

1

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*.

Our think piece this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird, movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come.

3

Our think piece this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird, movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination.

Our think piece this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on *Philomel*" (you may have already: this too)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird, movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come. Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." Yes

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination.

Lines and

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Is this a measurement that will stop our movement in thought? The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered.

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure love Boulez.

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

Shaviro helped me here: in Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" By Shaviro, Whitehead's attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz before.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird, movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination.

Why lines?:

Why Oneness?: Clarity, simplicity, perception, habit.

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Shaviro on Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being."

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure love Boulez.

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

We are becoming-sorceresses.

Shaviro helped me here: in Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" By Shaviro, Whitehead's attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz before.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird, movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination.

Why lines?:

Why Oneness?: Clarity, simplicity, perception, habit.

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Shaviro on Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being."

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure love Boulez.

Entering a piece as one can enter a rhizome, through anything, from anywhere. The inextricability of the piece from that which surrounds it. The inability of a piece to be (heard? apprehended? felt? I think it can be felt, experienced?) All at once. Becoming-the piece through listening. To woolly? Maybe too woolly. Attempting to listen all at once as yet another power takeover.

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

We are becoming-sorceresses; we become sorceresses and we are sorceresses of becoming. We are Nomads.

The only thing constant is change. But change is not constant: change cannot be traced along a linear axis of constancy. And if tracing seems necessary, put the tracing back on the map.

parsimony?

Shaviri helped me here: in Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" By Shaviri, Whitehead's attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz did before.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird, movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination.

Why lines?:

Why Oneness?: Clarity, simplicity, perception, habit.

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Shaviri on Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being."

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure love Boulez.

Entering a piece as one can enter a rhizome, through anything, from anywhere. The inextricability of the piece from that which surrounds it. The inability of a piece to be (heard? apprehended? felt? I think it can be felt, experienced?) All at once. Becoming-the piece through listening. To woolly? Maybe too woolly. Attempting to listen all at once as yet another power takeover.

Themes: rhizome, becoming-x, territorialization/deterritorialization, assemblage, tracing, mapping, virtual/actual, experimentation, listening and re-listening.

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)
3. Read what is below and think. (Read our piece and think?)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

~~~~~

We are becoming-sorceresses; we become sorceresses and we are sorceresses of becoming. We are Nomads. We are women who, it seems, must become-woman.

The only thing constant is change. But change is not constant: change cannot be traced along a linear axis of constancy. And if tracing seems necessary, put the tracing back on the map.

parsimony?

Shaviro helped me here: in Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" By Shaviro, Whitehead's attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz did before.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird; becoming-butterfly fluttering; movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come. I'M SO GARBLY.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination.

Why lines?:

Why Oneness?: Merely for clarity, simplicity, perception, habit.

Why Not Oneness?:

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Shaviro on Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being." Famously, Spinoza asks not what a body *is* but what a body can do. "S

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure love Boulez.

Entering a piece as one can enter a rhizome, through anything, from anywhere. The inextricability of the piece from that which surrounds it. The inability of a piece to be (heard? apprehended? felt? I think it can be felt, experienced?) All at once. Becoming-the piece through listening. To woolly? Maybe too woolly. Attempting to listen all at once as yet another power takeover.

Themes: rhizome, becoming-x, territorialization/deterritorialization, assemblage, tracing, mapping, virtual/actual, experimentation, listening and re-listening.

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)
3. Read what is below and think. (Read our piece and think?)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

~~~~~

We are becoming-sorceresses; we become sorceresses and we are sorceresses of becoming. We are Nomads. We are women who, it seems, must become-woman.

The only thing constant is change. But change is not constant: change cannot be traced along a linear axis of constancy. And if tracing seems necessary, put the tracing back on the map.

parsimony?

In Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" It seems like Whitehead's attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz did before.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird; becoming-butterfly fluttering; movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination.

Why lines?:

Why Oneness?: Merely for clarity, simplicity, perception, habit.

Why Not Oneness?: There is no music, only listening machines.

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Shaviro on Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being." Famously, Spinoza asks not what a body *is* but

what a body can do. D&G say: "Children are Spinozists...Spinozism is the becoming-child of the philosopher." Machinic assemblage of the ear that hears. (Question-machines.

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure love Boulez. (Here, I think I will go into some of the territorialization business from the eleventh plateau.)

Entering a piece as one can enter a rhizome, through anything, from anywhere. The inextricability of the piece from that which surrounds it. The inability of a piece to be (heard? apprehended? felt? I think it can be felt, experienced?) All at once. Becoming-the piece through listening. Too woolly? Maybe too woolly. Attempting to listen all at once as yet another power takeover.

Themes: rhizome, becoming-x, territorialization/deterritorialization, assemblage, tracing, mapping, virtual/actual, experimentation, listening and re-listening.

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)
3. Read what is below and think. (Read our piece and think?)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

~~~~~

We are becoming-sorceresses; we become sorceresses and we are sorceresses of becoming. We are Nomads. We are women who, it seems, must become-woman.

The only thing constant is change. But change is not constant: change cannot be traced along a linear axis of constancy. And if tracing seems necessary, put the tracing back on the map. Change speeds and slows.

In Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" It seems like Whitehead's attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz did before.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird; becoming-butterfly fluttering; movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come. Analysis is creation, disguised as truth-rooting. Rhizomic analysis is all creativity. There to catch the flow, tamponic. A tampon is just another penis, M. A tampon is a plug.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination. Wayback Machine.

Why lines?:

Why Oneness?: Merely for clarity, simplicity, perception, habit.

Why Not Oneness?: Because there is no music, only listening machines. We must never ask what music *is*, only what it functions with. What, do you think, is the difference between what something *does* and what something "functions with?"

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists

in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Shaviro on Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being." Famously, Spinoza asks not what a body *is* but what a body can do. D&G say: "Children are Spinozists...Spinozism is the becoming-child of the philosopher." Machinic assemblage of the ear that hears. (Question-machines.) All is caught up in all else.

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure love Boulez. (Here, I think I will go into some of the territorialization business from the eleventh plateau.)

Entering a piece as one can enter a rhizome, through anything, from anywhere. The inextricability of the piece from that which surrounds it. The inability of a piece to be (heard? apprehended? felt? I think it can be felt, experienced?) All at once. Becoming-the piece through listening. Too woolly? Maybe too woolly. Attempting to listen all at once as yet another power takeover.

A milieu exists by a periodic repetition whose effect is to produce a difference by which the milieu passes into another milieu, and this difference is rhythm. Rhythm is caused by repetition and interaction. Rhythms are an in-between passage and interaction between milieus, a coordination between heterogenous space-times. D&G call territory an act that *affects* rhythms and milieus, that "territorializes" them, that infects them. Territories are seized from components of milieus. Territory is the emergence of expression, and an act of rhythm-become-expressive. In a piece, or an analysis, how does territorialization function? The becoming-expressive of rhythm and melodies

If this book is a rhizome, and can be entered in from anywhere, so I will. I am intrigued by "block." We have block, a group or set of something, or to prevent something from happening. (I need to words better here.) Perhaps I am overcoded. Relate. Just kidding, the book was originally written in French. Slippery translations.

Themes: rhizome, becoming-x, territorialization/deterritorialization, assemblage, tracing, mapping, virtual/actual, experimentation, listening and re-listening.

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)
3. Read what is below and think. (Read our piece and think?)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

~~~~~

We are becoming-sorceresses; we become sorceresses and we are sorceresses of becoming. We are Nomads. We are women who, it seems, must become-woman.

We must become-Thousand, a thousand tiny sexes, we become new metaphors in the process of reading. Instead of machines we have queens. Instead of wars we have floors. Is it a rhizome or is it a The only thing constant is change. But change is not constant: change cannot be traced along a linear axis of constancy. And if tracing seems necessary, put the tracing back on the map. Change speeds and slows.

In Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" It seems like Whitehead's attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz did before.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird; becoming-butterfly fluttering; movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come. Analysis is creation, disguised as truth-rooting. Rhizomic analysis is all creativity. There to catch the flow, tamponic.

We are music theorists, maybe, and we could analyze as a rhizome and with a rhizome. We could choose any way into a piece, and when we analyze, we are tempted to have the piece on a single page, the piece all at once. We can never have a piece all at once, we can never experience all of its expressions and relations at once. (Can we?) We can listen in order and re-listen in order and find new entry points and new lines of flight, we can territorialize and deterritorialize. Let's have more, a multiplicity of listenings, let's have virtual listenings that never cross the threshold.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination. There's a website metaphor that D+G wouldn't have known about: Wayback Machine.

Why lines?:

Why Oneness?: Merely for clarity, simplicity, perception, habit. Heard all at once. (?)

Why Not Oneness?: Because there is no music, only listening machines. We must never ask what music *is*, only what it functions with. What, do you think, is the difference between what something *does* and what something "functions with?"

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Shaviro on Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being." Famously, Spinoza asks not what a body *is* but what a body can do. D&G say: "Children are Spinozists...Spinozism is the becoming-child of the philosopher." Machinic assemblage of the ear that hears. (Question-machines.) All is caught up in all else.

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure love Boulez.

Entering a piece as one can enter a rhizome, through anything, from anywhere. The inextricability of the piece from that which surrounds it. The inability of a piece to be (heard? apprehended? felt? I think it can be felt, experienced?) All at once. Becoming-the piece through listening. Too woolly? Maybe too woolly. Attempting to listen all at once as yet another power takeover.

A milieu exists by a periodic repetition whose effect is to produce a difference by which the milieu passes into another milieu, and this difference is rhythm. Rhythm is caused by repetition and interaction. Rhythms are an in-between passage and interaction between milieus, a coordination between heterogenous space-times. D&G call territory an act that *affects* rhythms and milieus, that "territorializes" them, that infects them. Territories are seized from components of milieus. Territory is the emergence of expression, and an act of rhythm-become-expressive. Expressive qualities territorialize and In a piece, or an analysis, how does territorialization function? Qualities delineate territories. Rhythm becomes a character, expressive qualities function as relations. Interaction is the key, here.

If this book is a rhizome, and can be entered in from anywhere, so I will. I am intrigued by "block." We have block, a group or set of something, or to prevent something from happening. (I need to words better here.) Perhaps I am overcoded. Relate. Just kidding, the book was originally written in French. Slippery translations.

Themes: rhizome, becoming-x, territorialization/deterritorialization, assemblage, tracing, mapping, virtual/actual, experimentation, listening and re-listening.

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)
3. Read what is below and think. (Read our piece and think?)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

~~~~~

We are becoming-sorceresses; we become sorceresses and we are sorceresses of becoming. We are Nomads. We are women who, it seems, must become-woman.

We must become-Thousand, a thousand tiny sexes, we become new metaphors in the process of reading. Instead of machines we have queens. Instead of wars we have floors. Is it a rhizome or is it a rug? A blanket sewn from every side. A blanket knit from the midst. A quilt of patches of lines of middles, and lines of flight, and planes. The only thing constant is change. But change is not constant: change cannot be traced along a linear axis of constancy. And if tracing seems necessary, put the tracing back on the map. Change speeds and slows.

Move your eyes across these words. You are becoming our sorceress thoughts. The event of reading is unfolding now and you find yourself back in the first week of quartering. You must work on processing process. In Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" It seems like Whitehead's attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz did before.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird; becoming-butterfly fluttering; movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come. Analysis is creation, disguised as truth-rooting. Rhizomic analysis is all creativity. There to catch the flow, tamponic.

We are music theorists, maybe, and we could analyze as a rhizome and with a rhizome. We could choose any way into a piece, and when we analyze, we are tempted to have the piece on a single page, the piece all at once. We can never have a piece all at once, we can never experience all of its expressions and relations at once. (Can we?) We can listen in order and re-listen in order and find new entry points and new lines of flight, we can territorialize and deterritorialize. Let's have more, a multiplicity of listenings, let's have virtual listenings that never cross the threshold.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination. There's a website metaphor that D+G wouldn't have known about: Wayback Machine.

Why lines?:

Why Oneness?: Merely for clarity, simplicity, perception, habit. Heard all at once. (?)

Why Not Oneness?: Because there is no music, only listening machines. We must never ask what music *is*, only what it functions with. What, do you think, is the difference between what something *does* and what something "functions with?"

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Shaviro on Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being." Famously, Spinoza asks not what a body *is* but what a body can do. D&G say: "Children are Spinozists...Spinozism is the becoming-child of the philosopher." Machinic assemblage of the ear that hears. (Question-machines.) All is caught up in all else.

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure love Boulez.

Entering a piece as one can enter a rhizome, through anything, from anywhere. The inextricability of the piece from that which surrounds it. The inability of a piece to be (heard? apprehended? felt? I think it can be felt, experienced?) All at once. Becoming-the piece through listening. Too woolly? Maybe too woolly. Attempting to listen all at once as yet another power takeover.

A milieu exists by a periodic repetition whose effect is to produce a difference by which the milieu passes into another milieu, and this difference is rhythm. Rhythm is caused by repetition and interaction. Rhythms are an in-between passage and interaction between milieus, a coordination between heterogenous space-times. D&G call territory an act that *affects* rhythms and milieus, that "territorializes" them, that infects them. Territories are seized from components of milieus. Territory is the emergence of expression, and an act of rhythm-become-expressive. Expressive qualities territorialize and In a piece, or an analysis, how does territorialization function? Qualities delineate territories. Rhythm becomes a character, expressive qualities function as relations. Interaction is the key, here.

If this book is a rhizome, and can be entered in from anywhere, so I will. I am intrigued by "block." We have block, a group or set of something, or to prevent something from happening. (I need to words better here.) Perhaps I am overcoded. Relate. Just kidding, the book was originally written in French. Slippery translations. My slippers become flippers.

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)
3. Read what is below and think. (Read our piece and think?)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

~~~~~

We are becoming-sorceresses; we become sorceresses and we are sorceresses of becoming. We are Nomads. We are women who, it seems, must become-woman.

We must become-Thousand, a thousand tiny sexes, we become new metaphors in the process of reading. Instead of machines we have queens. Instead of wars we have floors. Is it a rhizome or is it a rug? A blanket sewn from every side. A blanket knit from the midst. A quilt of patches of lines of middles, and lines of flight, and planes. The only thing constant is change. But change is not constant: change cannot be traced along a linear axis of constancy. And if tracing seems necessary, put the tracing back on the map. Change speeds and slows.

It is pleasant to read slowly. It pleases me to flowcalm.

Move your eyes across these words. You are becoming our sorceress thoughts. The event of reading is unfolding now and you find yourself back in the first week of quartering. You must work on processing process. In Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" This attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz did before. And yet we speak of them here: we know them, we are them, we them, wethem. Ryan's middle toe is not a transcendental event.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird; becoming-butterfly fluttering; movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come. Analysis is creation, disguised as truth-rooting. Rhizomic analysis is all creativity. There to catch the flow, tamponic.

We are music theorists, maybe, and we could analyze as a rhizome and with a rhizome. We could choose any way into a piece, and when we analyze, we are tempted to have the piece on a single page, the piece all at once. We can never have a piece all at once, we can never experience all of its expressions and relations at once. (Can we?) We can listen in order and re-listen in

order and find new entry points and new lines of flight, we can territorialize and deterritorialize. Let's have more, a multiplicity of listenings, let's have virtual listenings that never cross the threshold.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination. There's a website metaphor that D+G wouldn't have known about: Wayback Machine.

Why Oneness?: Merely for clarity, simplicity, perception, habit. Heard all at once. (?)

Why Not Oneness?: Because there is no music, only listening machines. We must never ask what music *is*, only what it functions with. What, do you think, is the difference between what something *does* and what something "functions with?"

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Shaviro on Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being." Famously, Spinoza asks not what a body *is* but what a body can do. D&G say: "Children are Spinozists...Spinozism is the becoming-child of the philosopher." Machinic assemblage of the ear that hears. (Question-machines.) All is caught up in all else.

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure dig Boulez. Also, and this has little to do with music: I refuse to discuss that becoming-field-of-anuses.

Entering a piece as one can enter a rhizome, through anything, from anywhere. The inextricability of the piece from that which surrounds it. The inability of a piece to be (heard? apprehended? felt? I think it can be felt, experienced?) All at once. Becoming-the piece through listening. Too woolly? Maybe too woolly. Attempting to listen all at once as yet another power takeover.

A milieu exists by a periodic repetition whose effect is to produce a difference by which the milieu passes into another milieu, and this difference is rhythm. Rhythm is caused by repetition and interaction. Rhythms are an in-between passage and interaction between milieus, a coordination between heterogenous space-times. D&G call territory an act that *affects* rhythms and milieus, that "territorializes" them, that infects them. Territories are seized from components of milieus. Territory is the emergence of expression, and an act of rhythm-become-expressive. Expressive qualities territorialize and In a piece, or an analysis, how does territorialization function? Qualities delineate territories. Rhythm becomes a character, expressive qualities function as relations. Interaction is the key, here.

If this book is a rhizome, and can be entered in from anywhere, so I will. I am intrigued by "block." We have block, a group or set of something, or to prevent something from happening. (I

need to words better here.) Perhaps I am overcoded. Relate. Just kidding, the book was originally written in French. Slippery translations. My slippers become flippers.

Themes: rhizome, becoming-x, territorialization/deterritorialization, assemblage, tracing, mapping, virtual/actual, experimentation, listening and re-listening.

Our think piece this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)
3. Read what is below and think. (Read our piece and think?)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

~~~~~

We are becoming-sorceresses; we become sorceresses and we are sorceresses of becoming. We are Nomads. We are women who, it seems, must become-woman.

We must become-Thousand, a thousand tiny sexes, we become new metaphors in the process of reading. Instead of machines we have queens. Instead of wars we have floors. Is it a rhizome or is it a rug? A blanket sewn from every side. A blanket knit from the midst. A quilt of patches of lines of middles, and lines of flight, and planes. The only thing constant is change. But change is not constant: change cannot be traced along a linear axis of constancy. And if tracing seems necessary, put the tracing back on the map. Change speeds and slows.

It is pleasant to read slowly. It pleases me to flow calm. It is pleasant to read and be read from all directions.

Move your eyes across these words. You are becoming our sorceress thoughts. The event of reading is unfolding now and you find yourself back in the first week of quartering. You must work on processing process. In Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" This attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz did before. And yet we speak of them here: we know them, we are them, we them, wethem. Ryan's middle toe is not a transcendental event.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird; becoming-butterfly fluttering; movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come. Analysis is creation, disguised as truth-rooting. Rhizomic analysis is all creativity. Flows flow in all directions. We become to catch the flow, tamponic.

We are music theorists, maybe, and we could analyze as a rhizome and with a rhizome. We could choose any way into a piece, and when we analyze, we are tempted to have the piece on a

single page, the piece all at once. We can never have a piece all at once, we can never experience all of its expressions and relations at once. (Can we?) We can listen in order and re-listen in order and out of order and find new entry points and new lines of flight, we can territorialize and deterritorialize. Let's have more, a multiplicity of listenings, let's have virtual listenings that never cross the threshold. Let's have howling in unison garb.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination. There's an internet metaphor that D+G wouldn't have known about: Wayback Machine.

Why Oneness?: Merely for clarity, simplicity, perception, habit. Heard all at once. (?)

Why Not Oneness?: Because there is no music, only listening machines. We must never ask what music *is*, only what it functions with. What, do you think, is the difference between what something *does* and what something "functions with?"

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Shaviro on Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being." Famously, Spinoza asks not what a body *is* but what a body can do. D&G say: "Children are Spinozists...Spinozism is the becoming-child of the philosopher." Machinic assemblage of the ear that hears. (Question-machines.) All is caught up in all else. All your life leads to you reading this FROOOOOGJ.

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure dig Boulez. Also, and this has little to do with music: I refuse to discuss that becoming-field-of-anuses.

Entering a piece as one can enter a rhizome, through anything, from anywhere. The inextricability of the piece from that which surrounds it. The inability of a piece to be (heard? apprehended? felt? I think it can be felt, experienced?) All at once. Becoming-the piece through listening. Too woolly? Maybe too woolly. Attempting to listen all at once as yet another power takeover. After all, one can knit one with wool and pearl two with clam chowder.

A milieu exists by a periodic repetition whose effect is to produce a difference by which the milieu passes into another milieu, and this difference is rhythm. Rhythm is caused by repetition and interaction. Rhythms are an in-between passage and interaction between milieus, a coordination between heterogenous space-times. D&G call territory an act that *affects* rhythms and milieus, that "territorializes" them, that infects them. Territories are seized from components of milieus. Territory is the emergence of expression, and an act of rhythm-become-expressive. Expressive qualities territorialize and deterritorialize (and deterritorize?); they unwind their own activity. In a piece, or an analysis, how does territorialization function? Qualities delineate territories. Rhythm becomes a character, expressive qualities function as relations. Interaction is the key, here. But remember: put your tracings back on the map.

If this book is a rhizome, and can be entered in from anywhere, so I will. I am intrigued by “block.” We have block, a group or set of something, or to prevent something from happening. (I need to words better here.) Perhaps I am overcoded. Relate. Just kidding, the book was originally written in French. Slippery translations. My slippers become flippers.

This sometimes feels like a manifesto. We read out loud, slowly, and unwound all sense. Accept this offering, though you cannot have it. It is best to live in a world without inherent meaning but if you need to cry, you are welcome to do so, and a tender touch to the arm can help. Sweet words are not always a waste of time-space: “Bobby, dear Bobby. I remember that time we went walking and you opened your ears and I showed you my interior jewelry.”

I am a sorceress becoming-child. Open the box, smells like Fruit Cereal. I am a child, becoming-playing-becoming-sorceress. What nostalgia rushes forth! Brightly colored nuggets inside a brightly colored cardboard receptacle. My nose, no longer a vestigial protrusion, detects a delectable aroma. I am magic; I make time and space. The scepter was made of a curtain rod. The top of the scepter was made of a lightbulb filled with glow stick glow. The glow stick leaked and stung my hand and stunned my eyes with radiant goop. Clearly I do not know any of these words at this age... but my senses were certainly sophisticated! Dazzling, scrumptious euphony! It suits the telling, to replace actual lively sensation with lively logos! Words words words!

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)
3. Read what is below and think. (Read our piece and think?)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

~~~~~

We are becoming-sorceresses; we become sorceresses and we are sorceresses of becoming. We are Nomads. We are women who, it seems, must become-woman.

We must become-Thousand, a thousand tiny sexes, we become new metaphors in the process of reading. Instead of machines we have queens. Instead of wars we have floors. Is it a rhizome or is it a rug? A blanket sewn from every side. A blanket knit from the midst. A quilt of patches of lines of middles, and lines of flight, and planes. The only thing constant is change. But change is not constant: change cannot be traced along a linear axis of constancy. And if tracing seems necessary, put the tracing back on the map. Change speeds and slows.

It is pleasant to read slowly. It pleases me to flowcalm. It is pleasant to read and be read from all directions.

Move your eyes across these words. You are becoming our sorceress thoughts. The event of reading is unfolding now and you find yourself back in the first week of quartering. You must work on processing process. In Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" This attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz did before. And yet we speak of them here: we know them, we are them, we them, wethem. Ryan's middle toe is not a transcendental event.

This is not an imitation. At best it is a circular system of ramification.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird; becoming-butterfly fluttering; movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come. Analysis is creation, disguised as truth-rooting. Rhizomic analysis is all creativity. Flows flow in all directions. We become to catch the flow, tamponic.

We are music theorists, maybe, and we could analyze as a rhizome and with a rhizome. We could choose any way into a piece, and when we analyze, we are tempted to have the piece on a single page, the piece all at once. We can never have a piece all at once, we can never experience all of its expressions and relations at once. (Can we?) We can listen in order and re-listen in order and out of order and find new entry points and new lines of flight, we can territorialize and deterritorialize. Let's have more, a multiplicity of listenings, let's have virtual listenings that never cross the threshold. Let's have howling in unison garb.

To have a book on a single page, to have a piece on a single page. There are pages inside these pages inside these pieces of pagination. There's an internet metaphor that D+G wouldn't have known about: Wayback Machine.

Why Oneness?: Merely for clarity, simplicity, perception, habit. Heard all at once. (?)  
Why Not Oneness?: Because there is no music, only listening machines. We must never ask what music *is*, only what it functions with. What, do you think, is the difference between what something *does* and what something "functions with?"

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Masumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Shaviro on Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being." Famously, Spinoza asks not what a body *is* but what a body can do. D&G say: "Children are Spinozists...Spinozism is the becoming-child of the philosopher." Machinic assemblage of the ear that hears. (Question-machines.) All is caught up in all else. All your life leads to you reading this FROOOOOGJ.

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure dig Boulez. Also, and this has little to do with music: I refuse to discuss that becoming-field-of-anuses.

Entering a piece as one can enter a rhizome, through anything, from anywhere. The inextricability of the piece from that which surrounds it. The inability of a piece to be (heard? apprehended? felt? I think it can be felt, experienced?) All at once. Becoming-the piece through listening. Too woolly? Maybe too woolly. Attempting to listen all at once as yet another power takeover. After all, one can knit one with wool and pearl two with clam chowder. She became my think with chowder.

A milieu exists by a periodic repetition whose effect is to produce a difference by which the milieu passes into another milieu, and this difference is rhythm. Rhythm is caused by repetition and interaction. Rhythms are an in-between passage and interaction between milieus, a coordination between heterogenous space-times. D&G call territory an act that *affects* rhythms and milieus, that "territorializes" them, that infects them. Territories are seized from components of milieus. Territory is the emergence of expression, and an act of rhythm-become-expressive. Expressive qualities territorialize and deterritorialize (and deterrorize?); they unwind their own activity. In a piece, or an analysis, how does territorialization function? Qualities delineate

territories. Rhythm becomes a character, expressive qualities function as relations. Interaction is the key, here. But remember: put your tracings back on the map.

If this book is a rhizome, and can be entered in from anywhere, so I will. I am intrigued by “block.” We have block, a group or set of something, or to prevent something from happening. (I need to words better here.) Perhaps I am overcoded. Relate. Just kidding, the book was originally written in French. Slippery translations. My slippers become flippers. I have become-block.

This sometimes feels like a manifesto. We read out loud, slowly, and unwound all sense. Accept this offering, though you cannot have it. It is best to live in a world without inherent meaning but if you need to cry, you are welcome to do so, and a tender touch to the arm can help. Sweet words are not always a waste of time-space: “Bobby, dear Bobby. I remember that time we went walking and you opened your ears and I showed you my interior jewelry.”

Philomel sings unsingable abyssopelagia. She becomes-animal-strophic-aria when the Ford Foundation commissioned such a piece. Amazingly flexible acoustical resources. Living, growing, changing, being in the hum always, which I wrote for Milton Babbitt to set thrashing, through. “[T]he effect to be horrific in a kind of baroque way, [the mangled root] but not coyly humorous.” Emptied, four KLH loud-speakers unfeeling and unfilled. “Quando fiam uti [aloud in the raptured ear of men] chelidon ut tacere desinam?” I feel myself becoming unspeakable pain and murderous rage. And so on.

I am a sorceress becoming-child. Open the box, smells like Fruit Cereal. I am a child, becoming-playing-becoming-sorceress. What nostalgia rushes forth! Brightly colored nuggets inside a brightly colored cardboard receptacle. My nose, no longer a vestigial protrusion, detects a delectable aroma. I am magic; I make time and space. The scepter was made of a curtain rod. The top of the scepter was made of a lightbulb filled with glow stick glow. The glow stick leaked and stung my hand and stunned my eyes with radiant goop. Clearly I do not know any of these words at this age... but my senses were certainly sophisticated! Dazzling, scrumptious euphony! It suits the telling, to replace actual lively sensation with lively logos! Words words words!

Our think peace this week will prepare you for discussion of *Philomel*. Please complete the following tasks before class time.

1. Listen to *Philomel* by Milton Babbitt (you may have already done this)
2. Read John Hollander's "Notes on Philomel" (you may have already: this too)
3. Read what is below and think. (Read our piece and think?)

You may enter this piece of thinking from anywhere.

~~~~~

We are becoming-sorceresses; we become sorceresses and we are sorceresses of becoming. We are Nomads. We are women who, it seems, must become-woman.

We must become-Thousand, a thousand tiny sexes, we become new metaphors in the process of reading. Instead of machines we have queens. Instead of wars we have floors. Is it a rhizome or is it a rug? A blanket sewn from every side. A blanket knit from the midst. A quilt of patches of lines of middles, and lines of flight, and planes. Here is a figure to add to the mix: Wayback Machine, via internetarchive.com. The only thing constant is change. But change is not constant: change cannot be traced along a linear axis of constancy. And if tracing seems necessary, put the tracing back on the map. Change speeds and slows.

It is pleasant to read slowly. It pleases me to flowcalm. It is pleasant to read and be read from all directions.

Move your eyes across these words. You are becoming our sorceress thoughts. The event of reading is unfolding now and you find yourself back in the first week of quartering. You must work on processing process. In Deleuze's brief engagement with Alfred North Whitehead, he praises Whitehead for asking the question, "What Is an Event?" This attention to 'events' is almost fully anomalous; only the Stoics and Leibniz did before. And yet we speak of them here: we know them, we are them, we them, wethem. Ryan's middle toe is not a transcendental event.

This is not an imitation. At best it is a circular system of ramification.

Let's think with music with Deleuze with Guattari. Thinking with and function. Becoming-bird; becoming-butterfly fluttering; movement-becoming. There is no ideal listener, there is only a power takeover by a dominant system of music listening and analysis. Music is never closed upon itself, except as a function of impotence, or powerlessness. Thinking with music (thought, analysis, measurement, description, perception of 'unity') exists in an 'empty dimension' that is supplementary to that of the system considered, and carries out a power takeover – overcoding. Creating an excess of concepts for peoples yet to come. Analysis is creation, disguised as truth-rooting. Rhizomic analysis is all creativity. Flows flow in all directions. We become to catch the flow, tamponic.

We are music theorists, maybe, and we could analyze as a rhizome and with a rhizome. We could choose any way into a piece, and when we analyze, we are tempted to have the piece on a single page, the piece all at once. We can never have a piece all at once, we can never experience all of its expressions and relations at once. We can listen in order and re-listen in order and out of order and find new entry points and new lines of flight, we can territorialize and deterritorialize. Let's have more, a multiplicity of listenings, let's have virtual listenings that never cross the threshold. Let's have howling in unison garb.

Why Oneness?: Merely for clarity, simplicity, perception, habit. Heard all at once. (?)

Why Not Oneness?: Because there is no music, only listening machines. We must never ask what music *is*, only what it functions with. What, do you think, is the difference between what something *does* and what something "functions with?"

What are our dimensions? Do we care? Do we need to know? Can we know? Reminds me of Massumi: "Measurement stops the movement in thought." The unity of the musical work exists in an 'empty dimension,' supplementary to that of the system considered. Whitehead: "Becoming is the deepest dimension of Being." Famously, Spinoza asks not what a body *is* but what a body can do. D&G say: "Children are Spinozists...Spinozism is the becoming-child of the philosopher." Machinic assemblage of the ear that hears. (Question-machines.) All is caught up in all else. All your life leads to you reading this FROOOOOGJ.

Our authors endorse a modernist, teleological narrative of Western concert music, one where harmony becomes progressively liberated until it reaches its twelve-tone plateau. Do they though? Well, they sure dig Boulez. Also, and this has little to do with music: I refuse to discuss that becoming-field-of-anuses.

Entering a piece as one can enter a rhizome, through anything, from anywhere. The inextricability of the piece from that which surrounds it. The inability of a piece to be (heard? apprehended? felt? I think it can be felt, experienced?). All at once. Becoming-the piece through listening. Too woolly? Maybe too woolly. Attempting to listen all at once as yet another power takeover. After all, one can knit one with wool and pearl two with clam chowder. She became my think with chowder.

A milieu exists by a periodic repetition whose effect is to produce a difference by which the milieu passes into another milieu, and this difference is rhythm. Rhythm is caused by repetition and interaction. Rhythms are an in-between passage and interaction between milieus, a coordination between heterogenous space-times. D&G call territory an act that *affects* rhythms and milieus, that "territorializes" them, that infects them. Territories are seized from components of milieus. Territory is the emergence of expression, and an act of rhythm-become-expressive. Expressive qualities territorialize and deterritorialize (and deterrorize?); they unwind their own activity. In a piece, or an analysis, how does territorialization function? Qualities delineate territories. Rhythm becomes a character, expressive qualities function as relations. Interaction is the key, here. But remember: put your tracings back on the map.

Look! Look! Look how much we know! We are becoming-manly.

If this book is a rhizome, and can be entered in from anywhere, so we will. Enter thee all over, enter from within.

This sometimes feels like a manifesto. We read out loud, slowly, and unwound all sense. Accept this offering, though you cannot have it. It is best to live in a world without inherent meaning but if you need to cry, you are welcome to do so, and a tender touch to the arm can help. Sweet words are not always a waste of paper-time-space: "Bobby, dear Bobby. I remember that time we went walking and you opened your ears and I showed you my interior jewelry."

Philomel sings unsingable abyssopelagia. She becomes-animal-strophic-aria when the Ford Foundation commissioned such a piece. Amazingly flexible acoustical resources. Living, growing, changing, being in the hum always, which I wrote for Milton Babbitt to set thrashing, through. "[T]he effect to be horrific in a kind of baroque way, [the mangled root] but not coyly humorous." Emptied, four KLH loud-speakers unfeeling and unfilled. "Quando fiam uti [aloud in the raptured ear of men] chelidon ut tacere desinam?" I feel myself becoming unspeakable pain and murderous rage. And so on.

I am a sorceress becoming-child. Open the box, smells like Fruit Cereal. I am a child, becoming-playing-becoming-sorceress. What nostalgia rushes forth! Brightly colored nuggets inside a brightly colored cardboard receptacle. My nose, no longer a vestigial protrusion, detects a delectable aroma. I am magic; I make time and space. The scepter was made of a curtain rod. The top of the scepter was made of a lightbulb filled with glow stick glow. The glow stick leaked and stung my hand and stunned my eyes with radiant goop. Clearly I do not know any of these words at this age... but my senses were certainly sophisticated! Dazzling, scrumptious euphony! It suits the telling, to replace actual lively sensation with lively logos! Words words words!