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Five years ago, I and Pedro van der Lee were asked to write an introductory article for an American musicological anthology with the working title “State of the Art”. We chose to take this opportunity to put on paper an ongoing discussion between us on the rather wide interface between our respective areas of research, especially on the creation of historical myths in the canon of western art music. In the text we shamelessly borrowed fragments from other texts of our own respective productions, especially my own dissertation and the dissertation Pedro at the time was in the process of writing. We selected and put fragments together in order to make them comment, expand and further each other, and then wrote the whole thing through together to create coherence. For a very long time we had been each other’s readers and critics, so we had no problem finding parts in each other’s texts that could be brought together to create a common line of reasoning.

The text was very well received by the editorial board, but unfortunately the anthology in question was never published in the form originally planned, so our article remained in the drawer. The American editors finally managed to get another anthology in print, *Keeping Score*, containing a different article of mine.

Pedro died last spring. While I was struggling to understand that he no longer remained among us (which I still haven’t managed neither to understand nor accept), I received the proof reading copy for the anthology in which the article he co-wrote was not to be found, which felt quite strange.

That is why I want the article to be published here instead, and without changes. Some parts of the text would undoubtedly benefit from some updating (to which Pedro would have been the first to agree: the text mirrors a discussion we had five years ago, and quite a lot has happened since then, both in his work and mine, and in the wider musicological discussion), but in view of the circumstances, I let it remain exactly the way we once wrote it.

Ola Stockfelt
Today, music is everywhere — not only as a philosophical basic assumption on the state of reality (as music of the spheres) but in a very concrete manner. The sound of the symphony orchestra can fill your ears while you’re water-skiing and the soft tones of an acoustic guitar can fill sports arenas. Everybody (in the western industrialised societies) is virtually free to listen to any piece of music for any number of times, any time and place they choose. Most of the music is closely connected with other forms of expression (e.g. film music, liturgical music, songs, commercials) and is heard in situations where the listener, in addition to listening, is supposed to do something more or less related to the music (e.g. dancing, watching a movie or the TV, driving a car, reading, shopping, waiting in the phone or riding in an elevator). Most of this music is rather recently produced, and we can reasonably expect that not much of it will be heard twenty years from now. Music is a central and important part of virtually all walks of life, getting its values defined and redefined from its situational and social contexts, and at the same time influencing the shape of these situations and social contexts. Music is used as a common representational system of social values — placing subcultural relationships into relief, defining acoustic demarcations of cultural and social territories in public environments, alluding to spheres of values in commercials, defining the moods and interrelations of film scenes, etc.

The explosive development of commercial music technology has thus placed us all in the relation to music once reserved for the rich and noble — the access to music as a tool and a commodity in everyday life which historically has been an expensive emblem of social exclusivity has lost all the marks of luxury, a development which has of course been met by adverse reactions by all sorts of culture conservatives.

The common travel radio at the bath tub ... is like a tie that obviously does not fit with the suit. The difference could lie only in the degree of dangerousness.¹

What makes a discussion on the autonomy of music worthwhile when it’s obviously only a small, marginal part of music that can possibly be thought of as autonomous in any form? Why discuss eternal values when most music obviously is completely ephemeral?

One reason for discussing eternal values could be the frequently propagated view that only time can tell which music is actually worth discussing — quality lasts, while the musically inferior perish and the value can only be determined at a proper historical distance. This is an interesting view since it presupposes that quality is something inherent within the music (wherever that is) — not in the uses of music or the listener’s actual experiences in relation to the music. This view actually robs us of the possibility to judge the music of our own time, while making us more competent judges of the quality of the works of long dead composers than the listeners of their own time. This is thus a point of view as difficult to attack as to defend, since it presupposes that the thing under discussion is placed outside the grasp of human reason — it’s a matter of faith, not of musicological analysis, and thus cannot be disputed even by rigorous historical evidence.

What can be musicologically described and analysed, though, is how, why and with what effects this idea could become an influential force in musicology and musical life.

Another reason is that the idea of “autonomous”, non-contextual values of music, which is a corollary of any discussion on eternal values, is a belief that still is remarkably influential as a form of unproblematized “common sense” in the musicological discussion. Even in the most informed and well-grounded discussions on music and society one might find statements like

historically, music has been viewed by Western culture by means of an unproblematized paradigm which assumes music’s non-representational character as the sine qua non from which all further study proceeds.²

This is a most unhistorical statement (and completely at odds with the main tenor of the book where it’s written) since the situation generally has been the reversed, except within a small, but influential, slice of Western culture, including the protected sphere of Academia, during a historically short period since around the 1830’s. Statements of this kind confirm the idea of musical autonomy while attacking it by mixing up “Western Culture” in general with the recent, explicit, recorded, educated discussions of cultural and political establishments.

Finally, the idea of music as an autonomous, non-representative form of expression of eternal, non-contextual values is not only an interesting parenthesis in the history of music. Its impact on musical life has been extremely strong, and we are living with its legacy around, and within, us today; even if it might never have been anything but a myth, it has had very concrete and tangible effects on the realities of musical life. Although the myth is disproved by musical practice, constantly and everywhere, it might be said to be stronger than ever. It has created a mode of thinking about music that has become a foundation of very real musical traditions, institutions, labels, relationships — and music.

“Classical music” is probably the best example of the impact of this myth in everyday musical life. The music of “the classical masters” is, like all popular music, an available and almost inescapable common part of everyday life in “Western culture”

¹. “Das sprichwörtliche Kofferradio in der Badewanne ... ist wie eine Krawatte, die einfach nicht zum Anzug "steht". Der Unterschied dürfte allein im Grad der Gefährlichkeit liegen.” (Habermas 1954, p. 717.)

today. Innumerable TV-commercials invite you to buy all the classical masters on CD, pre-selected and inexpensive — the Readers Digest of music history. Innumerable hardware commercials tells you their machinery gives you an even truer sound than the concert hall. In addition to this, the music meets us in the most unexpected, and unnoticed, contexts — Mozart sets the mood in the elevator, the d minor symphony of César Franck accompanies little blue figures in an animated TV-series for children (softly and edited to fit the story in a Nintendo-like manner), J.S. Bach provides horror music to the computer game, freely stolen passages from Mahler meet us at the movies.

Why do we still need live concerts? What’s so special about listening live, “unplugged”, in the concert hall to the same music you can’t escape hearing everywhere anyway?

Symphony orchestras are expensive. The concert halls need sponsors. What they can sell is the mark of authenticity — of proved independent quality that lasts, associations with non-commercial class and certified eternal values. This is not only something that, together with the architectural and ritual setting (not excluding the price of the tickets), creates expectations that helps the concert goer to establish modes of listening in the concert hall that can rarely if ever be achieved in the elevator, thus forming the basis for truly extraordinary music experiences. It’s also attractive for e.g. the branch of car industry that sells by promising quality, safety and lasting value.

Symphonic music, just like much of the “alternative music” from the 1960’s and onwards, has to be 100% proof non-commercial in order to sell well — the market value consists in part of the strong connection with values independent of day-to-day popularity, above the mundane matters of urban industrialised society. “Classical”, “eternal”, “autonomous” and other related terms and concepts thus today serve very modern and changing needs of the society on which they depend. The models created for and by the “classical music” have been copied and accommodated for any number of musical styles and genres during the 20th century — the strong connection between “classic rock hits” and “lasting quality jeans” being the probably clearest example during the 80’s.

Re-defining “classical music” — towards the refuge of the higher art

Wolfgang Amadé Mozart is one of the most certified classics there is; his music has been definitely liberated from any connection to mundane matters by the writers of music history in a way that no Amadeus-movie can erase. His music is therefore suitable as an example of the process of this recontextualising of classical music.

The term “classical” in relation to music have roots that can be traced far back in history. During the end of the 18th century, it was used as a qualifier for compositions which were thought of as fitting models for education and for the composition of new music. Which music was thought of as “classical” thus changed in accordance to the changes in musical life and the tastes of the audiences. One quality that was thought of as necessary for a piece of music to be a fitting model was that it was effective — it had to be correctly understood by the average listener the first (which was usually also the only) time it was heard. How this requirement could affect the evaluation of different composers and compositions is excellently illustrated in J.J. de Momigny’s discussion of two symphonies of Haydn and Mozart. In Momigny’s discussion, Haydn is the ideal “classical” composer, excellently clear in his statements and carrying through the music in a fashion that leaves no listener behind, while still being inventive and interesting enough to be appreciated by the experts. This quality of the music — to be immediately understood by anyone without being uninteresting to the connoisseurs — was the mark of a true genius. When Momigny speaks of understanding instrumental music, he does imply understanding in a very concrete manner: unambiguously grasping the musical development, understanding the dramatic action and following the lines of the actors. The meaning of the first motive of a Haydn symphony is directly translatable to words.

3. The devote attitude towards the almost immaterial genius Mozart is best followed in the tradition of Otto Jahn. Cf. Albert 1919, 1921 and 1956, and innumerable secondary literature. For an early example, see e.g. Niemetschek 1808 (1978).
5. The constant "up-dating" of what music was thought of as fitting models can e.g. be followed in the different editions of Koch’s Versuch... Cf. Koch 1782, 1787 and 1793, Ling 1985, Baker 1976, Baker 1978 and Stockfelt 1988.
7. Momigny’s methods of analysis (a short example can be found in the N.G. article on “Analysis”) is thus in kind related to Zarlino’s, V. Galileó’s et. al.’s “research” after the one true melodic line to go with every rhetoric sentence — but Momigny does the process “backwards” to find the true sentence to go with the rhetorically correct melodic lines... This is a part of what he without any modesty calls “La seule vraie théorie de la musique utile à ceux qui excellents dans cet art, comme à ceux qui en sont aux premiers éléments ou moyen le plus court pour devenir mélodiste, harmoniste, contrepointiste et composer.” Cf. Féris 1864, p.166.
Instrumental music to Momigny is meaningful when regarded as a drama — as a musical analogue to the verbal and scenic action on stage. Momigny speaks up against all forms of theoretical snobism (although being stiff-necked enough to appear as quite a snob himself). He also makes a point of criticising from the point of view of the common middle-of-the-road audience and from what is "natural to the ear" ("natural" being a word most writers of the time seem to have used to argue for the primary position of their own cultural base). He might thus tentatively be seen as a fitting spokesman for the common audiences in Paris during the first decades of the 19th century. This is the place and time where Mozart’s last symphonies first became "big hits" — the pupils at the conservatory, who had grown up with the revolution, the guillotine, the horror opera and other unusually strong and dramatic impressions, found Mozart’s music congenial to their needs of expression, playing Mozart at the conservatory’s public rehearsals to such an extent that the older generation (in a manner akin to many older generations up to our time) protested and wanted a chance to hear the old, familiar, Italian repertoire.

Now, what did they listen for, and how did they play? It seems clear that they not only listened for a drama in the sense of Momigny’s analyses but also played the symphony as a drama — e.g. stressing the dialogues between instrumental groups rather than the smooth flow of motifs between different parts of the orchestra.

Thus, the first motif of the g minor symphony of Mozart in Momigny’s discussion is an excellent and unmistakable “Motif of an exalted grief”, and as such a recognisable “actor”. The part in B flat major (mm 28-42) on the other hand completely breaks the rules — the stage is set but the actor is conspicuously missing:

8. "Elle a pour motif ré ré, ré, la, et pour réponse, ré, ut, ut, et ce motif semble dire: Devant les dieux prosternons-nous", Em, p. 408, col. 2 (the following times he discusses this motif he for some reason writes "Devant les dieux prosterez-vous"). Momigny's "translations" did of course not escape criticism. See for example Morel’s Observations sur la seule vraie théorie de la musique, par M. de Momigny, Paris, Bachelier, 1822, (immediately answered in Réponse aux observations de M. Morel, ou à ses attaques contre la seule vraie théorie de la musique, ouvrage de M. de Momigny, Paris (sans date), and the series of articles from 1808 in AMZ concerning Momigny’s “Cours Complet d’Harmonie et de Composition d’apres une theorie neuve et generale de la musique, basee sur des principes incontrovertibles, puisés dans la nature, d’accord avec tous les bons ouvrages pratiques, anciens ou modernes, et mis, par leur clarté, dans la portée de tout le monde. etc.” A somewhat more modern critic is Oliver 1947, p. 154, who writes "Momigny (1762-1838), the famous theoretician and editor of Volume II of the musical section of the Encyclopédie méthodique. Musique (1818). His criticalism of music in that work already reveals a departure from the cautious reserve of the eighteen century, and plunges into the hopeless gibberish of the nineteenth-century impressionists.”

9. Dahlhaus 1978 makes a rather concise review of the different ways in which sonata forms has been discussed — referring the analogue to speech found in the early 18th century in e.g. Mattheson’s concept “Klang-Rede” (c.f. Riepel), the analogues to drama made by Reicha and Czerny in the first half of the 19th century, the analogues to living organisms made by e.g. Proust in the late 19th century and the analogues made to architecture by e.g. d’Indy around 1900. Cf. Ling 1985, Ritael 1969, and, of course, Rosen 1972 (1971) and 1980.

10. This is mirrored in his political positions during the revolutions, as well as in his work beside the theoretical writings.

11. “Nous maîtres ont été, non des pédagogues obscurs qui régentent avec aigreur dans une classe poudreuse, mais l’élite des musiciens de diverses époques & de diverses nations; c’est dans les chefs d’oeuvre de Bach, de Handel, de Marcello, de Durante, d’Haydn & de Mozart que nous avons étudié la composition. Nous l’avons apprise aussi de notre oreille, organe par lequel la nature nous transmet ses lois, si bien comprises & tellement respectées par les plus grands artistes, qu’ils s’y montrent toujours les plus soumis, quand de fâcheux préjugés ne viennent pas leur faire croire qu’ils peuvent parfois s’en écarter.” (“Our teachers have not been obscure pedagogues, who with bitterness and acid rules a powdered class, but the cream of musicians from different ages and several countries; it’s in the masterpieces by Bach, by Handl, by Marcello, by Durante, by Haydn & by Mozart, that we have studied composition. We have also learned it from our ears, the organs by which the nature gives us its laws, so well understood and respected by the biggest artists, that these always are the most subservient to them, when offensive prejudices have not made them think they can break these laws.”) (Em p. 415, col. 1-2)

12. “The common audience” rarely write books, nor produce other forms of record of their views, which of course give all research into historical sources a strong bias. Even today, it’s not the home video productions that go into the archives, although these probably would give future generations of researchers the most interesting glimpses of our lives. For a somewhat closer touch to the cultural bustle of post-revolutionary France, a close reading of La Décade Philosophique is recommended. Cf. Schneider 1980-1983, p. 23-31. An illuminating discussion on the situation in Vienna in the late 18th century can be found in Ruf 1977.


14. This has been analysed at some length in Stockfelt 1988. Cf. also Koury 1988.

15. Saint-Foix is an excellent example of the kind of historical “reading” Leppard and McClary seem to allude to in the quote above when he discusses Momigny. “...the G minor was made subject of a long critical analysis — or rather corrective, for the author is profoundly shocked by the liberties, particularly in the harmony, that Mozart permits himself” — said J. de Momigny. We shall naturally ignore the corrections which the author, in the name of ‘good taste’ suggests in almost every bar of the symphony, but retain his aesthetic appreciation of the general character of the first movement, the first subject of which is ‘of an impassioned grief’”. Saint-Foix 1947 (1932), p. 97f. [my italics]

One notices an admirable orchestra, but searches for the actor it should accompany, & since one do not find him in any of the written parts, these parts forms but an imperfect whole.\textsuperscript{17}

The real troubles, though, begin with the “second theme” at measure 44 — it seems like this, in a drama, would have been a reasonable place for a dialogue, and Mozart’s choice of alternating instrumental groups appears to confirm this, but the rhetorical lines of the different groups makes no sense at all. It’s not until after considerable study of the score that Momigny manages to come to the conclusion that this part might be seen as a single melodic line:

It’s thus on this point not two songs of which one answers the other, but only one who is cut up to give a tiny morsel to the oboe; & this is also true, of what the violin says, when retaking the word, which is the result of what the oboe has said, & not of what he had started to say: this is the work of a pupil.

\textit{How can one explain these neglects?}\textsuperscript{18}

The musicians in all probability did not have Momigny’s opportunity to study the score carefully. Like the audience, they met symphonies briefly, rarely getting, or seeking, a chance to acquaint themselves closely to any particular piece.

Because it [the symphony] is not an exercise like the sonata but must be sight-read, there must be no difficulties which cannot be confronted and clearly played at once by many.\textsuperscript{19}

What appeared as a dialogue thus might well have been performed as a dialogue, thereby adding to Momigny’s troubles in discovering it’s “true” nature as a single melodic line. (This conflict actually represents a rather dramatic paradigmatic break in the history of instrumental music — traditionally music was something the musicians did together, but this theme is a definite step towards the reduction of the individual and conductor\textsuperscript{20} — a development of the orchestra in accordance with the general tendency of organisation during industrialism that points towards the development of the sequencer.)

Worst of all is the complete disregard for the audience Mozart seems to flaunt by the modulation to the development section (or, actually, by the absence of any perceivable modulation). Momigny is once again forced to a close study of the score.

By what should the ear be filled to understand Mozart here?\textsuperscript{21}

The entrance of the oboe and the bassoon sounds like complete madness.\textsuperscript{22} Momigny finally finds that the reason for this is that nothing in the music gives the listener any hint of the sudden exclusion of the expected key of c minor, towards which everything points, in favour of an entrance that can only be properly understood if you presuppose a transition to the key of f-sharp minor. For starters, you have to regard the \( f \) played by the basses (measure 101) as an \( e \) sharp (thus not as the 7 in a G.\#9 but as the 3 in a C\#9). The way the music is written, nobody can do this without keeping their eyes on the score while listening.

But what have Mozart done to justify this transition to the ear, an enharmonic utterance, as fallen from the skies? Nothing; he has disregarded the means he had to instruct the ear about this, to be able to present his tricks even more surprisingly.\textsuperscript{23}

Momigny gives examples on alternative choices that would give the listener a chance to understand the transition and concludes about Mozart’s choice of means:

This is not as Haydn use to do it: he leaves it to the pupils to behave like that, the apparently enharmonic transitions are nothing more than sharp & pretentious infantility, if they are not made to be understandable by the ear.\textsuperscript{24}

Mozart’s g minor symphony is thus only in some parts “classical” music, while much of it is rather the opposite: a warning example of elitist snobbism that disregards the taste and capacity of the average listener.

\textbf{References}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{17} Eduard Hanslick's words “The most admirable discipline has transformed it into an instrument upon which he plays with utter freedom…” concerning von Bülow’s managing of the orchestra in Meiningen, is an eminent example. (Hanslick 1886, p. 417; the English translation is found in \textit{Viennese Golden Years}… 1969 (1950), p. 271 and is quoted from Koury 1988, p. 141.) Cf. Salmen 1971.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Em p. 413, col. 1.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Em p. 413, col. 1.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Eduard Hanslick’s words “The most admirable discipline has transformed it into an instrument upon which he plays with utter freedom…” concerning von Bülow’s managing of the orchestra in Meiningen, is an eminent example. (Hanslick 1886, p. 417; the English translation is found in \textit{Viennese Golden Years}… 1969 (1950), p. 271 and is quoted from Koury 1988, p. 141.) Cf. Salmen 1971.
  \item \textsuperscript{21} De quoi faut-il que l'oreille soit embue pour comprendre ici Mozart? Em p. 413, col. 1-2.
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Em p. 413, col. 1.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Mais qu'a fait Mozart pour justifier à l'oreille cette transition, dite enharmonique, qui tombe des nues? Rien: il a négligé les moyens qu'il avait de l'en instruire pour rendre son escamotage plus surprenant. Em p. 413, col. 1-2.
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Ce n'est pas ainsi qu'en use Haydn; il laisse aux écologistes à tenir cette conduite, les prétendues transitions enharmoniques n'étant que l'enfantillage bien dur & à prétention, quand elles ne sont pas susceptibles d'être comprises par l'oreille. Em p. 413, col. 2.
\end{itemize}
It’s worth noticing that the ambiguity of harmony, so popular already in much of Beethoven’s production (not to mention Chopin) is something to be avoided as long as the music is thought of as an analogue of a scenic drama — Momigny e.g. praises the complex modulations as long as they can be un-ambiguously followed, but condemns everything that must cause the listener uncertainty of where the drama is heading.

As Momigny writes his critique, there is already a group of Mozart-fans by whom he expects to be attacked.

Without doubt many of those who see themselves as great judges, since they appear enthusiastic about everything that comes out of the pen of this great musician, here would like to cry break the staff over the ass; but when they have calmed down, & they have realised that if you don’t want to make your ears too long, only the truths can lead us in these observations, & that it is unwillingly we point out these less radiant points in this glorious beauty, in which we adore the heavenly better than those who pretend to be connoisseurs.25

(A stomping here announces the impatience & indignation of the Mozartists, who adore & do not judge any places in the works of this celebrity.)26

These fans, and others like them in Vienna, Berlin etc., had an attitude towards Mozart similar to the one my generation used to have towards the Beatles and Bob Dylan — and like us, many of them kept on liking the music of their idol for decades, even when different music was preferred by the general audiences. And — and this is the new factor — they managed to get it played.27 and to get it acknowledged as “classic” although it did no longer apply as “models for education”28 without considerable stretching and redefinitions.29 Mozart as a composer of operas never stopped being regarded as an unmistakable “classic” composer. As a composer of purely instrumental symphonic music, however, Mozart’s “classical” status was long debated, or simply disregarded. The g minor symphony was often discussed as an extraordinary complex and difficult masterpiece, but was actually first appointed a truly “classical” symphony when it was used as a conservative example in an argument against the length of “the new Beethoven symphony in E flat”.30 The manner of its actual performance seems to have varied a great deal from orchestra to orchestra, depending on the capacity of different participating musicians; praise were e.g. given to the oboe solo31 and the flute solo,32 lifting otherwise not too impressive performances. By the end of the first decade of the century it seems to have become firmly established as “Mozarts Symphony of Symphonies — the one in G minor”, but still in the beginning of the 20’s it was obviously regarded as a difficult piece of music — the Philharmonic Orchestra of London was e.g. recommended to rehearse it more than once.33

The g minor symphony was one of several pieces of music that stayed on the repertoire through the decades — actually being used in an emblematic function to give the sign of quality to newly established local orchestras and concert societies (not seldom with depressing results), and discussed in all newly established musical journals. This had one remarkable consequence — the quality of being understood at once, the first and only time you heard it that was the true mark of a “classic” composition as late as the beginning of the century, in just a couple of decades gradually became irrelevant to the music of the “standard repertoire” under formation: you could hear it several times, and you had an opportunity to know what to expect already the first time — especially as it was sold to the bourgeois homes in piano arrangements.

Symphony by W. A. Mozart, arranged for four-hand piano. No 2 in Leipzig at Breitkopf & Härtel. (Prize 1 Rthlr). One gets here the classical masterpiece in g minor; and since this, due to its very weighty difficulties especially concerning intonation, only by very good orchestras really can be performed as it should, it should in this form be welcome to not so few music lovers. The transcription is done with insight and care.34

By the time the symphony finally was more generally managed, it already began to be considered as too small. As the rest of the repertoire grew, the g minor symphony had to be rearranged and “boosted” in different fashions to stay up to date — especially 30. AMZ VII, May 1805, col. 500f. Cf. the similar comparison, but with the opposite conclusion, between Beethoven and Mozart made by Berlioz in Gazette Musicale, the 27th of mars 1836 (referred in English in Saint-Foix 1947 (1932), p. 111).
31. AMZ VII, June 1805, col. 613.
32. AMZ VII, September 1806, col. 795.
33. AMZ XXV, August 1823, col. 563. In Leipzig they still had problems with intonating the wind instruments in December 1822 (AMZ XXV, January 1823, col. 21) but seem to have solved this in April 1824 (AMZ XXVI, July 1824, col. 485), something seemingly not managed in Berlin until 1833 (AMZ XXXV, February 1833, col. 124ff).
since it now in all reviews was firmly bound up with conventionalised epithets signifying great size and impact. Exactly how it was rearranged is not established well enough, but we can get some hints from the reactions to these arrangements, occurring with ever greater frequency from the late 1820’s onwards.

One good example is found in the first of the two reports in the Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung from the big summer music festival of 1830 in Halle:

The music the first day began with the marvellous and excellently performed g minor symphony of Mozart. Kapellmeister Schneider had enlarged the Mozart instrumentation with trombones. I willingly admit that this generally was well done; nevertheless many beautiful passages were almost crushed by the powerful trombone-sound. — We really do live in the age of the trombone. But, you must nevertheless ask, is there not any more any music that can have effect without trombones? Must every composition, even compositions by such classical tone poeis, as Mozart, Haydn, who understood the masterful use of the trombone effect in it’s right place, be shrouded with this very resplendent attire when it comes to, with unusually numerous orchestra in unusually big rooms, performing music by these masters to which they have not ascribed trombones? The g minor symphony seems to me to be the kind of work that generally does not gain anything by the addition of trombones.35

The orchestra consisted, except for the local orchestra, of the whole Dessauer Kapelle, of parts of the Leipzig theatre orchestra and of many musicians and amateurs from near and far.36

The results of the revival of J.S.Bach by Felix Mendelsohn, A.B. Marx et al. is of course followed up in January 1830, as is also the best known example of the cross-roads in the history of classical music. Either you had to go on boosting and re-arranging the music that through the music journalism, literature and the formation of the standard repertoire had become a part of the “classical canon” to keep the performances measuring up to the established epithets in the appreciation of the general audiences, or you had to create a completely different norm for the concept “classical”, independent of public taste. It was a choice between modernity and historicism — either commercialism based on the average tastes or disregard for the public opinion.37 Both roads were followed, of course, but only one of them has been inscribed as an important part of the music history of the Western Culture.

The respect for what was seen as the composer’s intentions and disregard of the reactions of the audience gradually but swiftly became a serious matter. This development


38. The results of the revival of J.S.Bach by Felix Mendelsohn, A.B. Marx et al. is of course the best known example — but similar problems of performance praxis actually faced them in relation to Mozart: they had to create a new tradition in the name of an old one. This is an almost unique occurrence in the 50 year history of the journal, and it is furthermore followed up in January 1837 (col. 12) where the editors expand their comments on this "incomprehensible" error of their "otherwise knowledgeable colleague".
can be followed in the activity by and around the music director Moeser in Berlin. He arranged regular “Wednesday entertainments” around 1830 with performances of the music of “classical” masters (like Mozart and Beethoven) as well as contemporary music by participating musicians and composers, e.g. F. Mendelssohn (who sometimes sat in on the piano), L. Spohr and A.B. Marx. These performances were frequently reviewed in the Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung, and according to these reviews they used to play, enjoy and applaud music, eat, drink and dance.

The purest art pleasure was given us last month once again at Mr music director C. Moeser’s Wednesday entertainment through the spiritual performance of quartets by J. Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, even more through the, regarding energy and liveliness rather than any finer nuances, excellent performance of symphonies by Spohr (c minor), Beethoven (No 8, F major) and Mozart (on the celebration of his birthday the 27 of January) in g minor and C major with the fugue.

This happy circle obviously didn’t mind getting and providing “energy and liveliness rather than any finer nuances”. By 1837, however, something seems to have changed the basic mood of this educated, cultural sphere.

Berlin. (End). ... also the usual Wednesday-soirée gave us several classical masterpieces, like for example Mozart’s excellent g minor symphony, the majestic Overture to Egmont by Beethoven and Spohr’s “Weihe der Töne”. This last mentioned tone-painting, whose lack of variation and great length can’t be completely disregarded, was not only received with complete coldness — especially by the end it even caused the bad manner among the audience of hissing to show their dislike. This unfitting behaviour provoked Mr MD Moeser, who expressed the following demand: that on his Soirées, as a refuge for the higher art, any such expressions of approval or disapproval would be forbidden. This announcement is formulated extremely to the point.

Music had obviously in a few years ceased to be a matter of entertainment to these men — instead it was a sober matter of defending the “higher art” against the bustle, and judgement, of musical life in society outside the exclusive, enlightened circle of men with insight into the true values of Art, of creating a “refuge” where the eternal values of the classical masters (and, incidentally, of their own production) could be correctly understood and appreciated.

To be able to do this they had to complete an utter re-evaluation of many of the traditional basic common sense facts about music. “Classical” must be made independent of current public taste. A “genius” thus had to become, not somebody who could make himself immediately understood and appreciated by anyone, but someone who it might even take another “genius” to understand. Instrumental music must be made, not less important than vocal music or the various activities it traditionally accompanied but more important, and not an acoustic equivalent to the drama with obvious points of reference, but an independent, autonomous, non-referential world of its own — its meaning independent both of the actual contexts and of the flow of time. Therefore, they needed analytical tools that didn’t start out from music’s interrelations with, and dependence on, other modes of expression, but made music...
appear independent of its tradition and traditional contexts, and of any actual performance. Music must become, not something to be played and enjoyed, but something to be studied and understood — communication, understanding, must no longer be the responsibility of the composer or musician, but of the listener. The practical effectiveness of music must become less important than the theoretical understanding. Lack of understanding must become a judgement on bad listening (or possibly on inadequate performance), not on any inadequacies in the music canonised as a part of the higher art.46

This took some doing. The creation of musicology as a modern academic discipline was only one of the necessary means of the process.

The refuge from what?

What had happened, and why did it happen at that time and place?

It didn’t happen as suddenly as it might appear in the Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung. The process — or rather the tension between theoretical judgements on “true” values of music and the facts of day to day praxis — goes back to the dawn of recorded history.47 The formation of the new concept of subjectivity (noticeable e.g. in the introduction of the word “personality” in the French cultural debate before the revolution), and of music as a form of expression of subjective (not objective, as in the writings of Monteverdi) feelings in German bourgeoisie music (e.g. the Empfindsamkeit of C.P.E. Bach), were of course a necessary background, as was the philosophical writings of Kant and Hegel.48 The discussions among the Liebhabers with Sturm-und-Drang tendencies in the late 18th century clearly point to the use of music as an autonomous art form.49

The equivalents of the concept of art music as a somewhat autonomous genre of high status is not even a property of western society alone,50 but of several other societies, such as the Northern Indian or the Islamic, despite the general notion of Islam being against such worldly pleasures as music. In practice, Islamic courts and society have indulged in these pleasures throughout history.51 On the other hand, the incompatibility of religious feelings and the aesthetic pleasure of beautiful music has been the topic of Jewish52 and Christian discussions as well, notably the legend of Palestrina as the saviour of religious polyphonic music.53 Through medieval and renaissance Europe, art music was cultivated mainly by the courts and the Church, for the solace of kings and nobles as well as the glorification of secular as well as religious powers.

The new thing accomplished in the refuge is thus not the praxis as such. It is the way its defenders managed to make this praxis, as well as the ideological construction to defend this praxis, serve the oligarchic needs of a new type of society. They managed to get the norms adequate for the exclusive sphere of art music generally accepted in theory (although not necessarily followed in praxis) both for music that was never intended for this sphere, and for situations outside the refuge where neither music nor the listening situations provided any relevance for these norms.

Reasons are difficult things to prove, and are in hindsight easily mixed up with effects. What can be shown is a number of functions of the creation of, and within, the Refuge — creations that, in institutionalised form as concepts and organisations, has continued to have effects on musical life long after the disappearance of the circumstances that originally produced them.

46. It is of course tempting to stress this complete inversion of all the basic norms and values by translating the word “Asyle” as “asylum”, with a full set of connotations. We have, however, chosen the more neutral word “refuge” (modelled after an American translation of chapter 7 of Stockfelt 1988 by Kassabian, A.) — we do, after all, have many of our own cultural roots inside this sphere.
47. Cf. e.g., the different viewpoints held by Plato, Aristoteles and Aristoxenos.
48. Cf. e.g. §44 in Kants Kritik der aesthetischen Urteilskraft. “Writing” might, of course, be an inappropiate word for Hegels recorded lectures. It has been noted in several critical studies that the general tenor of Hegels teachings, putting the “truth” above the reach of mundane life as a teleological matter that only can be reached by rare insights or a long historical development, and the weight he because of this gave e.g. some of the instrumental music by Beethoven, seemed to be completely at odds with his own actual musical preferences. Cf. Ling 1985, Taylor 1986 (1975).
49. Cf. the clear distinction Sulzer and Koch does between symphony and chamber symphony (Koch 1793, p.303) — it has been argued that the Mozart g minor symphony actually was composed for the exclusive liebhaber chamber and not with any general understanding in mind. This radical elite did, however, no more propose to make their own opinions the one rule for all musical life than e.g. Gesualdo did. Cf. Ruf 1977. Cf. also Burneys famous comments on Rousseaus quoting of Fontannelle.
50. “...such terms (“classical” or “art” music) might be appropriate functionally to any music culture. Used in connection with large urban literate societies, the terms refer to music traditions that were appreciated and supported by the economic or governmental control groups of those societies. In the Near East, however, such aristocratic musics were already well established on both the courtly and tribal levels before the coming of Islam in the seventh century. In the Bedouin tribal camps, the poet-musician (shair) occupied a special place in the culture...in pre-Islamic courts...female dancers (gaynat) or singers and African musicians were a part of a tradition that was happily accepted by subsequent Islamic rulers.” (Malm 1977, p. 70)
53. Grout 1979, p. 263.
The different effects of the free market in cultural life have been discussed in a number of studies, stressing e.g. the needs for standardisation of instruments and ensembles by the piano industry, the publishing companies, etc. or the dislike among the educated middle class of the courting of public taste by “shopkeepers and Jew speculators”.

We will therefore not in this context discuss commercialisation as such — only note that some form of relation to commercialism obviously is a basic condition of all culture production in any capitalist economy, thereby in different fashions influencing all other factors.

Commercialisation was nothing new to the musical life of 19th century — it had been an ever more important force at least since the venetian opera entrance ticket in the 1630’s. What was new was the relative lack of the old balancing forces of feudal society, and the opposition to commercial culture among the very strongholds of commercialism, the upper middle classes of the bourgeoisie — the very basic need among the established spheres for a social distinction not based on money nor, of course, on ancestry alone. Cultural distinction thus served a very important social and central category in music life.

The tendency to specialisation and “professionalisation” of all levels of society inherent in the structure of industrial production reached not only the composers and musicians, the production and execution of music, but also the listeners — to listen to music became an activity in its own right to an ever bigger group of people, at the same time as the leisure time was separated from work and was given a value of its own. The commercialisation of concert life thus meant a dependence on music that would please the anonymous listener, who among the educated discussion on culture, just as today, but also strengthened the tendency to appoint fixed epitaphs and evaluations to particular pieces and composers, independent of what actually happened on the concert scene, thereby giving a very commercial boost to the “anti-commercial” propagation for eternal values. The “goldies” became “evergreens” by staying popular in spite, or because, of being “oldies” (which is a different, but complementary, development from the redefinition of “classical” within the refuge). Thus, the “ascetic” and devout attitude towards “the intentions of the composer” could reach the commercial concert scene, sometimes with results devastating to the expectations of the truly informed expert listeners.

Richard Wagner had learned that the g minor symphony of Mozart was supposed to be a masterpiece, and by reading the score had come to love it — forming a very clear and precise image of how it should sound, especially the Andante. Thus his reactions when he finally got a chance to actually hear the symphony performed:

“Fancies of this sort, however, were not permitted during the strictly classical performance under the veteran Kapellmeister, at the Munich Odeon: the proceedings, there, were carried on with a degree of solemnity enough to make one’s flesh creep with a sensation akin to a foretaste of eternal perdition. The lightly floating Andante was converted into a ponderous Largo; not the hundredth part of the weight of a single quaver was spared us; stiff and ghastly, like a bronze pigtail, the battuta of the Andante under the veteran Kapellmeister, at the Munich Odeon: the proceedings, there, were carried on with a degree of solemnity enough to make one’s flesh creep with a sensation akin to a foretaste of eternal perdition. The lightly floating Andante was converted into a ponderous Largo; not the hundredth part of the weight of a single quaver was spared us; stiff and ghastly, like a bronze pigtail, the battuta of the Andante...”

60. The choice of the word “his” is in this context purely a matter of convention. “Her” would be closer to historical truth, at least in Sweden; just as women dominated in the musical life of the bourgeois salon, at least during the second half of the century, as well as some branches of music education, the women especially by the end of the century seem to have been the dominating part of the audience at many concerts (cf. Tegen 1986 and Öhrström 1987). Special measures had to be taken to give the men a chance to get a seat. After careful study of the sources and a number of quotations, Tegen actually has to add “One should by all this of course not come to the conclusion that only women were occupied by music. (Ibid. p. 91)

61. This tendency has been touched upon above in connection with the g minor symphony of Mozart.

62. For a commentary on “ascetic” listener attitudes, see Weber, loc.cit.
The crossroad between historicistic classicism and actuality was not only a choice between eternal values and changing contexts. At least from the 30’s it also was a choice between the well-known and new experiences. The standard repertoire made possible the development of a completely new kind of listening — listening for the identical. Earlier, music might be repeated until it was “too well known” and then was replaced. Now it could instead be seen as a quality that a piece of music was generally known in the least detail — its established place on the standard repertoire became a

strong argument to keep it there. After a Gewandhaus-performance in Leipzig, January 28, 1847, the reporter reflects:

Well known, often heard compositions cause at their performance an atmosphere like the one that gets to us when we after a longer period in strange surroundings once more set foot on the home ground [“Heimat”], where everything, even the smallest, are dear and precious to us and where even the inconsequential details become attractive through the memories bound to them from before. When we for the first time meet new, really original compositions this might well be compared to a strange surrounding, in which no well known relations welcome us, but arrive first after a longer stay to fill and warm the lonely heart.

Today, listening for the identical often is the norm rather than the exception — phonographic reproduction has done to all forms of music what the formation of the standard repertoire did to the certified classics, only even more effective.

The reporter’s reflection is, however, not only illuminating on the standard repertoire. Together with the anti-commercialism (often coupled with anti-semitism), anti-exhibitionism and anti-sensualism of the defenders of the eternal values it also mirrors the ever stronger ethnocentricity, bordering to xenophobia, of the cultural elite who had entrenched themselves into the refuge. To them, it seems, true humanity had been reduced to a small group of cultured German men.

66. “Bekannte, oft gehörte gute Tonwerke bringen bei ihrer Wiederscheinung eine Stimmung hervor, ähnlich der, welche uns befällt, wenn wir nach längerem Weilen in der Fremde die Heimath betreten, in der uns alle Gegenstände, bis zu kleinsten herab, lieb und werth sind, und wo selbst unbedeutendere uns anziehende werden durch die Erinnerungen, die sich aus früherer Zeit daran knüpfen. Neue, zum ersten Male uns antrettende wirklich originelle Tonwerke dagegen sind wohl auch nicht ganz unpassend der Fremde zu vergleichen, in der uns keine bekannten freundlichen Beziehungen empfangen, die erst nach und bei längerem Verweilen sich einfinden, um das leere Herz zu füllen und zu wärmen.” AMZ XLIX, February 1847, col. 70.

67. It’s rather easy to feel sympathy with the historicistic attitude if you imagine that the only way to re-experience old favorites like Armstrong, Parker or the Stones were to hear them performed on synthesizer and drum machine, or by a string quartett.

68. Cf. e.g. Hanslick’s discussion on intoxication, Hanslick 1891.

69. The relatively inconsequential size or marginal position of a group is seldom in proportion with its importance in musical life — music has often been the domain of relatively marginalized groups and even outcasts of a society. In Bengal, music is traditionally the domain of the Baul people, in Turkey, the Balkans (even in Hungary) and southern Spain that of the gypsies. More or less marginalized groups in the society of 13th century Europe could be such as women (their capital role in music has already been discussed), people of Jewish origin (Mendelssohn, the Strauss family, Mahler), homosexuals (Tchaikowsky), etc. Music was one of the few licit extralaboural occupations of the North American black slave (cf. the situation today), and Tin Pan Alley would certainly not have been the same without the role played by people of Jewish origin.
One hidden effect of the re-definition of musical value in connection with the rise to political power of the European bourgeoisie was to provide an alternative side of society, a refuge from the stark realities of industrialism and colonialism. The bourgeois youngster, perhaps unwilling to inherit father's business, factory, power and "white man's burden" or mother's role under the "Kinder-Küche-Kirche"-Trinity could become a "sentimental dreamer" crying floods over a dead trout or a plucked rose, or dream away to places far away and long forgotten.

In the early seventies, against a background of increasing world-wide criticism against the US action in Vietnam, an American friend of ours could comment on Simon & Garfunkel's "Bridge over Troubled Water" by saying that "a country capable of producing that kind of music couldn't be that bad". This very function was sorely needed also by European bourgeois audiences during earlier eras, asserting the intrinsic superiority of western culture, religion, morale, art and music. Colonial Europe, be it Debussy's France in Algeria, Elgar's Britain in India or Strauss' Germany in Africa, did show symptoms similar to Oscar Wilde's Dorian Grey. David Lynch and Stephen King do often touch upon similar mechanisms today. (But it is, interesting enough, the hideous Phantom of the Opera who is the genie of art, who understands what the audiences appreciate, their deeper feelings and needs.)

The formation of the refuge as an inner circle with strict and known common codes and means of expression in relation to overwhelming surroundings and conflicting ideas of the basic nature of reality is thus an example of a very common human trait, similar to the Ba-Benzelé Pygmies' invocations before hunting, or the pep talk before a football match. The collective sharing of an experience through specific behaviour codes (applause conventions, singing along, clapping, reviews, etc.) is a means of re-ensuring the vital togetherness of the group as well as disqualifying outside norms for judgement.

If the setters of cultural and ideological, moral, standards of commercial utilitarian society needed to be pronounced anti-commercial, they of course also needed to be pronounced non-utilitarian, as has been touched upon above. The most materialistic culture so far had to stress Geistlichkeit, to hide materialism by reifying the immaterial, to hide the necessity of the seemingly unnecessary by making it all encompassing ("the fish doesn't realise the existence of water"). Like many men throughout history who have made their wealth by the work of others, they had a tendency to down-play the importance of the material exuberance they had finally attained for themselves, though this time, the artistic forms of self-deception became institutionalised common norms. This also helped hiding the fact that music, for them as for all societies through history, served very basic social, ritual and representative functions — which was a prerequisite for the perpetuation of the particular myth in the center of these socially representative rites: the absence of the importance of these socially representative rites.

The fundamental male-chauvinism of the refuge need not really be elucidated in this context; like the commercialism it was one of the basic conditions of the whole culture (as it still is). It is, however, worth noticing that the inescapable fact that the practical musical life was very much based on the activity and competence of women.

70. But generally not out of line with the uses of art music throughout history. Cf. Malm, loc.cit.
71. Or even, as in the case of Hegels followers, a more real world than the material.
did not pose any severe threat to the chauvinism of the refuge. Women dominated the cultural activities in many bourgeois salons, in many concert halls, as a market for home instruments and printed music, and they were, like e.g. Jenny Lind, celebrated and adored as performers of music. Bourgeois daughters were supposed to cultivate their artistic talents as part of their suitability as future wives. Women were not completely forbidden to choose a professional career as musicians or music teachers (although those who did so were often ridiculed, or accused of indecency). They might even be allowed to compose "inconsequential" music, ditties, children's songs etc. and maybe even get them published. They were, however, under no circumstances allowed to enter as musical or theoretical authorities into the refined air of the refuge.

Very few women seems to have cared a bit. Very few ever even wanted to get there. The major part of music life, where often the very same music as within the refuge, and often with the very same musicians, were used and appreciated as popular tunes, in restaurants, at the movies etc., carried on as always, adapting to the times and without needing to justify musical praxis by theoretical means.

The exclusion of women from the sphere of the higher art is thus an illuminating example of an even more severe exclusion. The practical side of musical life was ideologically seen as relatively inconsequential — therefore the women's relative dominance didn't really matter. Only the sphere of music that represented the pontification of the actual higher truths of life, the higher art (where the composers were given the position traditionally reserved for prophets, the conductors the position of priests and the theoreticians as exegetes of the true meaning) was completely forbidden for women, as well as for all who were not German (or at the very least central Europeans), "cultured", theoretically "correct", non-commercial, white and male.

This would hardly have mattered if Germany hadn't been such a dominating political force at the time, if the male chauvinism of the refuge hadn't been just part of a more fundamental restructuring of the oppression of women, if the idea of "higher art" hadn't entered into the liberal ideas of "lifting the people" as a part of the general education needed by industrialised society, and if the ideology of the refuge (including anti-commercialism as well as anti-semitism, racism and a general basic elitism, a regard for the theoretical aspects of music completely out of proportion with everyday praxis and a disregard for the contextual, factual uses of music mirroring the disregard for the bodily functions in favour of the "pure" mind) hadn't thus become an important norm also for the discussion on the musical life outside the refuge.79

It's notable that, while the 19th century sees the birth of most of the European national states and, as a manifestation of this, of all kinds of "national" music on the symphonic repertoire (as well as in "folk music" collections), it does not produce any national German music in spite of the strong and successful German nationalism. The musical means of the German art sphere, as "classical", "autonomous", "non-referential" and "non-contextual" manifestations of the "classic" tradition became, in spite of all obvious musical parallels to strictly regional traditions (e.g. Brahms use of horns), regarded as a nationally neutral lingua franca. The dominance of German cultural hegemony under the guise of autonomy was the basis from which other nations had to profile their own national "classical canon", a required mark of civilisation and quality that must not be more than superficially profiled into nationalism, or lightly spiced by exoticism.

The exotic pleased the romantic need for countries, feeling, and adventures from anywhere but the dull here and now.80 These works were often created by metropolitan composers (Bizet's Carmen) or by mediators from proud, fiery, beautiful or suffering nations (Liszt, Chopin, Borodin). The same applies to contemporary

75. The treatment of Fanny Henzel, Clara Schumann and other "too talented and competent" female composers and musicians is well documented. Even more interesting are cases like the Swedish composer Elfrida Andrée, who actually had strong support from her family and surroundings for a career as a professional musician, conductor and composer, and actually got chances to prove her remarkable capacity (including being gradually and grudgingly given respect from the orchestra musicians and her colleagues) but still was kept from the "top charts" of standard repertoire and, of course, from the writing of music history. Cf. Öhrström 1987.

78. Similar ideas, based on the ideology of the refuge, were (with somewhat different motivations) propagated by conservatives, liberals, social democrats and even communists (like Lenin) around the beginning of the 20th century — in short by all who had an upbringing related to bourgeois "higher" culture. Cf. Stockfelt 1988.
79. The historical bias in the traditional writing of music history thus does not just have a male bias, but a male theory bias. The reason for the exclusion of women in the annals of musical history is not only a bias for men, but a bias for composers (of art music) and theoreticians. This can be regarded as an suppression of traditional values, an oppression of the actual musical life and the preferences of the general audiences — who have always preferred great performers to high brow artists — including the women, and as a double oppression of the women privileged enough by society to be able to (aspire to) enter the refuge as equals.
80. Without actually having to go there, and to be physically confronted with the reality. If you actually have to confront the reality behind an idealised concept — be it a horror opera, a strange environment, or a worshipped idol — it is bound to put a critical strain to the perpetuation of the ideal image. A proper distance is as needed for the devout (who has always had a tendency to put their gods and idols on top of mountains or in graves) as for war infotainment fans.
The end of the German hegemony in our century did not, however, automatically mean the end of the power of the refuge. As noted above, many of its ideological fundamentals have been adapted, and developed, as tools of commercial society today. Neither does the placing of the refuge in its historical context mean an invalidation of the research done in the name of the refuge, only a beginning of a discussion on how the results of this research must be re-evaluated and adapted to fit into the analysis of musical life today.

Music plays a far more important role in contemporary life than ever before in the history of mankind, through the power, resources and reach of the contemporary global media techniques and commercial networks. When Charlemagne helped standardising and imposing Gregorian chant in Christian Europe (incidentally sneaking in the since Byzantine traditionally explicitly worldly and macho organ into the cathedral in Aachen), he was seeking a political and religious unity by cultural means. He would never have dreamt of the possibilities MTV could have offered him today, uniting the world under the never before so well fitting catch phrase "One world — one music", thereby making television culture one big Americanised Heimat for all.85

Today, all walks of life may have musical subtexts, communicating references on relative social value and cultural positions while being disguised as entertainment or beauty. Musicology needs to be developed as a necessary tool to clarify these references. The theoretical analysis of music must thus retake its historical position within Western Culture of clarifying the meaning of the relations between music and its referential contexts — instead of disguising or hiding these relations. Only by demystifying the ideology of the refuge, by demystifying traditional musicology, can we use the tools as developed and/or transformed by musicology to understand music as it meets us today, as a part of composite art forms like music videograms, opera or commercials, of everyday social situations and innumerable other contexts. This also means developing musicology as a tool for self-understanding (in a wider sense than e.g. the basic phenomenology of harmonic tension) by reuniting our theoretical framework with our own praxis of everyday life, where the considerable qualities of "autonomous" listening does play only a marginal (although neither inconsequential nor unimportant) part in a society where music can and will be found everywhere.
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