

## 2025-01 - The concept of Volumiphony

The term *multichannel diffusion* is imprecise in terms of the possibilities and choices it implies. For x,y vs x,y,z devices have little in common, both in terms of the composition of the work and its listening. In the first case, it's a question of 2D measurements/distances, and therefore of linear thinking and listening; in the second case, it's a question of 3D measurements/distances, and therefore of volumetric thinking and listening.

Historically, multichannel was first developed linearly: quadraphonic, octophonic and so on. Research then continued into volumetric spaces: cube, dome, etc.

The 3rd age <sup>1</sup> of this process - more volumetric than ever - is moving towards the design of so-called "primary forest" spaces, as opposed to Ambisonics and Atmos formats <sup>2</sup> because fortunately the space of our lives is infinitely more vast and much less standardized. Sound formations and vibrations in air/space deserve much better than these extremely restrictive reductions in the circulation and location of spatial sound masses.

In order to clarify a terminology - currently too muddled <sup>3</sup> - that would better define the spaciotemporal metrics of sound masses and the geodesic path of each of them in its curved space-time, the term volumiphony seems the most appropriate to define 3D multichannel diffusion. What's more, it follows in the etymological footsteps of its predecessors: stereophony, octophony, ambiphony, etc.

Jean VOGUET

Composer of acousmatic geophonies & heterotopias campsite.bio/jeanvoquet

Jean-Marc Duchenne presents it excellently in https://youtu.be/Z1R48MTQE40

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Such formatting induces spatial loss and sound compression, resulting in a significant loss of sound quality.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Let's leave multiphony to choral singing, a term that in no way resolves the differences between linearity and volumic.