

impressions that are different for every member of the audience.”<sup>74</sup> The complexity is daunting, and with a form featuring concrete visual moorings. Music is even more difficult.

E. M. Forster characterizes the personality of an audience as follows:

There is no such person as the average concert-goer, and no one can speak in his name. Not only does our enjoyment of music differ, but our attention wanders from it in different directions, and returns to it at different angles; so that if the soul of an audience could be photographed it would resemble a flight of scattering dipping birds, who belong neither to the air nor the water nor the earth. In theory the audience is a solid slab, provided with a single pair of enormous ears, which listen, and with a pair of hands, which clap. Actually it is that elusive scattering flight of winged creatures, darting around, and spending much of its time where it shouldn't, thinking now 'how lovely!', now 'my foot's gone to sleep', and passing in the beat of a bar from there's Beethoven back in C minor again!' to 'did I turn the gas off?' or 'I do think he might have shaved'.<sup>75</sup>

Each response is different, as is each receptive program: the extracinemantic frames of reference and experience that the viewer brings to the equation. We have seen the place of connotation and association in the complex ways that music means. Leonard Meyer suggests that susceptibility to musical connotation depends on the individual.

Whether a piece of music arouses connotations depends to a great extent upon the disposition and training of the individual listener and upon the presence of cues, either musical or extramusical, which tend to activate connotative responses.<sup>76</sup>

The diffuseness of response here characterized points again to the difficulty of establishing any kind of rational semiotic system in relation to musical meaning. Frames of reference do not sufficiently coincide. This state of affairs need not be troubling, however, as possibilities of enrichment outstrip the challenges. For this we allow the idea of program to proliferate. Stefani observes that “speaking and understanding a language is different from studying its written grammar and theory.”<sup>77</sup> This is true, especially in music/film music, where language, let alone theory and grammar, is so tenuous. But it still communicates.