

derstanding of classical music in film. To conclude I wish to briefly discuss how a certain indeterminacy, or perhaps an unpredictable multiplicity, aids that understanding.

I have argued that it is between strict parallelism and traditional figurative counterpoint that musical meaning is actually found, and that collisions, and syntheses too, are predicated on programs. Similarly I would like to suggest that the tentative space between the artist's intention and the receiver's apprehension is where this meaning can be contextualized. Though certainties may be professed on either side, classical music as appropriated and heard is, to a great degree, indeterminate.

In his compositions and other presentations John Cage relinquished authorial control, at least in its conventional sense.⁸⁶ There were also receptive, listener implications stemming from this relinquishment. The combined result was indeterminacy, which is to say, with all the points of address and apprehension, reference, and subjectivity, anything can happen.

There are critical applications for this broad generalization. There are specifically musical sites for the sender/receiver/context topography that Janet Staiger describes, and that I cited at the beginning of this chapter. In his *The American Film Musical*, Rick Altman suggests a useful model to account for the construction and communication of meaning, in film and elsewhere.

Meaning, as I will define it, is never something that words or texts have but always something that is made in a four-party meaning-situation. An *author* (understood in the widest possible sense: individual, group, industry, etc.) circulates a *text* (which may vary from a single word, image, or gestures to multiple volumes) to an *audience* (singular or plural, present or removed) whose perception is partly dependent on the *interpretive community* to which its members belong. . . . The model I am proposing has no message, that is no specific meaning that may be permanently ascribed to a given text. Instead, a text turns into a message (or different messages) only in the context of a specific audience in a specific interpretive community. . . . The interpretive community may thus be defined in part as a *context* in which the text is to be interpreted; the interpretive community names the *intertexts* that will control the interpretation of a given text.⁸⁷

The phenomenological parallels of this statement are clear. With regard to the sender/receiver axis, Altman refers to two lev-