

liturgically, theatrically, and domestically. It is the difference between the frame and the fresco; high art absorbed separately, exaltedly versus an integrated, integral part of experience and the praxis of life. Although we have heard claims that program music is emblematic of the generally appalling level of taste in the nineteenth century, I would argue for additional interpretation. If there were individual lapses in taste and execution, then it can still justly be argued that in general program music bridged the increasing distances between composers and listeners, between creators and receivers. We will also see that it can still do so.

I have just mentioned program's democratic potential, and I use that word in the traditional, documentary sense.⁶⁴ This is to say that previously underheard, underattended voices (the British working class, and so on) gain some access to the discussion, and are even able to alter the terms of that discussion. Egalitarian parallels in film/musical areas are numerous. In composition, the Vienna school had attacked tonal hierarchies and the tyranny of melody, which attack revolutionized twentieth-century musical culture. There is also a clear paradox here; serial music, while eliminating some elemental hierarchies, was also deemed to be superlatively inaccessible and elitist. These would seem to be irreconcilable accounts, and yet both interpretations clearly bear truth.

This contradiction also informs my own opening characterization of musicology's mingled validity and elitism, or at least insularity. Debates over program are similarly split, and just as susceptible to synthesis. "Democracy" enters this discussion as hierarchical breakdown extends beyond musicological settings into areas of reception and use. We have already discussed how increased attention to music can help to break down the traditional hierarchy of film elements—the primacy of picture and dialogue, and purposes—narrative first. Increased, disciplined musical attention also contributes to the breakdown of the traditional, still powerful subordination of the spectator to the artist.

In the first chapter I spoke briefly of the work of Donald Tovey, Leonard Meyer, and Deryck Cooke. They sought in their writings to make erudite musical matters accessible, a project that was not appreciated by all musicians. For some of these musi-