What Max Neuhaus Called "Music" *

KODERA Michiru
Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto

Abstract: Max Neuhaus (1939–2009) is generally regarded as a pioneer of sound installation and a first-generation sound artist. By reexamining his writings and the titles of his works, this article describes the chronological trajectory of what he called "music" and how he differentiated his works from "music." The trajectory is outlined in four points: (1) the title of his early sound installation, *Drive-In Music* (1967), includes the word "music," (2) in a booklet, *Program Notes* (1974), he called his works "music," (3) the title of his well-known installation, *Times Square* (1977–1992, 2002–present), was renamed from "Underground Music," and (4) in the early 1980s, he provided a more in-depth explanation for his works' spatial features to differentiate them from "music" and declared that his installation works were foreign to "music." These four points suggest that the logical framework he used to show the differentiation had developed gradually, alongside the vocabulary he applied to characterize his works, as an afterthought following his sound works. In other words, this article provides a significant case study about the formation of an art discipline with sound, today called sound art.

Keywords: Max Neuhaus, sound art, music, sound installation

1. Introduction

Max Neuhaus (1939–2009) is generally regarded as a pioneer of sound installation and a first-generation sound artist (Gál 2017: 79, Licht 2019: 60). By reexamining his writings and the titles of his works, this article describes the chronological trajectory of what he called "music" and how he differentiated his sound works from "music," clarifying that the logical framework he used to show the differentiation had developed gradually, alongside the vocabulary he applied to characterize his works, as an afterthought following his sound works. In other words, this article provides a significant case study about the formation of an art discipline with sound, today called "sound art".

Although there has never been a rigid definition of the word "sound art" so far, it is generally understood as an art discipline which widely includes creation and activity with or involved in sound except conventional music[1]. From a historical perspective, the first-generation of sound artists, which included visual artists using sounds, appeared between the 1960s and early 70s after John Cage's experimental music: this led to the name "sound art" spreading broadly throughout the 90s. This discipline enhanced its presence through some large-scale exhibitions in the 2000s (Wong 2012,

* This paper is based on the Japanese version printed in *Bigaku* 72, No. 1 (2021): 84–95, published by the Japanese Society for Aesthetics.

[1] For a recent discussion about the definition of "sound art," see, for instance, Licht (2019: 5–10).

Gál, *op cit.*, Licht, *op. cit.*, 1–5, Nakagawa 2010). At least in the United States and Europe, sound art has been described as an art discipline which expanded during the latter half of the twentieth century.

Max Neuhaus, the subject of this study, is an artist who was active from the 1960s to 2000s: the period the discipline "sound art" appeared, expanded, and established itself. He started his career as a virtuoso percussionist and performed experimental and avant-garde music in the 60s. In the same decade, he began to exhibit some of his own works: *Listen: Field Trips Thru Found Environments* (1966–76), the first work of the series called *Public Supply* (1966), and *Drive-In Music* (1967), which is discussed below. He stopped performing as an instrumentalist in 1968, and since then has concentrated on and exhibited his creations, including his most famous sound installation, *Times Square* (1977–92, 2002–present). In 1994, a series of books, *Sound Works, vol. 1–3*, which includes Neuhaus's writings, interviews, critics' articles, and images of his drawings, was published (Neuhaus and Jargins (eds.) 1994a, b, c).

It should be noted at the beginning that Neuhaus regarded the word "sound art" negatively as a name of a category for art works. In his essay "Sound Art?" which was a contribution for the exhibition, *Volume: Bed of Sound*, in 2000, he argued that "sound art" is not an appropriate term for classifying art activities and it has been overused (Neuhaus 2000)[2]. According to his opinion, it is necessary to withhold calling him "sound artist" and his works "sound art." However, many critics and researchers today recognize his works as a kind of sound art (Cooke 2009: 23, Pardo 2017: 40, Licht 2019: 1). It is therefore reasonable to regard him as a significant person who was part of the establishing process of the art discipline called sound art.

Many important resources for surveying the activities and mindset of the artist are available. This includes many of his own articles and interviews, his drawings[3], as well as his installation *Times Square*, which is still currently running and open for public access[4].

Through these materials, it is well known that Neuhaus consciously differentiated his own works from conventional music.

> Traditionally composers have located the elements of a composition in time. One idea which I am interested in is locating them, instead, in space ... and letting the listener place them in his own time. (Neuhaus: 1974a[5])

This quotation is the fourth paragraph of Neuhaus's booklet, *Program Notes*, published in 1974, and is reprinted in *Sound Works* in 1994. Many articles have excerpted it (LaBelle 2006: 147, Potts 2009: 47, Joseph 2009: 67, Eppley 2017: 47, Pardo 2017: 40, Cox 2018: 139). In the

[2] In the same contribution, Neuhaus says that we cannot "call what is essentially new music something else." Right before this statement, he also refers to Edgard Varèse's and John Cage's expansion of the definition of music. Therefore, Neuhaus seems to consider that "essentially new music" must be called "music" based on its expanded definition. Also see note 15.

[3] Neuhaus's drawing has not been exhibited with the work the drawing depicts. He says "they [drawings] are not works within works" (Neuhaus and Jardins (eds.) 1994b: 11), so they can be regarded as independent works from other kinds of his works with sound.

[4] Neuhaus's new official website lists up in the page of "Vectors" the fourteen works which are running today.

[5] This booklet has no page numbers. Its left-hand pages are blank and the sentences are printed on only its right-hand pages.

quotation, Neuhaus differentiates his works from conventional music by the contrast between time and space, and in the respect of the mode of listening.

In the essay titled "Modus Operandi" (1980), he also said about his *Drive-In Music* that "[i]t was a radical departure from the current, and still prevalent form of production of sound art, i.e. the arrangement where a group of people gather together at a specific time and place and watch and listen to a usually smaller and more specialized group make sound" (Neuhaus and Jardins (eds.) 1994a: 18). Although he uses the words "sound art," what the term means here is, according to his description, certainly conventional concert, not including visual art with sounds nor reproduction of sounds like field-recording. In fact, he also notes in the same essay that his audiences are overexposed to the music of the 18th and 19th centuries (*ibid.*).

A few previous studies have examined Neuhaus's transitional process from the field of conventional music to the field of non-music, i.e. sound installation. Charles A. Eppley's dissertation submitted to Stony Brook University (2017) might be the most exhaustive research on the materials written by Neuhaus himself and the previous studies on him. Eppley's thesis illustrates Neuhaus's background and activities from the 1960s to 1980 in detail and loosely periodizes Neuhaus's career into the three phases: *musical*, *anti-musical*, and *post-musical*. Neuhaus performed existing musical instruments as a percussionist in the *musical* phase, exhibited his own works without existing percussion in the *anti-musical* phase, and concentrated on creation of his sound installation in the *post-musical* phase[6].

Eppley regards the completion of *Times Square* as the turning point where Neuhaus left the field of music, and writes in his postscript, "[a]s revealed by this research, much of his [Neuhaus's] work, despite its anti-musical aspirations, retained lingering musical connections. These were largely severed with his completion of *Times Square*, which redirected, and ultimately cemented, his practice within the context of art museums, galleries, and the open field of *contemporary art*" (264). The author also implies (see on pages 206 and 210) that the year 1980 was the artist's turning point in terms of his creation method and his financial resources. Depending on his suggestions mentioned here, Eppley seems to recognize the latter half of the 1970s as Neuhaus's transition.

This paper is compatible with Eppley's outline of Neuhaus's career. However, it reexamines his transition from music to non-music from another perspective by focusing on Neuhaus's personal word usage of "music"[7]. The commentaries which show how Neuhaus uses the word "music" are scattered, and there is no research which has chronologically reordered his remarks for the purpose of reexamining his use of the word "music." The reordering and reexamination outline Neuhaus's career in a new way.

Generally speaking, the explanation of what is conventional music is inevitable to clearly differentiate some types of art works from music, also to clarify logically these art works' originality or novelty. Neuhaus is no exception. He also explains the distinction between

[6] Although Eppley does not clarify the specific period of these three phases, it is presumed that the *musical* phase is until about 1968, the *anti-musical* one from about 1966, and the *post-musical* one after about 1970s. (The *musical* and *anti-musical* phases are partly overlapped.)

[7] Eppley outlines a chronicle of the vocabulary Neuhaus used to describe his own works (2017: 150–151). However, Eppley does not show the references one by one.

conventional music and his works several times. Hence, examining the context he uses the word "music" offers the clue to consider the logic of his differentiation[8]. In addition, it is worth paying attention to the titles of his works to better understand how he characterized his own creations.

Although much information this paper refers to is already known, its chronological rearrangement and reconsideration contribute to understanding the trajectory of Neuhaus's personal description method and promoting strategy for his pieces. In the following, this paper will focus on his *Drive-In Music* in 1967, a booklet, *Program Notes*, in 1974, *Times Square* in 1977, and an interview and a lecture in 1982.

2. "Music" in Neuhaus's writings and the titles of his works

2.1. In 1967—*Drive-In Music*

Drive-In Music, which was installed in Buffalo, New York, from October 1967 to April 1968, has been credited as Neuhaus's first sound installation work[9]. However, since Neuhaus said during a 1982 interview that he coined the term "sound installation" in the early 1970s (Neuhaus and Jardins (eds.) 1994a: 42)[10], the inclusion of *Drive-In Music* into his sound installation series seems to have happened retrospectively. *Drive-In Music* is an installation of transmitters along Lincoln Parkway, each of which sends radio waves to cars driving through. Car radios in turn receive the radio waves and emit sounds. The received signals depended on the area where the transmitters are set, and drivers listen to the sound changing as the car drives through.

Some recent studies on sound art also mention this work in relation to the transitional process of Neuhaus's activity from conventional music to non-music. Christoph Cox says "*Drive-In Music* (1967) marks Neuhaus's final break with music and his first foray into "sound installation"" (2018: 147). On the other hand, Eppley emphasizes the connection between the work and music.

> The work was directly associated with the Department of Music [in which Maryanne Amacher, who invited Neuhaus to Buffalo, stayed as a resident artist], an affiliation prominently featured on advertisements for the piece [...]. The title itself makes this connection clear, albeit ironic (as it references kitschy drive-in theaters of the 1950s, a product of popular culture anathema to the concert hall). Despite an attempt to abandon the institution of music, Neuhaus's transition [from music to non-music] was not swift [...]. (Eppley 2017: 139)[11]

[8] Eppley states "[...] Neuhaus is not arguing that what he does is not music in any way, but rather that the way in which we understand what is or is not music is largely irrelevant. Avoiding the musical frame was not an ideological stronghold for Neuhaus, but rather a tactical effort to prevent people from leaning back on their preconceptions of how to listen" (2017: 200). This paper is not inconsistent with Eppley's statement, but focuses on Neuhaus's logic of "avoiding the musical frame" rather than his "ideological stronghold." However, it is doubtful that actually "Neuhaus is not arguing that what he does is not music in any way." Eppley himself notes in another page that Neuhaus tried to characterize his work as "anything but music" when applying for public grants (*ibid.*, 210).

[9] Eppley points out that *Fan Music* (1967) is Neuhaus's first sound installation, since it was exhibited a few months before *Drive-In Music* (2017: 129).

[10] Alan Licht indicates assertively without any references it was 1971 when Neuhaus coined the term "sound installation" (2019: 9).

[11] See Packer (2010: 63–72) in detail.

Taking these comments into account, while *Drive-In Music* largely deviated from the conventional exhibiting and listening style of music, like traditional concert style, the association with the institution and its title were still deeply tied to music.

This paper pays attention to the word "music" used in the naming of *Drive-In Music*, like Eppley does. It is, of course, too shallow to conclude that Neuhaus categorized the work into music simply because the title includes the word "music." However, while Neuhaus did not recognize his own work as conventional music, he neither explained it as "non-music" nor "something irrelevant to music" explicitly. For Neuhaus, naming his work with "music" might be effective as a metaphor that this work does comprise of important auditory elements. In addition, it is unlikely that his naming was as strategic as the musical group "Group Ongaku": its members are Mieko Shiomi, Yasunao Tone, Takehisa Kosugi, etc. They used the word "music" ("*ongaku*" in Japanese) in their group's name based on the idea that their activity would be called music in the future (Shiomi 2005: 64). If Neuhaus had intentionally used the word "music" in his work's title as Group Ongaku did, one can assume he would have explained this reason somewhere. However, such an explanation cannot be found in his writings.

From the above, it is not probable that he hesitated to call his own work with the word "music."

2.2. In 1974—a booklet, *Program Notes*

It is not only the title of his work that indicates the possibility that he did not hesitate to use the word "music." The booklet *Program Notes*, published in 1974, explains the following.

> I'm not interested in making music exclusively for musicians or musically initiated audiences. I am interested in making music for people. (Neuhaus: 1974a)

This paragraph follows the paragraph quoted above in which Neuhaus explains his own works contrasting between time and space. Although this booklet consisted of thirteen paragraphs, only the above mentioned two (fourth and fifth paragraphs) were reprinted in *Sound Works* (Neuhaus and Jardins (eds.) 1994a: 34). While the artist differentiates his works from conventional music in the fourth paragraph, he calls what he makes "music" in this fifth. In other words, it seems that the word "music" is not an inappropriate description of his works to him at that time. Previous studies have overlooked this significant point.

On the other hand, as Pardo (2017: 41) and Eppley (2017: 3) emphasize, Neuhaus's strategic differentiation in this booklet also shows that his "music" is "for people" rather than "for musicians or musically initiated audiences."

Furthermore, in the sixth paragraph of the booklet it is said that "[a]ccusing a musician of becoming a technologist if he learns audio circuitry is like accusing a painter of becoming a French impressionist if he learns to speak French" (Neuhaus 1974a). Here Neuhaus seems to justify his method of using electric circuits as a "musician's" approach.

Program Notes tries to differentiate Neuhaus's works from conventional music in other ways too. Its first paragraph says "[i]f one looks at the vast range of sounds the human ear is capable of hearing, it is not hard to see what a small area music has been concentrating on for the past several hundred years". This paragraph characterizes music in terms of the limitation of

sound materials. The third paragraph of *Program Notes* indicates the exhibiting form of conventional music by the term “the proscenium situation”, on which Eppley focused as well (2017: 93–94). Based on these points, it can be said that in 1974 Neuhaus has already shown the various aspects in which he differentiates his own works from conventional music.

2.3. In 1977—*Times Square*

As mentioned above, Neuhaus allowed his own works to be called music in *Program Notes*. When, then, did he stop using the word “music” to signify and to explain his works? His masterpiece *Times Square* is remarkable to answer this question. *Times Square* is located at the triangle pedestrian area surrounded by Broadway, Seventh Avenue, and 46th Street in Manhattan, New York. Here, Neuhaus’s electronic quiet drone comes from under the ventilation grating. When pedestrians (possible audience) notice such a quiet sound and strain their ears, the drone makes them pay attention to the auditory environment surrounding them. Previous reviews relate *Times Square* to the contemporary practices of land art, minimal music, and postminimalism sculpture (Licht 2019: 54, Joseph 2009: 66–68, Cox 2018: 152–156).

It is well known that Neuhaus at first named this work “Underground Music” (Cooke 2009: 27, n. 1). He conceptualized the idea for *Times Square* by 1973 (Neuhaus and Jardins (eds.) 1994a: 143). An archive at Battler Library of the Columbia University, Max Neuhaus Papers, includes a typed document titled “UNDERGROUND MUSIC(S)” signed by the artist and dated in 1974 (Neuhaus 1974b), which can be assumed to be a kind of proposal for *Times Square*. Like was seen in the writings of *Program Notes*, the original title for *Times Square* also suggests that Neuhaus, in 1974, did not necessarily hesitate to indicate his own work by the word “music”.

Since there is no material in which the artist called the work “Underground Music” after 1974, it is not clear when he abandoned this particular name. However, based on related materials, it is possible to estimate when this happened. Some documents, including a newspaper article, call the work “Underground Music” after its opening (Ericson 1977, Lorber 1978, “Underground Music” 1978), but the exhibition catalog in 1981 introduces it as just a “sound installation” (Neuberger Museum (ed.) 1981: 74). Then, other two exhibition catalogs, both in 1983, which call it “Times Square” imply that the current name might have been fixed around that time (Musée d’Art Moderne de la Ville, Paris (ed.) 1983, Kunsthalle Basel (ed.) 1983: 16). It can be inferred from these facts that Neuhaus discarded the original title, “Underground Music,” at least by the beginning of 1980s.

It is to be noted that, through the constant renaming of *Times Square*, the word “music” disappeared from the title of Neuhaus’s works. (Other works whose title include “music” are the series of works called *Underwater Music*. Its fourth and final work was exhibited in 1978.) Although Eppley insists that the connection between Neuhaus’s activity and music was “largely severed with his completion of *Times Square*,” the timing of this work’s renaming suggests that Neuhaus’s connection with music was not perfectly severed when this work opened. In other words, his severance with music was achieved more thoroughly when he finally abandoned the original title. Moreover, the renaming makes it possible to discuss his permanent sound installations, including *Times Square*, without the need to use the word “music.” Previous studies have overlooked this important point.

2.4. In 1982—Interview and Lecture

How had Neuhaus's vocabulary changed since 1980s?

His interview conducted by composer William Duckworth in 1982 is printed in *Sound Works* (Neuhaus and Jardins (eds.) 1994a: 42–49). In the same year as this interview, he came to Japan and had a lecture at Studio 200, which was an art space on the eighth floor of Seibu Ikebukuro department store. *Sound Works* and *The Digest of the Studio 200: 1979–1991* both include what Neuhaus talked about during this lecture (*ibid.*, 58–70, Studio 200 (ed.) 1991: 76–77, 79)[12].

At the beginning of the interview by Duckworth, Neuhaus explains two main categories of his works: "sound installation" and "broadcast work." In broadcast work, the audience provided sound materials to Neuhaus through telephones, and then Neuhaus generally mixed and modulated them, and broadcasted the edited sounds by radio. The series of works *Public Supply* (1966–73) and *Radio Net* (1977) are the typical examples of this category.

Depending on this categorization, Neuhaus says:

> Broadcast works are very much about music. [On the other hand, t]he [sound] installations are related completely to their location. I don't start to conceive of them until I'm in the actual context; and that context is not only aural, but also visual and social. These are ideas which are foreign to music and seem hard for people oriented to music to understand. (Neuhaus and Jardins (eds.) 1994a: 42)

Three interesting points can be derived from this excerpt. First, he makes it clear here his broadcast works are "music." The artist declares that his role in the broadcast works is unlike a conventional composer and instead "the catalyst for the situation" (*ibid.*, 48), in which people make sounds. He also says "[m]aybe [this is] a new concept or role for a composer" (*ibid.*). Since the word "composer" is closely associated with music, it is reasonable to assume that his description of broadcast works is only within the territory of music. In the lecture at Studio 200, Neuhaus also clarifies that a part of his activity is related to music (Studio 200 (ed.) 1991: 76). Therefore, this important part of his activity does not fit within the simplified scheme of Neuhaus's transition "from music to non-music."

Second, it is obvious in the excerpt that his sound installations have non-musical elements. During the above interview, Neuhaus also analogizes his sound installation with visual art, especially sculptures (Neuhaus and Jardins (eds.) 1994a: 42). This indicates that he started explaining his sound installations as something outside of music by 1982. In other words, the distinction between sound installation and broadcast work makes it possible to differentiate between Neuhaus's sound installations and those works he considers to be "music" more strictly.

Third, this quotation also refers to the visual and social contexts of sound installation, as well as aural. During his lecture at Studio 200, he mentions these three types of contexts (*ibid.*,

[12] Although *Sound Works* indicates that the lecture was held at Seibu Museum Tokyo on the twelfth floor of Seibu Ikebukuro, two literatures (Sezon Museum of Art (ed.) 1989, 1999) which summarize the museum's exhibitions and events do not mention any about Neuhaus's lecture. Therefore, Neuhaus probably had the lecture only at Studio 200, and *Sound Works* seems to confuse the locations.

58, Studio 200 (ed.) 1991: 76). This reference expands and sophisticates the discussion about the spatial aspect of his works, which was emphasized in *Program Notes*. His emphasis on space rather than time in the booklet from 1974 can be applied to some kinds of art works which control spatial factors, i. e. directions where sounds come from, as one of the musical parameters in a concert hall. However, concert halls and the other kinds of live venues are isolated from their social context[13]. On the other hand, by referring to the social context, his lecture in 1982 makes it clear that what Neuhaus images is his works' social environment of the site, not the controllable parameter of the isolated space. (It is meaningful that the final title for his work *Times Square* reflects the name of the site where the work resides[14].)

This close attention to the social context of a work can also be seen in his works before 1982. He declared, by 1980, that he tailored his *Drive-In Music* for Buffalo where people frequently drive their cars (Neuhaus and Jardins (eds.). 1994a: 18). That is to say, what he did for the first time in 1982 seems to formulate the explanation that juxtaposed the social context with the visual and aural contexts, not just recognizing the existence of a social context.

His lecture in Studio 200 also has an interesting statement.

> Not using sound recordings to describe them [my own works] is a basic principle of mine. There are also some practical reasons for it—the first being that they are, in fact, un-recordable. Many of them have sound components which cannot be recorded. They are also sometimes made up of sound topographies; instead of being spatially one dimensional like music, they have two or three dimensions—they have different sounds in different places. So the question of where to record a work comes up. (*ibid.*, 58)

Although he had already explained the un-recordability of his works in an interview in 1975 (Neuhaus 2019: 171), he here obviously contrasts his works with music, which is spatially one-dimensional, and then differentiates his works from that. Moreover, since he asserts that the un-recordability is an inevitable nature of his two- or three-dimensional works, the feature and his strategy of differentiation based on the spatiality mentioned above are compatible. The un-recordability of his works thus makes a rigid logic which clearly discerns Neuhaus's works from music—Licht also presents a similar idea (2019: 14–15).

In addition, the word "topographies" used here should be given some attention. Because the term appears repeatedly in Neuhaus's latter lectures (Neuhaus and Jardins (eds.) 1994a: 10, 75, 77, 104, 120, 125), "topographies" has been functioning to reinforce his differentiation, based on spatiality, of his works from music.

---

[13] According to Kotz (2009: 103), Neuhaus regarded La Monte Young's *Dream House* (1962) as a kind of music. *Dream House* controls sounds (standing waves) in a space separated from social contexts. In addition, Nakagawa (2010), which discusses the "relativization" of the Cagean experimental music in the 1950s, also focuses on the "sociality." Nakagawa argues that sound artists after John Cage, concretely Bill Fontana, attempt to relativize their own works to Cage's experimental music by criticizing the repression of meanings of sound in Cage's music. Nakagawa also calls this repression "the loss of the sociality." Although Neuhaus's "social context" and Nakagawa's "sociality" are not necessarily same, they both imply that "the restoration of the sociality" was a shared problem for the artists after Cage.

[14] This idea is largely indebted to a comment of a peer reviewer for the original paper in Japanese.

Since the early 1980s, Neuhaus had categorized his works into broadcast works and sound installations, based on a distinction between something musical and not. He then, on the one hand, described differences between the former and conventional music and, on the other hand, strengthened the logic with which he explains the latter as not music.

3. Conclusion

After the latter 1980s, Neuhaus continued to try to categorize his own works without the term "music". Since the mid 1980s, Neuhaus started to use the word "sound works" to indicate his oeuvre (*ibid.*, 43), and in an article in 1992 referred to the subcategories of "place piece" and "moment piece" under the category of "sound installation." He then classified his works into the eight categories called "vectors"[15]. Dasha Dekleva says "[t]he vector diagram distilled Neuhaus's sound activities by displacing the often confusing dichotomy of music – not-music" (2003: 44). This vector classification reorganized the use of vocabulary to illustrate Neuhaus's works into a system or scheme unbound from the dichotomy of music – not-music.

This paper has described hitherto how Neuhaus differentiated his works from conventional music, focusing on what he called "music." It outlines the chronological trajectory of his differentiation in four points: (1) the title of his supposed first sound installation, *Drive-In Music* (1967), includes the word "music," (2) in his booklet, *Program Notes* (1974), he not only differentiates his works from conventional music based on their spatiality but also calls them "music," (3) when the artist abandoned the original title, "Underground Music," of *Times Square* (1977), the word "music" disappeared from his works' titles by at least the 1980s, and (4) in the early 1980s, he declared that his installation works were foreign to "music" and refined his differentiation based on spatiality. Previous studies have not emphasized these second and third points enough. Rather than to suggest these points, the most critical contribution of this paper is by arranging these points chronologically to clarify the process, or at least a summary of it. Through the process of differentiating between his works and music, Neuhaus has established and renewed his use of logic and vocabulary—especially which are relevant to his installations' spatiality.

Neuhaus's process is also a significant case which shows the formulation of the art discipline called sound art. Particularly, this process depicts the development of the logic and vocabulary behind the concept of spatiality, which is regarded frequently as a characteristic element of sound art (Pardo 2017: 40, Licht 2019: 6). Comparisons of Neuhaus's case with other contemporary artists' might be effective to widen this paper's perspective.

[15] "Networks," a succeed category of "Broadcast works," is explained as a category whose works propose a kind of new types of music. For Neuhaus's "Vectors" in detail, see the web page "Sound Works" in his new official website, Dekleva (2003: 43–44), and Eppley (2017: 21–28).

References

Cooke, Lynne. 2009. “Introduction,” in *Max Neuhaus: Times Square, Time Piece Beacon*, 23–27, Lynne Cooke and Karen Kelly with Barbara Schröder (eds.), New York: Dia Art Foundation; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Cooke, Lynne, and Karen Kelly with Barbara Shröder (eds.). 2009. *Max Neuhaus: Times Square, Times Piece Beacon*, New York: Dia Art Foundation; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Cox, Christoph. 2018. *Sonic Flux: Sound, Art, and Metaphysics*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dekleva, Dasha. 2003. *Max Neuhaus: Sound Vectors*, master’s thesis, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Eppley, Charles. 2017. *Soundsites: Max Neuhaus, Site-Specificity, and the Materiality of Sound as Place*, Ph.D. diss., Stony Brook University.

Ericson, Raymond. 1977. “Max Neuhaus Music Made Especially for Times Square,” *The New York Times*, November 27, p. 113.

Gál, Bernhard. 2017. “Updating the History of Sound Art: Additions, Clarifications, More Questions,” *Leonard Music Journal*, Vol. 27: 78–81.

Joseph, Branden W. 2009. “An Implication of an Implication,” in *Max Neuhaus: Times Square, Time Piece Beacon*, 59–81, Lynne Cooke and Karen Kelly with Barbara Schröder (eds.), New York: Dia Art Foundation; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kotz, Liz. 2009. “Max Neuhaus: Sound into Space,” in *Max Neuhaus: Times Square, Time Piece Beacon*, 93–111, Lynne Cooke and Karen Kelly with Barbara Schröder (eds.), New York: Dia Art Foundation; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kunsthalle Basel (ed.). 1983. *Max Neuhaus: Sound Installation*, Basel: Kunsthalle Basel.

LaBelle, Brandon. 2006. *Background Noise: Perspectives on Sound Art*, New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Licht, Alan. 2019. *Sound Art Revisited*, New York: Bloomsbury.

Lorber, Richard. 1978. “Max Neuhaus, Times Square,” *Artforum*, Vol. 16-5: 64.

Musée d’Art Moderne de la Ville, Paris (ed.). 1983. *Sound Installation*, Paris: Musée d’Art Moderne de la Ville, Paris.

Nakagawa, Katsushi. 2010. “The Logic to Relativize John Cage in the 1950s: On the Problems of Cagean “Experimental Music”,” *Journal of Kyoto Seika University*, Vol. 37: 3–22 [中川克志　2010　「一九五〇年代のケージを相対化するロジック――ケージ的な実験音楽の問題点の考察」『京都精華大学紀要』Vol. 37: 3–22].

Neuberger Museum (ed.). 1981. *Soundings*, Purchase, NY: Neuberger Museum.

Neuhaus, Max. 1974a. *Program Notes*, Toronto: York University.

———. 1974b. “UNDERGROUND MUSIC(S),” unpublished, Max Neuhaus Papers (Box 10, Folder 12), Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Butler Library, Columbia University.

———. 2000. “Sound Art?” liner notes for *Volume: Bed of Sound*, at MoMA PS1, New York, https://www.max-neuhaus.estate/en/sound-works/sound-works-texts/sound-art, Nov. 24th, 2023.

———. 2019. “Max Neuhaus Entretien par Lucio Pozzi,” in *Les pianos ne poussent par sur les*

arbres, gathered and presented by Daniele Balit and Matthieu Saladin, 171–175, Dijon: Les presses du réel (first published in 1975. *Revue DATA ARTE*, no. 18).

Neuhaus, Max and Gregory des Jardins (eds.). 1994a. *Max Neuhaus: Sound Works, Vol. 1, Inscription*, Ostfildern-Ruit, Germany: Cantz.

———. 1994b. *Max Neuhaus: Sound Works, Vol. 2, Drawings*, Ostfildern-Ruit, Germany: Cantz.

———. 1994c. *Max Neuhaus: Sound Works, Vol. 3, Place*, Ostfildern-Ruit, Germany: Cantz.

Packer, Renée Levine. 2010. *This Life of Sounds: Evenings for New Music in Buffalo*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pardo, Carmen. 2017. "The Emergence of Sound Art: Opening the Cages of Sound," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 75-1: 35–48.

Potts, Alex. 2009. "Moment and Place: Art in the Arena of the Everyday," in *Max Neuhaus: Times Square, Time Piece Beacon*, 45–57, Lynne Cooke and Karen Kelly with Barbara Schröder (eds.), New York: Dia Art Foundation; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sezon Museum of Art (ed.). 1989. *New Museology of SMA*, Tokyo: Libro Port [セゾン美術館 1989 『新しいミュゼオロジーを探る——西武美術館からセゾン美術館へ』 東京：リブロポート]。

———. 1999. *The Seibu Museum of Art – Sezon Museum of Art, 1975–1999*, Tokyo: Sezon Museum of Art [セゾン美術館 1999 『西武美術館・セゾン美術館の活動：1975–1999』 東京：セゾン美術館].

Shiomi, Mieko. 2005. *What is Fluxus? People Connecting Daily Life and Art*, Tokyo: Filmart [塩見允枝子 2005 『フルクサスとは何か？——日常とアートを結びつけた人々』 東京：フィルムアート社].

Studio 200 (ed.). 1991. *The Digest of the Studio 200: 1979–1991*, Tokyo: Seibu Department [スタジオ 200（編） 1991 『スタジオ 200 活動誌［1979–1991］』 東京：西武百貨店].

"Underground Music," 1978. *MoMA*, no. 7: 7.

Wong, Mandy-Suzanne. 2012. "Sound Art," *Grove Music Online*, https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.A2219538, Nov. 24th, 2023.

* Former official website of Max Neuhaus has been closed, but its several pages are now available through the Wayback Machine by the Internet Archive. His new official website has been opened in January 2021. Former website: https://web.archive.org/web/20180626212725/http://www.max-neuhaus.info/, current website: https://www.max-neuhaus.estate/en.

This paper is supported by JSPS KAKENHI, Grant Number 19K12982. For their instructive comments, I appreciate Katsushi Nakagawa and the peer reviews of the original version of this paper.