> this on the composer is that he can think in terms of supplying material that would actually be too subtle for a first listening.[3]

Eno's history of recording touches on other philosophical points, some of which we have already dealt with: recording makes music available to any location that has playback equipment, the early emphasis on faithful reproduction of musical performances has yielded to a realization that the medium has its own unique potentials, the development of magnetic tape was decisive in the sense that it made the recorded sound vastly more manipulable, through the possibilities of splicing, looping, reversing, and variable-speed playing, and the development of multi-track recording and mixing makes possible whole new ranges of use and abuse. While many recordings today still have as their purported purpose the most faithful possible reproduction of a musical performance, Eno's emphasis is always on innovative ways the contemporary composer can approach the new technology should he choose to do so. What Eno calls "in-studio composition" is the result of the multi-track idea "that composition is the process of adding more." With in-studio composition,"

> you no longer come to the studio with a conception of the finished piece. Instead, you come with actually rather a bare skeleton of the piece, or perhaps with no starting point. Once you become familiar with studio facilities, or even if you're not, actually, you can begin to compose in relation to those facilities. You can begin to think in terms of putting something on, putting something else on, trying this on top of it, and so on, then taking some of the original things off, or taking a mixture of things off, and seeing what you're left with – actually constructing a piece in the studio.[4]

Eno makes much of the "transmission losses" from composer to score, score to performers, and performers to audience, and inasmuch as his records sound the same every time they're played, while Beethoven's symphonies do not, he has a point. Perhaps, however, Eno's assumption that any given record of his "is going to be the same every time it's played"[5] underestimates the significant differences in playback equipment on which his records are played. Having heard Eno pieces on several different sets of speakers in different rooms, as well as

---

[3] Eno, "Pro Session – Part I," 56. The idea that *recording* is solely responsible for the spatialization of music is debatable. A recent pointed scholarly exchange in the pages of *19th Century Music* revolved around the issue of whether or not it is valid to view the tonal structure of Verdi's operas as existing on an ideal, "spatial" plane outside the temporal plane of actual performance and perceived, heard, local modulations. Whatever side one favors in that debate, it is probably true that the debate itself could not arise with reference to music that has not been notated: in the case of the Verdi operas, it is the *score* that takes music out of the time dimension and puts it into the space dimension, or at least makes it much more susceptible to "spatial perception" and structural tonal analysis. Music notation has perhaps always had this sort of spatializing effect, but it is interesting that the linear vs. spatial debate has arisen only since the advent of sound recording. See Sigmund Levarie, "Key Relations in Verdi's *Un Ballo in Maschera*," *19th Century Music* 2 (1978), 143-7, Joseph Kerman, "Viewpoint," *19th Century Music* 2 (1978), 186-91, and Levarie's reply to Kerman, *19th Century Music* 3 (1979), 88-9.

[4] Eno, "Pro Session – Part I," 57.

[5] Eno, "Pro Session – Part I," 57.