



# Proceedings of the Musical Association

ISSN: 0958-8442 (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rrma18>

## The Sense of Programme

Herbert Antcliffe

To cite this article: Herbert Antcliffe (1910) The Sense of Programme, Proceedings of the Musical Association, 37:1, 103-116, DOI: [10.1093/jrma/37.1.103](https://doi.org/10.1093/jrma/37.1.103)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jrma/37.1.103>



Published online: 28 Jan 2009.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 4



View related articles [↗](#)

W. H. CUMMINGS, Esq., Mus. D.,

PRESIDENT,

IN THE CHAIR.

# *THE SENSE OF PROGRAMME.*

BY HERBERT ANTCLIFFE.

It has been said of James McNeill Whistler that "he held truly it is the province of art to interpret—not to imitate." He attempted to avoid, in an art which in its primary and most elementary functions at the least, is a representative one, everything which could fall under the head of realism or mere reproduction; just as many composers, in an art which is primarily emotional, attempt to bring into being a reproduction of matters not necessarily or usually productive of emotional feeling.

Whistler failed (where he did fail) in the same manner, though not perhaps to the same degree, as these composers, only in that he explained too much. Emotion has its place not only in music but in all arts, while a certain amount of representation or description is not without its place in music. Where, however, what is the primary function of one art appears as a secondary or ancillary function of another, the relation between the two should appear by the mere exercise of that which is the immediate means of expression, and no explanation by means of words or by analogy of other matters would in ideal circumstances be necessary.

Now the highest type of programme music is generally acknowledged to be that which interprets life so faithfully as to reproduce in others the emotions, and sometimes the thoughts, aroused in the composer by certain circumstances or conditions of life,—material or psychological. Descriptive writing, or what we call realism, has often no part, and at the most only a small part, in such interpretation. (Realism as we now know it, usually bears but a small and insignificant relation to reality, as it is a presentation of only the most superficial qualities of reality.)

The desire merely to imitate or represent external matters (from which the composition of this descriptive music arises) is, however, the first instinct of all art, and we see it in the art of childhood and savagery; the desire to originate comes only with the development of mind and soul; the desire and impulse

to interpret at first hand is given only to the prophet and seer ; all save these interpret, so far as they do interpret, not with authority, but merely as teachers of that which they have received from others.

It is nevertheless true that the faithfulness of any interpretation expressed through the medium of musical art depends to some extent upon the composer's ability to realise the relationship of musical sounds to external nature or to circumstances outside the nature and accidents or manner of those sounds.

Mr. Lawrence Gilman, the eminent American critic, not long ago expressed the opinion that there are some composers (he mentioned four at the time,—Debussy, d'Indy, Loeffler and MacDowell) who have not only realised but effectively utilised this relationship. To them he said, "the world of external nature is no longer merely a group of phenomena, lovely or terrible, whose picturesque aspects, or the moods which they awaken, are to be sympathetically recorded . . . . It is Nature made sympathetic and psychical, Nature suffused with subjective emotion."

A condition such as this is the result of as well the deliberate training of a temperament naturally responsive to the appeal of nature, as of environment conducive to the development of such a temperament. Man is by nature provided with five primary senses from which must be evolved any more subtle and acute sensibilities necessary or desirable for a successful career through life. Mr. Ernest Newman speaks, for instance, of certain mystics apprehending the universe "through a kind of sixth sense that is an instantaneous blend of the ordinary five." This is an ideal unity to which the majority can never attain ; we can, however, go some little distance towards its attainment, by blending two or more of the senses which are keenest and most subtle in our individual natures.

The appreciation of musical sounds at all is one of these secondary senses. It is not, however, as are many of them, a blend of two or more of the others, but a development of only one of them. Being the result of the evolution or development of that one, caused by its intelligent use, rather than a direct endowment of nature, it is consequently found, not only in varying degrees but also in quite different qualities, in different nations and different individuals.

The sense of programme in music—the appreciation of an ultimate distinctiveness in sounds—is a still further development of this secondary sense, and is a blend of the senses of sight and hearing, brought about by their co-relationship to all or several of the various arts. It is possessed in some degree by practically all who have educated and cultivated the best of their natural tendencies, though in some natures it is more pronounced than in others. Like all artistic

sensibilities it is more subtle in its higher than in its lower forms. It shows itself in its crudest form in the desire to make all music imitational or descriptive, and to work upon the emotions by the suggestion of external matters only.

Another sign of its existence in a crude state is seen in those attempts, so common among slightly educated music-lovers, to give to all music a meaning expressible in words. This crude and improperly developed sense is responsible for the names which have been and are given to works to which the composer, often with the deliberate intention of avoiding any suggestion of programme, has omitted to give any title. Instances known to everyone occur in Beethoven's "Moonlight" Sonata, "The Bee's Wedding" or "Spinning Song" of Mendelssohn, Chopin's "Raindrop" Mazurka, some of Haydn's Chamber Music, and countless other pieces. Unfortunately many composers, some even of high ability and attainments, have not hesitated to pander to the cruder and sometimes to the more debased conditions of this sense, with the consequence that the thing itself, as well as the name of "programme music," was for many years, and to a smaller extent still is, despised and rejected by the very men who should have been cultivating and directing both the sense and its progeny.

Nations and races, like individuals, have each their own degree and quality of this, as of every other sense, varying according to temperament, to development of other arts and of their artistic sensibilities generally, and to all the varied accidents of artistic life. We find it most evident and less subtle in the less romantic, and what are called the more practical, nations, who have succeeded in commerce and empire building—in the Germans and in the English and the Scotch.

In the French and the Irish (or more strictly in the Celts) it is of a subtler and more refined quality, but it is none the less existent and vital; the human romance of the former people, and the faëry life, to which everything connected with the latter is referred, only give to it a lighter touch and a more delicate feeling. The singing for sheer joy or sadness of life—the music which flows from the heart and lips of the people individually and collectively without deliberate intention or effort on their part—which is the peculiar characteristic of the Romance nations of Southern Europe, and chiefly of the Italians, all but excludes this sense or the desire for its exercise from their nature. In the Slavonic races, with their passion and youthlike ardour, we find it elementary yet sensitive and active.

A simple, yet at the same time subtle form of this sense is the susceptibility to colour suggestions from tonal pitch or quality, which is possessed by some either as a natural

disposition or by force of early circumstances and associations. Beethoven possessed it with regard to tonality and key-relationship, as did also Schumann, though in a degree not quite so exact. (It has been said that this is a mistake with regard to Schumann, and that such mistake has arisen by the confusion of his name with that of Schubart the poet. There may have been this confusion at times, but whatever sense of the relationship of tonality and colour the poet may have had, the composer certainly had some such sense, as is evidenced by even a casual knowledge of his works.) Alfred de Musset had it in respect of single notes, and in a less degree of human voices.

Some pseudo-scientific philanthropists have attempted to bring this association of tone and colour into practical utility, in order to assist the deaf to appreciate the beauties of sound, and the blind the beauties of colour. How far they will be successful it is impossible to forecast. What was in the case of Beethoven, and still more in the case of de Musset, an exceptional thing, is now not at all uncommon. In some cases—perhaps in the majority—it is affected, especially by musical critics and writers on music, who would have a difficulty otherwise in describing what they hear; in other cases, however, there is no doubt it is unaffected and intuitional, and, by force of usage, tradition and heredity, it will in all probability become more commonly so.

The psychological condition mentioned by Mr. Gilman as being that of the composers he names is an ideal one, though in its fullest fruition it would extend still further, and apply not only to the relation of art to nature, but to its relation to all the artificial conditions of life as well.

It is a condition towards which all composers might well strive, and the fact that it is impossible to agree entirely with Mr. Gilman as to its complete existence in at any rate three of the four composers named (the works of the fourth, Mr. C. M. Loeffler, I have not yet had an opportunity of either seeing or hearing), does not controvert its possibility or desirability; and one can agree with him to the extent that these composers have arrived at a condition nearer to this than have any others (with the possible exception of Mr. Delius) whose works are now before the public.

The programmatic sense cannot, however, in any of its degrees or qualities, be called an absolute one. That is to say, the composer will never, unless music should develop some characteristics or capabilities which in its present state of development it shows no evidence of possessing, be able to indicate definitely and unmistakably to the normal mind, either from his own standpoint or that of the hearer, the scenes or verbal imagery which have inspired him.

"It must always remain an open question how far music is able of itself to influence the mind's eye, for the simple

reason," as has been pointed out by Mr. Frederick Corder, "that some imaginations are vastly more susceptible than others and can therefore find vivid pictures where others can see and hear nothing"; that is, because of the vast difference in the quality and quantity of this sense as possessed by different persons.

The late Oscar Wilde, with his keen sense of the beauty and expressiveness of sounds, declared that "Music can never reveal its ultimate secret"; a statement which would appear almost certainly to be true, because music, I think you will agree with me, is as near being infinite as anything which exists in this finite world. By the constant association of certain sounds with corresponding ideas, however, it may be that some day a power of definite indication or suggestion will be achieved approximately, but it is impossible to suggest that an absolute association of sounds with scenes or even with sensations, will ever come into existence.

The condition of music as a means of expression of other matters, appears, in its present state, to be that it is dependent upon outside assistance for its ability to stir more than one emotion at one time, while what we require of a perfect condition of that which we call "Programme Music" is that it arouses, without such assistance, emotions or sensations of a multiple or complex nature.

Mr. Newman, in the essay on "Programme Music" contained in his "Musical Studies," gives an example of this. He says: "Let us examine a simple case, say the 'Romeo and Juliet' overture of Tschaikowsky, and see whether this particular work could be equally understood and appreciated, as pure music, by the man who knows and the man who does not know the programme. There is not the slightest doubt that the 'Romeo and Juliet' would give intense pleasure to anyone who simply walked unpremeditatedly into a concert-room and heard the overture without knowing that it had a poetical basis—who listened to it, that is, as a piece of music pure and simple in sonata form. But I emphatically deny that this hearer would receive as much pleasure from the work as I do, knowing the poetic story to which it is written. He might think the passage for muted strings, for example, extremely beautiful, but he would not get from it such delight as I, who not only feel all the *musical* loveliness of the melody and the harmonies and the tone colour, but see the lovers on the balcony and breathe the very atmosphere of Shakespeare's scene. I am richer than my fellow by two or three emotions in a case of this kind. My nature is stirred on two or three sides instead of only one."

It is the lack of power to stir or express these several emotions instead of the one only, that shows the limitation not so much of the art of music as of the sense of programme.

The fact that it develops, and the way in which it does so, is seen by reference to the history of music during the last sixty or seventy years, during which time it has risen from, at its highest, a subconscious and unrecognised existence, into one of the most important qualifications of the composer and the critic.

An interesting experiment on this subject was made some little time ago at a music school in the North of England. A certain orchestral work was played in a four-hand pianoforte arrangement, to a class of students from whom the title of the piece and the name of the composer were withheld, and the members were then asked to give a short description of what it suggested to them. The replies were remarkably similar, and quite in keeping with the character of the work, which was Sterndale Bennett's "The Naiads" Overture. This was an extreme test put to students who, generally speaking, had received suitable and ample preparation for such tests, but it speaks strongly for the possession on the part of both the composer and the audience of students that such agreement as to the interpretation should exist among the latter, especially as the aid of orchestral colour was entirely dispensed with.

In studying music written at the time when the art was only beginning to develop into a passionate and emotional one, we see the embryonic development of this programmatic sense, with occasional definite signs of life, and of its recognition and exploitation by composers who were born before their time.

It may in the first instance have been the result of a mental effort rather than of a psychological condition; but it certainly has become the latter now. We cannot, of course, say to which of these the earliest attempts to write programme music, or to read a programme into music not primarily intended to express one, are to be attributed; for neither as purely emotional sounds nor as merely derivative or imitational ones, do they make any appeal to our modern senses. Kuhnau, when he wrote his Bible Sonatas, undoubtedly possessed this sense, and in a somewhat highly developed state; but the means for exercising it at his command were totally inadequate for its proper expression.

That Purcell possessed it is evident, I gather (though I have not been sufficiently fortunate to hear the work) from the way in which he treated the adaptation from Lully's "Isis" of chattering teeth and shivering limbs as suggestive points in the frost scene of "King Arthur." The effects employed by Handel in the plague music of "Israel in Egypt," though not themselves programme music or directly connected with it, could only have been written by a composer with a well-defined sense of what is appropriate in that branch of his art.

A composer in whom this sense was less developed would have made these suggestions less effective both musically and in descriptive power.

As with music lovers of the lower types, so also with composers of less strength and originality; it is usually to be observed that they who possess less real power and realisation of tonal relation to external matters, or who possess it in a cruder and more superficial degree, are the most ready to call in the aid of verbal directions or other adjuncts to prevent any misapprehension of their intentions. Like other possessions it frequently happens that they who possess the least are the most anxious to make the appearance of having much.

Beethoven and Schumann both possessed it in a high degree; yet when the former indulged it to any serious extent he half apologised, and endeavoured to explain away what he had done; while the latter was content with a word or a title here and there to show the direction of his thoughts.

But Beethoven was compelled by his natural honesty and frankness to acknowledge that inspiration came from no mere desire to sing for singing's sake; and like other composers who were smaller than himself in both spirit and expression, he confessed to his friend Neate, "*Ich habe immer ein Gemaelde in meinen Gedanken, wenn ich am componiren bin, und arbeite nach demselben.*"

Spohr had little of this sense, but thought himself rich in it, and so tried to prove his affluence by indulging in large subjects and embellishing his works with titles which convey everything or nothing.

The common idea that the failure of so many programme works to effect their object is caused by the lack of realisation of the limitations of music and its accidents is only partially correct. Quite as many of such works fail owing to the smallness of this sense, or the lack of its proper development in the composer, as to any lack on his part of technical knowledge or intuition; and perhaps as many to the lack or distortion of its development in those who listen to the works.

Some have so keen a sense of programme that without an appeal to it their creative faculties remain unstirred, and this in spite of their own admiration for the works of those who have had or have used little of it. Sir Edward Elgar, for instance, after expatiating on the higher order of music which exists (or which he imagines exists) in that which has no programme, replied to his critics who demanded to know why, in view of his opinions, he indulged in the composition of programme music, that he was personally unable to do anything else, and felt himself to be a composer of lower rank because of this. There is no reason for believing that he was otherwise than honest in what he said, and that it was actually as well as potentially true. It gives, however, a very concrete



example of how a natural or hereditary sense may have the upper hand of intellectual principles.

In its higher and more subtle forms it appears sometimes in the works of those who, not only in principle, but also in practice, are the strictest and most conscientious of absolutists, proving the statement made earlier that no one is entirely devoid of it. In the case of Brahms, for instance, we see it in some of his pianoforte music and in the suggestiveness of some of the accompaniments to "A German Requiem" and the "Song of Destiny." In Schubert (*le musicien le plus poète que fût jamais*, as Liszt called him) we see it reflected from his songs to his symphonies, which express the innermost workings of a soul strangely stirred by his surroundings. What wonder, therefore, that we find it tinging some of even the chamber music of so modern though so careful an artist as M. Vincent d'Indy.

The amount of conviction which a piece of programme music carries depends upon the development of this sense, first in the composer and then in the interpreter and the hearer. The progress of this class of music therefore must be affected more by the æsthetic training, in a right or wrong direction, of this sense, than by the development of the mere mechanical or technical means of musical expression.

The almost entire lack of it, and the invincible ignorance displayed of its existence as a natural (though not a primary) faculty, have more than once seriously impeded the progress of music, and have been the causes of much of the bitterest and most futile criticism in the past. The too great desire to exploit it in themselves and in others has on the other hand caused many present day artists and critics to go too far towards the other extreme. They fail to see that not only, like all other human faculties, has it distinct limitations, but that within those limitations it must develop by slow degrees, and cannot arrive at fruition by any sudden leap. On its realisation and proper adjustment depend the proper adjustment and realisation of the relations of the two great branches of instrumental music.

It might be asked, "Who are the persons who" (to repeat my own description of their office) "should be cultivating and directing both the sense and its progeny?" My reply would be that every one who is in any degree responsible for developing the taste and ideas of others is one of these persons; that is, at least every teacher, performer (or conductor) and critic.

I am not going to attempt to say how this is to be done. To do so would require a long discourse on methods of teaching, programme selection and criticism, which would require a whole evening to discuss, and would probably be somewhat out of place here.

But it is at least the business of every teacher to encourage and direct this sense when it appears in the pupil, whether the pupil be an interpreter or a composer. The method of doing this must depend very largely upon the individual teacher and the individual pupil, and upon the circumstances of each. The experiment I have mentioned gives a good idea of one method; the careful study of the small works of Schumann will do much for the elementary pupil, while in all stages the emotional element in Bach's works must not be overlooked.

The performer and conductor must cultivate the sense within himself;—that is, he must encourage and exercise it, but he must not allow it to run riot; while the critic—and I would remind you that every intelligent listener is a critic—the critic must not be afraid to speak his convictions on the subject, yet must not be rash in arriving at such conclusions.

And when we all practise these counsels of perfection—well, then there will probably be no programme music, for the millennium will have arrived!

---

## DISCUSSION.

THE CHAIRMAN.—We are much obliged to Mr. Antcliffe for his paper, which contains much that deserves thought and consideration. But I fear one can scarcely give it a proper amount of attention without seeing it in print. We want to see it in print to refer to what he has tried to enforce. The word programme to me is a little vague. I am not fond of it in connection with music, because I think of music as *the* art that attempts to give tongue to that which does not exist in this mundane world; to that which belongs to the life beyond in its highest sense; therefore programme can have nothing to do with it. I fancy that if we were to endeavour to make our students—or encourage them to become—familiar with programme music only, then we would not be doing our best possible for them. For we must remember that music is at present in its infancy. I say this though it was practised by the Greeks 2,500 years ago. Pythagoras wrote a treatise about it: and the music which delighted the Greeks—spoke to them, gave great delight to them—was probably very fine programme music; but it would not appeal to us all. The music of each age that has passed by, has had its own music and has appealed to the

generation in which it was produced. And so it is with our art to-day. Music is passing through various phases; it is advancing, and possibly the music which pleases us most will not please a future generation; it will find something better. We hope, at any rate, that it may be so. But what I feel is this, that no kind of instruction to students can ever produce the greatest art. Science and philosophy may do very much; they may enable a composer to write a symphony, an oratorio, or opera, but that symphony, oratorio, or opera may after all be an exercise, or mere arrangement, unless it has at the back of it genius; that can only come from the Almighty, otherwise the music will remain merely a specimen of counterpoint and harmony. No amount of schooling can bring genius; that is given by the Almighty. The differences in the music we listen to are very marked indeed. Some of the music we hear (I will not mention names),—some of it is extremely good; you can find no fault in it; there is nothing wrong in counterpoint or melody, but you cannot compare it with the Beethoven symphonies which had no programme so far as we know (he did write one symphony, the Pastoral Symphony, which was distinctly a programme symphony). Others had no programme attached to them; and in my mind they occupy the highest place because they speak to heart and soul; they do not tell a story, they seem to suggest something that will come hereafter better than we have at the present moment. What I believe we have to do for our students is to put before them the best music; let them see what it is, and not lay down too many rules for them. It is very difficult in a few words to deal with so wide a subject; I submit that music is not a mere question of art, science, and philosophy, but it does depend upon genius which comes from above. For, although our lecturer told us just now we have five senses, yet they are very limited; and I would point out that there is a super-sense, the sense of imagination, of thought which has no limit. Now a genius, like Beethoven, probably has that imagination, that thought, that sense in a higher degree than someone else, and he hears things which are not heard by others. Our senses are limited. For instance, sight. We see a star far off; we know that the light of that star comes straight through darkness, that it takes many thousands of years travelling to us. Surely, then, there may be sounds in the heavens too that take many thousands of years coming to us; and that these can only be appreciated by those to whom the Almighty has given the super-sense of genius: they can hear those heavenly harmonies. I fear that what I have said may have been involved: but this is a deep matter. The secret of good music and of the advance of

music, is in the genius which comes to each generation and succeeding generations, and lifts us on from one plane to another.

Mr. H. H. STATHAM.—I would like to suggest that from the highest point of view the sort of programme music that we should desire is what I would call symbolism in music. I think there are two sorts of defensible programme music. The one is that of such a man as Beethoven, who, in the Pastoral Symphony, has expressed in notes the emotion which a certain scene gave him in order to arouse the same emotion in the hearer. I have a very passionate love of the country myself; and I have felt that the sentiment aroused in me by the first movement of the Pastoral Symphony was so like the feeling aroused by going into the country, that if one could be conscious of the feeling without knowing its cause I could hardly distinguish between the one and the other. I said that once to a non-musical friend with whom I was walking; and I am sorry to say he was entirely sceptical. I think he thought I was humbugging him. Now in the second movement of the Pastoral Symphony there is an instance of what I call material programme music, in those realistic imitations of birds which Beethoven, as I always think, unhappily inserted (I believe as an after-thought) at the conclusion of the movement. You see the whole of that movement is symbolism; it is not the imitation of anything; but at the end he turns from symbolism to realism, and attempts to imitate the voices of birds: and then the non-musical people in the audience look at each other and say "How pretty; there are the birds"; but to my mind it is just the spoiling of what was otherwise a perfectly beautiful movement. There was rather a fine remark made in the analytical programme which accompanied the first performance of Elgar's Symphony that I heard. I do not know the writer, but two or three things in it struck me much. Before the resumption of the principal subject there is a long, descending arpeggio for the harp; and the programme-writer said,—“Surely we may regard this as an obeisance before the entry of a great Presence.” I thought this rather fine; for it indicates the sort of way in which we should regard such a suggestion of music: it is not imitation, but symbolism. In regard to Schumann there is one composition of his, the eighth Novelette, that I have regarded as a sort of sketch of the life of a man: but the only clue to it is furnished by the fact that in the third movement, in D major, which is a kind of hunting song, one may say, he introduces a melody, *pp*, and writes over it “Voice from a distance.” That seems to give the key to the whole; the first movement is a period of struggle; then there is the interlude of gaiety; then the struggle renewed; then the joy of the hunt (the D major movement).

in the midst comes the "Voice from a distance," as a kind of warning. Then the *Finale* is the part in which he finds himself, and he goes on to triumph in the end. It is fine symbolism; there is nothing material in it all. I have always regarded Beethoven's Symphonies as being symbolical; but I think it is just as well that the symbolism is not defined by words. Beethoven at one time had the idea of republishing his sonatas with explanatory notes as to what suggested them. Now I must say we may feel glad he did not do that, because then our imagination would have been confined to one idea; but instead of that we are each of us at liberty to symbolise as we please. The paper is a very interesting one; but, as the Chairman says, the subject is difficult and involved; and I have only endeavoured to express two or three thoughts which it suggested to me.

Mr. J. T. LIGHTWOOD.—I have been much interested in Mr. Antcliffe's paper. I am afraid at the last meeting I rather misunderstood our secretary, and thought that the paper was going to be upon the "Sense of programmes." I thought Mr. Antcliffe was going to criticise the modern programme, and that we were going to have some fun. We have not had the fun; but we have had a very interesting and highly educational paper, and one showing very deep thought on a subject that touches all those who love music. Programme music is a very difficult subject to follow out at the present day. There is programme music and word-painting, and one or two other branches which seem to me to give rather an abstract view of music instead of being, shall I say, descriptive in any way. The story of programme music, of course, goes back right away to the sixteenth century, when we read of attempts being made to give the idea of fair weather and foul weather, etc., upon the virginal, though it must have been hard to give the conception of a storm upon such an instrument. However, the idea of programme music seems to have been a very old one, and has developed with various composers. Bach gives programme music; so does Handel, although with him it is word-painting, rather than programme music, and so right on to the time of Beethoven and down to the present day. I was interested in the reference by the lecturer to the playing of a piece of music arranged for four hands, by some students in the North of England; it seems to me the piece played, Bennett's "Naiads" overture, was one that should have been so familiar to students that it should not have been difficult to define or to determine. It seems to me another branch of programme music is one in which the scheme is such that you are supposed to be able to develop some connection between the title and the piece of music itself. For instance, in Sir Edward Elgar's new Symphony we have the title given to it, "Rarely, rarely,

comest thou, spirit of delight." I wish that title was taken away. I wish we could have heard Elgar's Symphony first; and that we could ourselves have put a title that would occur to us as most suitable. What I mean is that writers seem rather to give away their compositions nowadays; while not infrequently musical critics give their impression of the programme beforehand instead of allowing the hearer to determine upon the programme which the composer intends. The critics, I think, make the music rather too easy for the ordinary concert-goer.

MR. ANTCLIFFE.—I do not know that there is much that I have to reply to in the criticisms which have been made, and which have been by no means so severe as I anticipated, especially from our Chairman who, I had thought, would simply, metaphorically speaking, sit on me. I quite agree as to the question of music not being a matter of teaching. Nevertheless one has to consider the point of view of the teacher and of the learner, because the greatest genius must have his abilities developed by those who are responsible for his education and for his bringing up generally. And, of course, one has to consider in that way the question of imagination. Well, imagination may be drawn forth in various ways. It may come entirely from within, or it may be stirred by something without. I think I should define programme music as being music in which the imagination is stirred by some external matter. Abstract music comes, I suppose, purely from one's imagination without reference at all to anything else. I like the idea of one speaker as to symbolism. Of course programme music is symbolical, and that in a dual way. It may symbolize merely the emotions or imagination, or it may describe material things. But in describing material things its object should be—as probably the greatest programme music writer of to-day keeps attempting to tell us, although he does not always carry out his own ideas—to arouse in the hearer the same emotions which are aroused by those same material things in the composer. Then we are told that the musical critics are making music too easy. I quite agree there. We do not leave enough to the hearer's imagination, which, as I pointed out, you remember, in my paper, is really a crude form of programme music. The more subtle form leaves more to the imagination. So that really, according to my thinking, the composers who are doing most for programme music are not the people who give us long programmes telling us of such details as hammering a nail in the wall to hang a picture on, and that kind of thing. The people who are doing most for programme music are those who give as little suggestion as possible by means of words or pictures or anything else. What we want is to have as much as possible left to the imagination. But

we cannot have everything left to the imagination in all cases, because our imaginations are not sufficiently connected with our senses. Imagination, as our Chairman says, is a God-given gift; the senses are a natural gift. Now we have to unite these two; and therefore we ask for some suggestion from the composer to enable us to unite them. If those of us who are strenuously working for programme music, and if those who are opposing it, can only be got to look at the matter in that way, we shall find it is wonderful how much we agree.

Those present having expressed by acclamation their thanks to Mr. Antcliffe, the proceedings terminated.

---