call] *ambiance*" (Morton 2007, 15). Replacing absolute statements about perception, world and self with a much more subtle operational thinking, Morton attends to what Bille refers to as *atmospheric practices* or to what might be also called the cultural techniques of forging *atmospheric relations*. Building on Morton, as well as Vadén and Torvinen (2014), as points of reference, I have proposed four aspects I deem central to the logic of atmospheric relations: dynamics of modulation, mereological relations, affective thresholds and movement (Riedel 2019a). The chapters in this volume bring vivid illustrations to this debate. They address aspects of the conceptual framing outlined in this introduction in diverse but complementary ways, and both individually and collectively constitute a significant contribution to theoretical debates about music and sound as atmosphere.

Overview of the chapters

The volume opens with two chapters that sketch out conceptual trajectories further. Vadén and Torvinen take up two topics that are widely discussed in music scholarship: the ineffable and musical meaning. Rather than treating musical experience as a metalinguistic or metaphysical experience of a cognisant subject, they insist that musical meaning is "asubjective." Atmosphere, non-individual mood, is pre-conceptual because it is pre-individual. The intricate argument that Vadén and Torvinen craft through references to music and poetry touches on notions of temporality, ecology, meaningfulness and in-betweenness, and ties in with a mereological notion of atmospheric relations. The chapter by Hermann Schmitz is an exercise in "new phenomenology." In this text, translated here from German

with the author's permission, Schmitz recapitulates many of his main philosophical arguments regarding space and time, singularity and identity, relationality and motion, in order to sketch the structural similarities between music, sounds and atmosphere.

The chapters by Ruard Absaroka and Juha Torvinen each draw attention to those musical textures that summon an environmental mode of listening. In doing so they elaborate acoustemologies of atmosphere and raise important theoretical and epistemological concerns about atmospheric relations. Absaroka enquires into parallels between the epistemic functions of "atmosphere" and of "timbre." In a case study of *jiangnan sizhu* (Silk-and-Bamboo), the sophisticated folk-chamber music of a central portion of eastern seaboard China, he notes the aesthetic primacy of timbral considerations throughout the process of performance. He argues that attentiveness to "timbral-environmental listening" highlights structural similarities between timbral and atmospheric modes of explanation. Tracing a cross-cultural history of notions of timbre provides an instructive contrast to accounts of *Stimmung* and "atmosphere," attends to "trans-sensual" experience and points to the epistemological productiveness and affective power of vagueness. Torvinen brings together the "inspirational" potential of "the (arctic) North," as discussed in cultural geography, with ecomusicological concerns and the phenomenology of atmosphere. In a close listening to a work by Finnish composer Kalevi Aho, he searches for musical evidence of a so-called "Northern tone." Mobilising a phenomenology of atmosphere, he develops an analytical orientation that links pre-conceptual experiences and cultural signification to elaborate an acoustemology of ecological awareness.

The next two chapters, by Tamara Turner and Andrew McGraw, explore the conflicting power-dynamics of atmospheric relations. Both in a North American jail (McGraw) and in Algerian Sufi rituals (Turner), music and sound precipitate and perpetuate power relations that in turn stimulate atmospheric practices of musicking. In the Algerian ritual, participants engage in the affective labour of establishing and maintaining the right kind of "hāl," a term that can be translated as atmosphere. In the Richmond (Virginia) city jail, residents who take part in a studio programme actively deploy music to counter a "carceral atmosphere" that is otherwise permanent, ubiquitous and reinforced by a regime of sonic signals. In contrast to the mundane sonic constraints that residents endure, music can promise a "liberatory atmosphere," one that doesn't simply unearth memories of freedom. Rather, the looser parameters of musical style enable a performance of the self as process that is itself a *manner* of freedom. It is through this atmospheric and liberatory power of music, McGraw concludes, that residents essentialise music as an absolute good.

The following chapters each engage with debates about sonic materialism but reach different conclusions. Holger Schulze explores sound events as situations. He builds on Christoph Cox's proposal that we conceive of sound art as a confluence of forces that span both the material and the cultural. Schulze extrapolates Cox's proposition about sound art into the sensory experiences of everyday life, and in doing so, expands the argument to theorise listening and sensibility as

situated. He argues for the necessity of a new anthropology, one that leaves behind Western subject-philosophy to which critics of sonic materialism still seem to adhere. Schulze's notion of an anthropology of sensibility starts off from the same footing as a (Schmitzean) phenomenology of atmosphere as situation. However, whereas Schmitz postulates a reified "felt-body" as the pivotal point for an analysis of atmospheric situations, Schulze outlines an anthropology of sensibility that considers the *anthropos* of atmosphere itself as radically situational and contingent. Like Schulze, Birgit Abels takes up the debates on sonic materialism. She adopts arguments from Brian Kane's critical analysis of the ontological turn and its use of affect in sound studies (Kane 2015). However, whereas Kane argues for the need to read ontological claims about sound as ontographies, Abels goes much further by rejecting "conventional affect theory" altogether. She parades Schmitz's phenomenological notion of atmosphere as what she sees as a missing link between the material and the immaterial. She then reinterprets Schmitz's concept of "suggestions of motion" as a material process and conceives of music not in phenomenological but in acoustic terms; namely, as a movement that enters the body in material ways. Abels substantiates this through a close analysis of a *ruk* (men's dance) performance from Palau, Micronesia, and describes body percussion, group shouting/singing and rhythmic arrangements as material movements that act on the body.

Erik Wallrup and Dafni Tragaki explore the complex ways in which music has the capacity to render present deep layers of the historical past. Rather than essentialising post-war rebetiko love songs as intrinsically atmospheric, Tragaki emphasises audile techniques that correspond to the affective manifestation of heterochronic atmospheres. Through an evocative close study of acousmatic listening to "old" rebetiko recordings from around the 1940s, she charts the confluence of vectors of pain for heartbroken lovers and for war-torn citizens. Tragaki analyses how rhythm and the distinctive articulation of vowels create "atmospheres of ruined corporeality" in rebetiko love songs. The love-crisis, as voiced in song, produced on cassettes and reproduced on the radio, then intimates "social disorder and the potential of resistance in sound." Erik Wallrup unpacks the intricately entangled pasts in Ingmar Bergman's famous 1975 television adaption of Mozart's opera *The Magic Flute*. It is not that Bergman recreates a past atmosphere in filmed performance, but rather that atmosphere manifests as a *relation* to the past. In other words, the re-construction of the historically informed performance as staged in the film occasions its own sentimental atmosphere.

The next two chapters each make a case for mediation. In a close reading of late-eighteenth-century travel reports by German Protestant visitors to Rome, Holzmüller discovers that the affective experiences travellers described are not unmediated impressions of atmosphere. On the contrary, they are related to the historically specific paradoxes between religious ritual and profane entertainment. Böhme's notion of atmosphere, Holzmüller argues, falls short here as it cannot account for the ambivalences that emerge from these paradoxes, since it "makes claims about immediacy and presence." Holzmüller thus makes a case for the notion of "immersion" by charting analogies between experiences in cyberspace

and those recounted by the eighteenth-century Protestant pilgrims. The chapter by Milla Tiainen, Inkeri Aula and Helmi Järviluoma is equally concerned with the mediation of sonic experiences. However, their interest lies with the ubiquity of media technologies that have fundamentally transformed modes of mundane listening. In response to this, they elaborate a research method of "sensobiographic walks" that aims at examining the sensory and atmospheric transformations of sonic environments in the wake of new technologies. Arising from an understanding of atmosphere as situation and of experience as site-specific and relational, the methodology of "sensobiographic walks" seeks to capture experience in process and action. In a discussion of three such sensobiographic walks, the authors conclude that beyond the technological conditions of new media, the human (body and mind) herself constitutes a medium for atmosphere.

The volume ends with four texts that frame a debate, the outcome of a face-to-face encounter between two prominent theorists of affect, Jan Slaby and Brian Massumi (Kompetenzzentrum Medienanthropologie and IKKM, Weimar, May 4, 2017). In interrogating resonances and interferences between the concepts of "affect" and "atmosphere," these two philosophers articulate their thoughts on these terms. Their contributions come with introductions by Christoph Carsten and Friedlind Riedel. To open the debate, Carsten poignantly casts critique as an act of affirmation. He builds on Deleuze and Guattari to argue for a "pedagogy of the event" that refuses the negative mode of ressentiment and instead is "a joyful production of difference." Riedel outlines the philosophical positions of Hermann Schmitz and Brian Massumi on atmosphere and affect against the music and sound scholarship that has mobilised these terms. She emphasises the various resonances between affect and atmosphere, and weaves them together in a post-Schmitzean notion of "atmospheric relations." Slaby and Massumi both sharply criticise Schmitz's approach and explore alternative philosophical matrixes to theorise atmosphere. Slaby proposes Deleuze's and Guattari's notion of the "agencement" as a conceptual and stylistic antidote to Schmitz, while Massumi turns to A.N. Whitehead and his concern with the "background of experience" to which he adds C.S. Peirce's concept of "Firstness" and Deleuze and Guattari's concept of "haecceity" to elaborate his own take on atmosphere.

Notes

1 *More than a feeling*. M&L: Tom Scholz © Pure Songs. With kind permission by Sony/ATV Music Publishing (Germany) GmbH.

2 I am indebted to Andrew McGraw, Juha Torvinen and most of all to Ruard Absaroka, for their constructive and immensely helpful comments on drafts of this introduction. I am grateful to Christiane Voss and Lorenz Engel for their inspiring intellectual input and support of this research project within the Kompetenzzentrum Medienanthropologie, Weimar, and to the IKKM Internationales Kolleg für Kulturtechnikforschung und Medienphilosophie, also at Bauhaus Universität Weimar, for co-hosting the debate between Brian Massumi and Jan Slaby on atmosphere and affect.

3 "Aber auch die ganze Atmosphäre des Salons schien wie mit einem Schlag verwandelt."

4 It is telling of a high level of conceptualisation that many of these terms have crossed linguistic divides as untranslatable lexemes. Thus the Sanskrit term *Rasa* entered

Javanese to remains a key notion in the aesthetic theory of the performing arts (Benamou 2010). Similarly, the German term *Stimmung,* having travelled from music into the field of philosophy and from there back into music theory, has famously been labelled by Leo Spitzer as "untranslatable" (Spitzer 1942, 409; see also Gumbrecht 2011; Wellbery 2003; Cassin 2014). And the lexeme *atmosphere,* a Greek neologism, has established itself as a technical term in a variety of languages (Spitzer 1942). I return to this terminology and genealogy later in the introduction.

5 In order to arrive at such distinctions, the concepts of emotion and affect are here artificially narrowed down to a single but broad definition. Some strands within research on affect and emotion have also sought to tackle those dimensions that we address here as "atmosphere."

6 Locating feelings outside the human subject is of course a provocation that some, such as philosopher Angelika Krebs, have taken issue with.

7 Here I refer to the notion of *Kulturtechnik*, as developed primarily in German *Medientheorie*. For a comprehensive introduction in English, see Siegert 2015.

8 See also the debate at the end of this collection with contributions by Massumi, Slaby, Carsten and Riedel. For a contrary view, see Abels (2018a) and Eisenlohr (2018a), who have adopted Ruth Leys' critique of affect who took issue with affect as allegedly being a purely material force. On these grounds, Abels and Eisenlohr insist that "affect theory" is incompatible with (or indeed falls short in light of) Schmitz's notion of atmosphere, which, in contrast to affect, encompasses both the material and the ideational. Rejecting "affect" as conceptually deficient for the study of music and sound, they have urged scholars to turn to (Schmitz's notion of) atmosphere in order to overcome tenacious dualisms of matter and mind. See also Abels, this volume.

9 "Die Wirkung des Klima [sic!] [. . .] verbreitet sich viel mehr auf die Massen der Dinge als auf die Individuen; doch auch auf diese durch jene."

10 Or, as Schmitz puts it, atmospheres have primacy over constellations and singularity and thus tend to be *pre-personal* (Schmitz 2005 [1978]).

11 Berger mentions "words, sounds, material objects, practices" as materials of expressive culture.

12 The vast field of empirical psychological research on music and emotion (and the heated debates it has given rise to, for instance, between Noël Carroll and Peter Kivy concerning musical mood) has been concerned with similar questions. This important body of work is not among the central concerns of this volume, due to constraints of format and the need to keep the discussion focussed. Bringing the phenomenological take on atmosphere into dialogue with psychological and empirical research on music such as that produced by Eric Clarke, John Sloboda and Martin Clayton would doubtless prove to be immensely fruitful. The work of Joel Krüger (2019) and Maria Witek (2019) are examples of a productive transdisciplinary approach to atmosphere.

13 For the emergence of the notion of *Stimmung* as a particular epistemological nexus between knowledge about the human body and sound, see the work of Marie-Louise Herzfeld-Schild (2017a, 2017b).

14 In German, the term *Gemütsbewegung* (motion of the *Gemüt* that can vaguely be translated as soul, mind, or feeling) was often used synonymously with *Gemütsstimmung* (*Stimmung* of the soul).

15 Both meanings are given in the 1793 edition of the first major German dictionary, compiled by Johann Christoph Adelungen, and one can continue to trace them far into the nineteenth century through numerous medical and meteorological books.

16 See, for instance, Goethe's use of the term atmosphere with reference to a person's character in his bourgeois novel *Elective Affinities*.

17 The Dutch saying reads as follows "Elk vogeltje zingt zoals het gebekt is." Such aspects of Kunst's work have not aged well, and the terminology not only sounds dated, but the essentialisms now clearly look racist in many ways. But it was this agenda, dating to

just after the end of the Second World War, that drove Kunst's efforts to institute ethnomusicology as a modern discipline in its own right. Note that in the same passage he prominently quotes, without qualifier, the German musicologist Wilhelm Heinitz, who was not only an active supporter of Hitler, but who reproduced racist Nazi ideology in his musicological studies.

18 Note that Kunst admitted that no general characterisation of the music of "a race" would be possible due to the "great differences in the cultural level of the various component parts of the race" (ibid.). Ultimately, Kunst's use of the term atmosphere can be read as a lingering trope of environmental determinism whereby climatic atmospheres were considered to predispose social structures and influence cultural development.

19 In a similar vein, music philosopher Vladimir Jankélévitch (1903–1985) poetically essentialised the differences between the musical work of Gabriel Fauré and Pyotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky in terms of atmosphere. Jankélévitch asserted that the latter's musical language was "Russian, through an unknowable atmospheric something that gives his music its local climate and that is never due to this or that identifiable Gallicism. This miracle assumes form as a subtle harmonic atmosphere" (Jankélévitch 2003, 106). There was something in the music of these composers that, albeit subtly, permeated their entire oeuvre and could not be linked to a particular musical element in their compositions.

20 For comparison, see also Abels (2017), who analyses the "mobile notions of space that are specific to the Sama Dilaut within the ethnic fabric of their life-world" to sound out feelings of cultural belonging. She states that festival music "fills physical space with an atmosphere of Sama Dilautness." For her, this "Sama Dilaut atmosphere," however, does not simply *signify* cultural belonging or ethnic difference but it (materially) relates to the "the Sama Dilauts'" felt bodies (Abels 2017, 28; see also Abels 2018a, 2018b; and Abels, this volume).

21 Schmitz had referred to this phenomenon as *Anmutung* (Schmitz 2005 [1969]).

22 Such *noticing* is not to be confused with "intellectual recognition" or a "rational understanding."

23 Schmitz does not follow Heidegger's fundamental-ontological phenomenology, and does not take up the latter's notion of *Stimmung* as "attunement." Instead, he sees himself as being closer to Maurice Merleau-Ponty, who, like Schmitz, mobilizes *Gestalt* theory for his *Phenomenology of Perception*. However, Schmitz dismisses the work of his French colleague as "diffuse," "erratic" and without theoretical contour (Schmitz 2005 [1978], IX). Of greater significance, for Schmitz are the psychological phenomenology and philosophical anthropology of scholars such as Ludwig Klages, Otto Friedrich Bollnow, Max Scheler, Theodor Lipps and Robert Francès. Schmitz also finds proof of his propositions about atmospheres and feelings in the psychological case studies with so called test-persons that he excerpts from empirical psychology (William James, Maria Hippius, John Paul Nafe, Hans Cornelius and Philip Lersch). In addition to finding confirmation from such sources, Schmitz also forges his argument by means of extensive reference to ancient Greek authors and to the writings of Goethe.

24 Schmitz uses this phrase in different ways: alternative translations for *ortlos* can include "expansively," "rimlessly," "holistically" or, most literally, "placelessly."

25 It is important to remember here that Wellek's theories of space and feeling were informed and probably driven by the racial ideology of the Third Reich. Wellek maintained his support for Hitler throughout the Third Reich and even served in the NSDAP as a war psychologist. His work is characterised by an assumption of German cultural superiority. Despite his many references to Wellek, Schmitz, to his discredit, does not critically comment on this.

26 He thus also rejects the spatial theories of music and sound put forth by the music psychologists Wolfgang Köhler (1887–1967) and Georg Anschütz (1886–1953). Köhler

and Anschütz had maintained that the sense of height and depth experienced in pitch derives either from a corporeal experience of sound production (Köhler 1915) or from the "mass properties of sound" (Anschütz 1930; Schmitz 2005 [1969], 198).

27 It is important to note here that Schmitz does not explicitly distinguish between sound(s) and music. Rather than speaking of sound (*Schall*) that denotes the physical medium of music, Schmitz frequently employs the term *Schälle* (sounds), the rarely used plural of the German term. In doing this, he emphasises that non-musical sound events, much like musical gestures, also have their own distinctive *Gestalt*.

28 Jonathan Sterne poignantly and critically describes just such arguments about the senses in terms of an "audio-visual litany" (Sterne 2003).

29 To reinterpret sound as a "full thing" – that is, as a physical object – Schmitz argues, would mean to leave the phenomenological perspective (Schmitz 2005 [1978], 118, 2009). Treating the "transducive effects of sound waves" as "suggestions of movement" (Eisenlohr 2018a, 102), for instance, is arguably incompatible with Schmitz's new phenomenology.

30 See also Ernst Kurth (1920) who famously postulated that "we hear dynamically not acoustically" (Kurth 1920, 59; my translation) and who spoke of listening as "entrainment" (*mitströmen*) (ibid., 9).

31 See also the important work on suggestion and affect by Lisa Blackman (2012).

32 An amended version of this paragraph also appears in Riedel (2019b).

33 Note that Schmitz considers all living beings to be "*leibliche Wesen*." In this, and with regard to their "primitive present," there is no difference between animal and human.

34 I am indebted for this argument to an observation made by Jan Slaby at a talk in Weimar in 2017.

35 Which does not mean that his phenomenology is not anthropocentric. In fact, it is.

36 This is not to say that ocularcentric knowledge production is only to be found in the West, which is itself an orientalist trope, but that there is a particular kind of struggle against ocularcentrism that is articulated in this vein in the "Western" academy.

References

Abbate, Carolyn. 2004. "Music – Drastic or Gnostic?" *Critical Inquiry* 30 (3): 505–36.

Abels, Birgit. 2013. "Hörgemeinschaften: Eine musikwissenschaftliche Annäherung an die Atmosphärenforschung." *Musikforschung* (3): 220–31.

Abels, Birgit. 2017. "Musical Atmospheres and Sea-Nomadic Movement among the Sama Dilaut." *Atmospheres and Mobilities* 3 (3): 21–36.

Abels, Birgit. 2018a. "Beziehungsweise: Sozial wirksame Präsenzeffekte des Musikalischen." In *Stimmungen und Atmosphären: Zur Affektivität des Sozialen*, edited by Larissa Pfaller and Basil Wiesse, 217–32. Wiesbaden: Springer.

Abels, Birgit. 2018b. “Music, Affect and Atmospheres: Meaning and Meaningfulness in Palauan Omengeredakl.” *International Journal of Traditional Arts* 2: 1–17.

Adelung, Johann Christoph. 1793. *Grammatisch-Kritisches Wörterbuch Der Hochdeutschen Mundart*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf und Compagnie.

Adler, Guido, ed. 1961 [1929]. *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte 2*. Tutzing: Hans Schneider.

Andermann, Kerstin, and Undine Eberlein. 2011. “Einleitung: Gefühle als Atmosphären? Die Provokation der Neuen Phänomenologie.” In *Gefühle als Atmosphären: Neue Phänomenologie und philosophische Emotionstheorie*, edited by Kerstin Andermann and Undine Eberlein, 7–17. Berlin: Akadademie-Verlag.

Anschütz, Georg. 1930. *Abriss Der Musikästhetik*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.

Augoyard, Jean-François. 1991. “La vue est-elle souveraine dans l’esthétique paysagère?” *Le Débat* 65 (mai-aout): 51–58.

Augoyard, Jean-François. 1995. “L’environnement sensible et les ambiances architecturales.” *L’Espace géographique* 24 (4): 302–18. Accessed June 17, 2019. https://doi.org/10.3406/spgeo.1995.3409.

Augoyard, Jean-François, and Henry Torgue. 1995. *A l’écoute de l’environnement: Répertoire des effets sonores*. Paris: Parenthèses Editions.

Bekker, Paul. 1934. *Wandlungen der Oper*. Zürich: Orell Füssli.

Benamou, Marc. 2010. *RASA: Affect and Intuition in Javanese Musical Aesthetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berger, Harris M. 2009. *Stance: Ideas About Emotion, Style, and Meaning for the Study of Expressive Culture*. Music/culture. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Berger, Harris M. 2015. “Phenomenological Approaches in the History of Ethnomusicology.” Accessed June 13, 2019. www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935321.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935321-e-30.

Bie, Oskar. 1913. *Die Oper*. Berlin: Fischer.

Bille, Mikkel. 2019. *Homely Atmospheres and Lighting Technologies in Denmark: Living with Light*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Binswanger, Ludwig. 1933. “Das Raumproblem in der Psychopathologie.” *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie* 145 (1): 598–647.

Blacking, John. 1987. *A Commonsense View of All Music: Reflections on Percy Grainger’s Contribution to Ethnomusicology and Music Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blackman, Lisa. 2012. *Immaterial Bodies: Affect, Embodiment, Mediation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Böhme, Gernot. 1972. “System der Philosophie: By Hermann Schmitz.” *Man and World* 5: 363–72.

Böhme, Gernot. 1995. *Atmosphäre: Essays zur neuen Ästhetik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Böhme, Gernot. 2013. *Atmosphäre: Essays zur neuen Ästhetik*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Born, Georgina. 2010a. “For a Relational Musicology: Music and Interdisciplinarity, Beyond the Practice Turn.” *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 135 (2): 205–43. DOI: 10.1080/02690403.2010.506265.

Born, Georgina. 2011. “Music and the Materialization of Identities.” *Journal of Material Culture* 16 (4): 376–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183511424196.

Born, Georgina. 2012. “On Tardean Relations: Temporality and Ethnography.” In *The Social After Gabriel Tarde: Debates and Assessments*, edited by Matei Candea, 230–45. London and New York: Routledge.

Born, Georgina. 2013. “Introduction – Music, Sound and Space: Transformations of Public and Private Experience.” In *Music, Sound and Space: Transformations of Public and Private Experience*, edited by Georgina Born, 1–70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2013. *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brennan, Teresa. 2004. *The Transmission of Affect*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

British Library. n.d. Department of Manuscripts. “Buddhist Cosmology.” 19th century Burmese Manuscript. Ref. No. Or 14004, London.

Cassin, Barbara, ed. 2014. *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chattopadhyay, Budhaditya. 2016. “Ambient Sound: Presence, Embodiment and the Spatial Turn.” *Sonic Field*. Accessed June 13, 2019. http://sonicfield.org/2016/06/ambient-sound-presence-embodiment-and-the-spatial-turn/.

Connor, Steven. 2000. “Making an Issue of Cultural Phenomenology.” *Critical Quarterly* 42 (1): 2–6. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8705.00269.

Cook, Nicholas. 2003. “Music as Performance.” In *The Cultural Study of Music: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Martin Clayton, Trevor Herbert, and Richard Middleton, 204–14. New York: Routledge.

Corbin, Alain. 1986. *The Foul and the Fragrant: Odor and the French Social Imagination*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

DeNora, Tia. 2000. *Music in Everyday Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahlhaus, Carl. 1989. *Nineteenth-Century Music*. Translated by J. B. Robinson. Berkley: University of California Press.

Dufrenne, Mikel. 1973. *The Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Eisenlohr, Patrick. 2018a. *Sounding Islam: Voice, Media, and Sonic Atmospheres in an Indian Ocean World*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Eisenlohr, Patrick. 2018b. “Suggestions of Movement: Voice and Sonic Atmospheres in Mauritian Muslim Devotional Practices.” *Cultural Anthropology* 33 (1): 32–57. https://doi.org/10.14506/ca33.1.02.

Engelhardt, Jeffers. 2015. *Singing the Right Way: Orthodox Christians and Secular Enchantment in Estonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Feld, Steven. 1996. “Waterfalls of Song: An Acoustemology of Place Resounding in Bosavi, Papua New Guinea.” In *Senses of Place*, edited by Steven Feld and Keith H. Basso, 91–135. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Fuchs, Thomas. 2013. “The Phenomenology of Affectivity.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy and Psychiatry*, edited by K. W. M. Fulford, Martin Davies, Richard G. T. Gipps, George Graham, John Z. Sadler, Giovanni Stanghellini, and Tim Thornton, 612–28. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gallagher, Michael, Anja Kanngieser, and Jonathan Prior. 2017. “Listening Geographies.” *Progress in Human Geography* 41 (5): 618–37. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132516652952.

Griffero, Tonino. 2014. *Atmospheres: Aesthetics of Emotional Spaces*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Griffero, Tonino. 2017. *Quasi-Things: The Paradigm of Atmospheres*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Guillebaud, Christine. 2015. *Toward an Anthropology of Ambient Sound*. London: Routledge.

Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich. 2011. *Stimmungen lesen: Über eine verdeckte Wirklichkeit der Literatur*. München: Hanser.

Hanslick, Eduard. 1922 [1854]. *Vom musikalisch Schönen*. 13–15th ed. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.

Helmholtz, Hermann. 1865. *Die Lehre von den Tonempfindungen als physiologische Grundlage für die Theorie der Musik*. Braunschweig: Vieweg.

Helmreich, Stefan. 2010. "Listening Against Soundscapes." *Anthropology News* 51 (9): 10. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-3502.2010.51910.x.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. 1869 [1785]. *Ideen zur Geschichte der Menschheit 2*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

Herzfeld, Gregor. 2011. "Verführung – Vereinnahmung – Verderben: Musik bei Søren Kierkegaard, Richard Wagner und Thomas Mann." *Musik & Ästhetik* 59: 79–96.

Herzfeld, Gregor. 2013a. "Atmospheres at Play: Aesthetical Considerations of Game Music." In *Music and Game: Perspectives on a Popular Alliance*, edited by Peter Moormann, 147–57. Dordrecht: Springer.

Herzfeld, Gregor. 2013b. *Poe in der Musik: Eine versatile Allianz*. Münster: Waxmann.

Herzfeld-Schild, Marie Louise. 2017a. "Resonanz und Stimmung: Musikalische Paradigmen im historischen Spannungsfeld von Anthropologie, Ästhetik und Physiologie." In *Resonanz-Rhythmus-Synchronisierung: Interaktionen in Alltag, Therapie und Kunst*, edited by Thiemo Breyer, Michael B. Buchholz, Andreas Hamburger, Stefan Pfänder, and Elke Schumann, 127–44. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Herzfeld-Schild, Marie Louise. 2017b. "Stimmung des Nervengeistes: Neurophysiologie und Musik im 18. Jahrhundert." In *Stimmungen und Vielstimmigkeit der Aufklärung*, edited by Silvan Moosmüller, Boris Previsic, and Laure Spaltenstein, 121–41. Göttingen: Wallstein.

Hirschkind, Charles. 2006. *The Ethical Soundscape: Cassette Sermons and Islamic Counterpublics* (Cultures of History). New York: Columbia University Press.

Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. 1905. "Shakespeares Könige und große Herren: Ein Festvortrag." *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* 41: X–XXVII.

Husserl, Edmund. 2001 [1900/1901]. *Logical Investigations*, edited by Dermot Moran. 2nd ed. 2 vols. London: Routledge.

Ingold, Tim. 2011. *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. London: Routledge.

Jankélévitch, Vladimir. 2003. *Music and the Ineffable*. Translated by C. Abbate. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kane, Brian. 2015. "Sound Studies Without Auditory Culture: A Critique of the Ontological Turn." *Sound Studies* 1 (1): 2–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/20551940.2015.1079063.

Kartomi, Margaret J. 1973. "Music and Trance in Central Java." *Ethnomusicology* 17 (2): 163. https://doi.org/10.2307/849881.

Kazig, Rainer. 2016. "Presentation of Hermann Schmitz' Paper, 'Atmospheric Spaces'." *Ambiances* [online]. http://ambiances.revues.org/709.

Klotz, Sebastian. 2011. "Musik Als Artikulation Von Stimmungen: Positionen Vom 19. Jahrhundert Bis in Die Gegenwart." In *Stimmung. Zur Wiederkehr einer ästhetischen Kategorie*, edited by Anna-Katharina Gisbertz, 197–209. München: Fink.

Köhler, Wolfgang. 1915. "Akustische Untersuchungen III." *Zeitschrift für Psychologie* 72: 1–192.

Krüger, Joel. 2019. "Music as Affective Scaffolding." *Music and Consciousness 2. Worlds, Practices, Modalities*, edited by Ruth Herbert, David Clarke, and Eric Clarke, 55–70. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kunst, Jaap. 1973 [1933]. *Music in Java Vol I*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Kunst, Jaap. 1974 [1953]. *Ethnomusicology: A Study of Its Nature, Its Problems, Methods and Representative Personalities to Which Is Added a Bibliography*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.

Kurth, Ernst. 1920. *Romantische Harmonik Und Ihre Krise in Wagners "Tristan"*. Berlin: Max Hesse Verlag.
Kurth, Ernst. 1931. *Musikpsychologie*. Berlin: Max Hesses.
Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lewis, Jayne Elizabeth. 2012. *Air's Appearance: Literary Atmosphere in British Fiction, 1660–1794*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lipps, Theodor. 1906. *Ästhetik: Psychologie des Schönen und der Kunst* 2. Hamburg: Leopold Voss.
Marx, Adolf Bernhard. 1857 [1839]. *Allgemeine Musiklehre: Ein Hülfsbuch für Lehrer und lernende in jedem Zweige musikalischer Unterweisung*. 6th ed. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.
Massumi, Brian. 2015. *Politics of Affect*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
McAuley, Tomas. 2019. "Immanuel Kant and the Downfall of the Affektenlehre." In *Sound and Affect: Sound, Music, World*, edited by Stephen D. Smith, Judy Lochhead, and Eduardo Mendieta. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
McGraw, Andrew. 2016. "Atmosphere as a Concept for Ethnomusicology: Comparing the Gamelatron and Gamelan." *Ethnomusicology* 60 (1): 125–47. https://doi.org/10.5406/ethnomusicology.60.1.0125.
Moisala, Pirkko, Hanna Väätäinen, Milla Tiainen, and Taru Leppänen. 2014. "Noticing Musical Becomings: Deleuzian and Guattarian Approaches to Ethnographic Studies of Musicking." *Current Musicology* 98: 71–93.
Morton, Timothy. 2007. *Ecology Without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, Andreas. 2016. "The Atmosphere of Genocide." In *No Feedback Performance in Context: Form 1*, edited by Nina Feldman, Lizzie Sells, Jen Plants, and Genevieve Maxwell. London: NFC Books.
Porcello, Thomas. 1998. " 'Tails Out': Social Phenomenology and the Ethnographic Representation of Technology in Music-Making." *Ethnomusicology* 42 (3): 485–510.
Racy, Ali Jihad. 1991. "Creativity and Ambience. An Ecstatic Feedback Model from Arab Music." *The World of Music* 33 (3): 7–28.
Ramann, Lina. 1880. *Franz Liszt, Band 2: Künstler und Mensch*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.
Ramann, Lina. 1886. *Franz Liszt als Psalmensänger und die früheren Meister: Zu einer musikalischen Psalmenkunde*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.
Riedel, Friedlind. 2015. "Music as Atmosphere: Lines of Becoming in Congregational Worship." *Lebenswelt* 6: 80–111. https://doi.org/10.13130/2240-9599/4913.
Riedel, Friedlind. 2018. "On the Dynamic and Duration of Atmosphere: Sounding out New Phenomenology through Music at China's Margins." In *Exploring Atmospheres Ethnographically*, edited by Sara A. Schorer and Susanne B. Schmitt, 172–88. London: Routledge.
Riedel, Friedlind. 2019a. "Atmosphere." In *Affective Societies: Key Concepts*, edited by Jan Slaby and Christian von Scheve, 85–95. New York: Routledge.
Riedel, Friedlind. 2019b. "The Atmosphere of Tones: Notions of Atmosphere in Music Scholarship, 1840–1930." In *Atmosphere and Aesthetics: A Plural Perspective*, edited by Tonino Griffero and Marco Tedeschini (n.n.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Rothfarb, Lee Allen, and Christoph Landerer. 2018. *Eduard Hanslick's on the Musically Beautiful: A New Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Runkel, Simon. 2015. "Zur Genealogie des Atmosphären-Begriffs: Eine kritische Würdigung der Ansätze von Hermann Schmitz und Gernot Böhme." In *Atmosphären des*

Populären I: Perspektiven, Projekte, Protokolle, Performantes, Personen, Posen, edited by Ulrich Wünsch, 20–39. Berlin: Uni-Edition.

Runkel, Simon. 2018. "Collective Atmospheres: Phenomenological Explorations of Protesting Crowds with Canetti, Schmitz, and Tarde." *Ambiances*. https://doi.org/10.4000/ambiances.1067.

Schmitz, Hermann. 1998. "Situationen und Atmosphären: Zur Ästhetik und Ontologie bei Gernot Böhme." In *Naturerkenntnis und Natursein: Für Gernot Böhme*, edited by Gernot Böhme, Michael Hauskeller, Christoph Rehmann-Sutter, and Gregor Schiemann, 176–90. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Schmitz, Hermann. 2005 [1965]. *Der Leib*. System der Philosophie II, Teil 1. Studienausgabe. Bonn: Bouvier.

Schmitz, Hermann. 2005 [1967]. *Der leibliche Raum*. System der Philosophie III, Teil 1. Studienausgabe. Bonn: Bouvier.

Schmitz, Hermann. 2005 [1969]. *Der Gefühlsraum*. System der Philosophie III, Teil 2. Studienausgabe. Bonn: Bouvier.

Schmitz, Hermann. 2005 [1978]. *Die Wahrnehmung*. System der Philosophie III, Teil 5. Studienausgabe. Bonn: Bouvier.

Schmitz, Hermann. 2009. *Kurze Einführung in die Neue Phänomenologie*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag K. Alber.

Schmitz, Hermann, Rudolf Owen Müllan, and Jan Slaby. 2011. "Emotions Outside the Box – the New Phenomenology of Feeling and Corporeality." *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 10 (2011): 241–59.

Schmitz, Hermann. 2014. *Atmosphären*. Freiburg: Karl Alber.

Siegert, Bernhard. 2015. *Cultural Techniques: Grids, Filters, Doors, and Other Articulations of the Real*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Simmel, Georg. 1917. "Die Historische Formung." *LOGOS: Internationale Zeitschrift für Philosophie der Kultur* 7 (2): 113–52.

Simpson, Paul. 2009. "'Failing on Deaf Ears': A Postphenomenology of Sonorous Presence." *Environment and Planning A* 41 (11): 2556–75. https://doi.org/10.1068/a41247.

Simpson, Paul. 2013. "Ecologies of Experience: Materiality, Sociality, and the Embodied Experience of (Street) Performing." *Environment Planning A* 45 (1): 180–96. https://doi.org/10.1068/a4566.

Simpson, Paul. 2016. "Sonic Affects and the Production of Space: 'Music by handle' and the Politics of Street Music in Victorian London." *Cultural Geographies* 24 (1): 89–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474016649400.

Slaby, Jan, and Rainer Mühlhoff. 2019. "Affect." In *Affective Societies: Key Concepts*, edited by Jan Slaby and Christian von Scheve, 27–41. New York: Routledge.

Smith, Bruce R. 2000. "Premodern Sexualities." *PMLA* 115 (3): 318–29.

Smith, Bruce R. 2004. "Listening to the Wild Blue Yonder: The Challenges of Acoustic Ecology." In *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening, and Modernity*, edited by Veit Erlmann, 21–42. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Sørensen, Tim Flohr. 2015. "More Than a Feeling: Towards an Archaeology of Atmosphere." *Emotion, Space and Society* 15: 64–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2013.12.009.

Specht, Richard. 1921. *Richard Strauss und sein Werk: Der Vokalkomponist, der Dramatiker 2*. Leipzig: E. P. Tal & Co.

Spitzer, Leo. 1942. "Milieu and Ambiance: An Essay in Historical Semantics." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 3 (2): 169. https://doi.org/10.2307/2102775.

Steingo, Gavin, and Jim Sykes. 2019. “Introduction: Remapping Sound Studies in the Global South.” In *Remapping Sound Studies*, edited by Gavin Steingo and Jim Sykes, 1–38. Durham: Duke University Press.

Sterne, Jonathan. 2003. *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Sterne, Jonathan, ed. 2012. *The Sound Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Sykes, Jim. 2018. *The Musical Gift: Sonic Generosity in Post-War Sri Lanka*. Critical Conjunctures in Music & Sound. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tellenbach, Hubert. 1968. *Geschmack und Atmophäre: Medien menschlichen Elementarkontaktes*. Das Bild des Menschen in der Wissenschaft 8. Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag.

Terada, Rei. 2001. *Feeling in Theory: Emotion After the “Death of the Subject”*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Thibaud, Jean-Paul. 2002a. “From Situated Perception to Urban Ambiances.” First International Workshop on Architectural and Urban Environment, Nantes, France, 2002.

Thibaud, Jean-Paul. 2002b. “L’horizon des ambiances urbaines.” *Communications* 73 (1): 185–201. https://doi.org/10.3406/comm.2002.2119.

Thibaud, Jean-Paul. 2003. “Die sinnliche Umwelt von Städten: Zum Verständnis urbaner Atmosphären.” In *Die Kunst der Wahrnehmung: Beiträge zu einer Philosophie der sinnlichen Erkenntnis*, edited by Michael Hauskeller, 280–97. Die graue Reihe 36. Zug: Die Graue Edition.

Thibaud, Jean-Paul. 2011. “A Sonic Paradigm of Urban Studies.” *Journal of Sonic Studies* 1 (1). http://journal.sonicstudies.org/vol01/nr01/a02.

Thibaud, Jean-Paul. 2015. “The Backstage of Urban Ambiances: When Atmospheres Pervade Everyday Experience.” *Emotion, Space and Society* 15: 39–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2014.07.001.

Thompson, Marie, and Ian Biddle. 2013. “Introduction. Somewhere Between the Signifying and the Sublime.” In *Sound, Music, Affect. Theorizing Sonic Experience*, edited by Marie Thompson and Ian Biddle, 1–24. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Torvinen, Juha. 2007. *Musiikki ahdistuksen taitona: Filosofinen tutkimus musiikin eksistentiaalis-ontologisesta merkityksestä. [Music as the Art of Anxiety: A Philosophical Approach to the Existential-Ontological Meaning of Music]*. Acta Musicological Fennica 26. Helsinki: Finnish Musicological Society.

Torvinen, Juha. 2019. “Resounding: Feeling, Mytho-ecological Framing, and the Sámi Conception of Nature in Outi Tarkiainen’s The Earth, Spring’s Daughter.” *MUSICultures* 45 (1–2): 167–89.

Trippett, David. 2013. *Wagner’s Melodies: Aesthetics and Materialism in German Musical Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vadén, Tere, and Juha Torvinen. 2014. “Musical Meaning in Between: Ineffability, Atmosphere and Asubjectivity in Musical Experience.” *Journal of Aesthetics and Phenomenology* 1 (2): 209–30. https://doi.org/10.2752/205393214X14083775795032.

Vischer, Friedrich Theodor. 1861. *Kritische Gänge*. Vol. 3. Stuttgart: Gotta’scher Verlag.

Volmar, Axel, and Jens Schröter, eds. 2013. *Auditive Medienkulturen: Techniken des Hörens und Praktiken der Klanggestaltung*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Weiss, Sarah. 2010. *Listening to an Earlier Java*. Amsterdam: Brill.

Wellbery, David E. 2003. “Stimmung.” In *Ästhetische Grundbegriffe: Historisches Wörterbuch in Sieben Bänden*, edited by Karlheinz Barck and Martin Fontius, 703–33. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Wellek, Albert. 1963. *Musikpsychologie und Musikästhetik: Grundriss der systematischen Musikwissenschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Akademische Verlagsgesallschaft.

Welsh, Caroline. 2008. “Nerven-Saiten-Stimmung: Zum Wandel einer Denkfigur zwischen Musik und Wissenschaft 1750–1850.” *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 31 (2): 113–29. https://doi.org/10.1002/bewi.200801317.

Welsh, Caroline. 2012. “ ‘Stimmung’: The Emergence of a Concept and Its Modifications in Psychology and Physiology.” In *Travelling Concepts for the Study of Culture*, edited by Birgit Neumann and Ansgar Nünning, 267–89. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Weymann, Eckhard. 2005. “Atmosphäre – ein Grundbegriff für die Musiktherapie.” *Musiktherapeutische Umschau* 26 (3): 15–28.

Witek, Maria. 2019. “Feeling at One: Socio-Affective Distribution, Vibe, and Dance-Music Consciousness.” *Music and Consciousness 2. Worlds, Practices, Modalities*, edited by Ruth Herbert, David Clarke, and Eric Clarke, 55–70. New York: Oxford University Press.

Woyt, Johann Jacob. 1709. *Gazophylacium Medico-Physicum*. 12th ed. Leipzig: Bey Friedrich.

Zhang, Dora. 2018. “Notes on Atmosphere.” *Qui Parle* 27 (1): 121–55. https://doi.org/10.1215/10418385-4383010.