

Schoenberg in the Streets: Approaches to a History of Listening to Music

Anne Holzmüller

Understanding of my music *still* goes on suffering from the fact that the musicians do not regard me as a normal, common-or-garden composer who expresses his more or less good and new themes and melodies in a not entirely inadequate musical language — but as a modern dissonant twelve-note experimenter.

But there is nothing I long for more intensely (if for anything) than to be taken for a better sort of Tchaikovsky — for heaven's sake: a bit better, but really that's all. Or if anything more, then that people should know my tunes and whistle them.¹

Towards the end of his life Arnold Schoenberg sounds resigned and a little bitter. It did not have to be Beethoven, but time could at least have made of him “a better sort of Tchaikovsky”. Instead, half a century after his career began, he has still not cast off his status as a “twelve-note experimenter”.

The driver of time that should have been at work here, smoothing out his melodies and turning them into popular, familiar songs, is the transformation of listening, which over the course of history had elevated so many other composers before him to the Olympian heights of musical genius; composers, who at first had been decried as devotees of “new” music and bogeys of the bourgeoisie. Today, not much whistling is heard in the streets any more, but Schoenberg's music even failed to enter comparable popular music practises. Conversely, it is really quite astonishing how the figure of Schoenberg in public perception seems to resist any historical reassessment and remains stuck in the cliché of the dissonant twelve-toner.

The model, which for the people of the early twentieth century — and also for Arnold Schoenberg — verified in the most impressive way the historical progression of music listening, was the music of Ludwig van Beethoven. Adolf Loos described the wondrous transition from enfant terrible to darling of the middle classes satirically exaggerated as a process of anatomical decline:

Since then [since Beethoven's appearance] a hundred years have come and gone, and the bourgeoisie listens, enraptured by the works of the sick, mad composer. Have they become aristocratic [...], and are awestruck, confronted by the will of the genius? No, they have all fallen sick. They have all got the diseased ears of Beethoven. For a century, the dissonances of St. Ludwig have maltreated their ears. Their ears could not bear it. All anatomical details, all ossicles, tubes, eardrums, and trumpets have now got the pathological forms that Beethoven's ears exhibit.²

Loos' satire does have topical value, for it relativises as culturally contingent the Beethoven Cult of the early twentieth century, a cult which today, in the twenty-first century, shows no

sign of abating. But what makes listening change? What are the mechanisms whereby in the course of a hundred years Beethoven becomes a dearly loved national treasure, and in the same number of years allows Schoenberg to remain unknown to the majority of music listeners?

For musicology, these questions were from the outset an elementary and stiff challenge. Correspondingly, the scholarly debate on the issues was subjected to a dialectic of drafting, rejecting, and re-elaborating again. My lecture today also conforms to this dialectic. In the following, I would first like to observe from a theoretical perspective which explanatory models for the change in music listening are used to support the various twentieth-century approaches to a history of listening. On this basis I shall assess critically and reject, before finally re-elaborating and attempting to grasp under which methodological conditions an approach to changes in the history of listening is possible today specifically under phenomenological aspects. I should like to begin for the second time with Arnold Schoenberg.

1. Listening in the Service of the Musical Work

Schoenberg's hope that his music would become popular in the future reveals a lot about his self-image as a composer, about his concept of music history, and about the fundamental role that listening occupies in both. In his essay "Composition with Twelve Tones", he derives in retrospect his method of the twelve-tone technique from the logic of the historical development of music at the heart of which is the change in listening to music.³

Schoenberg, in short, adopts a position here which one might call "inspired formalism". For him, at the beginning of all historical processes of change stands the inspiration of the composer, the creative achievement of the musical genius. The highest goal of a composer must necessarily be to arrive at comprehensibility of the music created — and that means for Schoenberg to achieve an understandable form — which listeners are able to follow. A "satisfied listener" for Schoenberg is a comprehending, understanding listener, and insofar as all composing should have the goal of attaining a comprehensible message through a comprehensible form, achieving resonance in the listeners is the highest precept.

This ennobling of the listeners, however, remains firstly hypothetical for de facto it is the lot of the composer — here Schoenberg sees himself in the company of Wagner and Beethoven — to be unrecognised by contemporary listeners and only later recognised as the genius he

is. Secondly, this is actually only superficial for in the final analysis Schoenberg's model of the history of listening is based on an aesthetic of genius elitism.

What the composer creates — at first against the resistance of the masses and anticipating history — gains the acceptance of the audience only through a “habit” of the ears; that is, through a conventionalising process of listening aesthetics, an audience about whose powers of listening Schoenberg frequently made disparaging remarks.

The example from which he believed he could derive this model inductively and empirically, is the “emancipation of dissonance”, which he saw in the ongoing trend towards chromatic harmonies since the eighteenth century, via Beethoven and Wagner, up to the liberation of sound from its harmonic and functional bonds in Debussy's impressionistic music. “The ear had gradually become acquainted with a great number of dissonances, and so had lost the fear of their ‘sense-interrupting’ effect.”⁴

Schoenberg assumes — with regard to the aesthetics of form — a progressive tendency of the material, which has to be laid open by the inspired creator as a form either “consciously” or “unconsciously”, but yet is given a reception-aesthetic veneer of being oriented on comprehensibility for the listener. Schoenberg understands his twelve-tone technique as the goal of the emancipatory movement of dissonance because it does not privilege certain tonal positions or accords. That they do not encounter the understanding envisaged, have not achieved the intended measure of “comprehensibility”, only shows for Schoenberg that contemporary listeners are not yet sufficiently “equipped”. The listeners, however, will only become “equipped”, meaning “educated”, through the works that operate at the “actual” status of history and in this way set the status quo.

Basically, Schoenberg goes on the assumption of two fundamentally different forms of musical listening: (1) a creative, inspired, “prospective listening” on the part of the composer, who as the leading listener intuits the status of material history and in this way sets in motion processes of change in music history; (2) a passively following, basically dependent listening, which with “music lovers” is more a reflex than a proactive practise, and which must first be shaped by the composer and set upon the right road of history. In this implicit concept of the process of change in the history of listening, the radical movement derives from the tension between the poles of two classes of listening: one takes the lead and shapes, the other follows and through this develops aesthetically. Schoenberg's concept of himself as an artist is based on historical logic that, as a far-sighted creative mind of his time, he ought to have been placed on a par with Bach, Beethoven, and Wagner. His lack of success with the wider

public not only exacerbated his disapproval of the general public's capability to listen, it also became a real identity crisis.

The notion of educating the ear by repeatedly confronting it with new musical sounds as a basis for progress in the history of listening was widespread in the twentieth century even after Schoenberg. Particularly for twentieth century composers it held out the hope of future audiences, who would be more understanding and attentive. In the case of the composer Hermann Heiss, the adaptation of the work-listening hierarchy took on grotesquely concrete features. He represents an anatomic explanatory model in which he understands the adaptation of the ear to the new musical work as a physiological process.⁵ He references the work of the physician Fritz Kahn, whose books on science were extremely popular in the first half of the twentieth century. Heiss quotes from Kahn's book *Der Mensch*.⁶

According to the wonderful law of nature whereby an organ becomes ever more efficient the more demands are made on it, the public dissemination of music through mass production of instruments and particularly through the daily music programmes on the radio will continue to rapidly perfect the listening piano [Hörklavier] in our ear. To the known *four* auditory hair cells will be added the already beginning *fifth* and *sixth rows of hair cells*, and when the listening piano [Hörklavier] in our ear can keep up with the technical instruments with which we cultivate it from the outside, then our instruments — which is already partly the case — will sound thin and poor.

For Heiss as a composer it was most attractive to have the aesthetic *raison d'être* of New Music provided by the irrefutable evidence of biology. Schoenberg's heroic narrative of composer geniuses being "forced" into New Music by their advanced faculty of listening — Heiss called them "the first, always solitary" — was seen now as underpinned allegedly by biological "facts". Heiss' argument that falls back on anatomy may be grotesque — and, incidentally, without the inspirational moment also circular — but it can be read as a kind of prolongation of Schoenberg's formalistic model. In both cases music listening is unfree and does not stand for itself; it is functional and related to the context of the musical work. It represents a function of the musical work to which it is always secondary and subordinate; as a sort of level of comprehending the composer's logic. In the final analysis, for both Heiss and Schoenberg, it is not a change in music listening that is central, but rather the change in the musical material. Music listening follows this change in musical material; in essence it is inscribed in it as an implicit, adequate form of listening.

2. Listening as Experiencing: Earlier Models of a Phenomenological History of Listening

In the first half of the twentieth century, these functional and hierarchical models stood opposed to an alternative line of tradition that centred on the phenomenological dimension of music listening. To thematise listening as “experiencing” music entails removing the one-sided orientation of “understanding” and “judging” the work, and connecting it more with the listeners and their situatedness in everyday life as well as giving more space to the diverse forms and manifestations it may take on.

As early as 1925 Heinrich Bessler had engaged with listening from a phenomenological perspective in his habilitation lecture in Freiburg titled “Grundfragen des musikalischen Hörens” [Fundamental questions of music listening],⁷ which generated controversial discussions. He began with a radical analysis of the music culture of his time, and emphatically rejected a concept of listening, which, as adequate listening, was retroactively indebted to the musical work and its rules. For the diversification of the musical world that had taken place in the modern era made it impossible to comprehend music listening from the “fortunate self-evident position of a cohesive musical tradition”,⁸ as the identification and evaluation of a cohesive system of musical rules. For Bessler, not only the notion of “timelessly beautiful music” à la Eduard Hanslick had been taken to the point of absurdity in the modern age, but also the matter-of-course manner in which listening was supposed to derive “from fundamental issues of classic Romantic harmonics”, as it still was for Hugo Riemann and, one could add, Schoenberg, was definitely passé.

Music listening is for Bessler “a mode of human existence”, which takes part in what has been heard, and reaches out into and is interwoven with the world the listeners live in and the associated mental and physical processes: in movement, in work, and also in spirituality. The sole focus is not on concentrated listening, which we encounter rather as the exception than the rule — a deviation from this mode does not seem even worth considering for Schoenberg and Heiss — but also “listening with half an ear” and the physical “outpouring of active reactions” to music: in dance, the synchronisation of physical movements and work processes in work songs, the communal experience in community singing, the resonance effects of witticisms, eroticism, and intellectual cynicism in cabaret songs, the holistic emotion in songs that are declarations of beliefs or, spiritually, in the context of liturgical music. These are all examples of contexts of music use and its interwovenness with the everyday lifeworld. For it is only in the context of use, in the embedding of music in everyday environments and actions, that humans *listen* while involved in *directly proactive life*.

Besseler understands the history of music listening alongside this connection of music to social and corporeal existence and is critical of contemporary culture as a progress of decline.

This decline of musical existence oriented on making music for use passed through several historical stages of alienation: (1) In the continuous rhythmic flow without contrasts or caesuras of French motets from the twelfth to fourteenth centuries one can perceive the direct corporeal, co-enacting listening of medieval people. (2) Through the gradual substitution of the primacy of rhythm by that of sound, indicated by the caesuras of octaves and fifths in the motet of the fifteenth century, a new aesthetic autonomy and emphasis on the form of music are demanded, which places listeners and music for the first time in an objective relationship of distance and indicates the transformation of co-enactment [Mit-Vollzug] into re-enactment [Nach-Vollzug]. (3) Dependent listening that is merely inward co-enactment of a particular expressive content has entered classical music, as well as the inward “devotion” to what is heard, coupled with an exalted aesthetic that amazes and overwhelms, which according to Besseler destroys all “own activities” on the part of the listener. (4) The final stage of alienation, listening in the age of Romanticism, is only briefly mentioned, but should be understood as a further differentiation of classical listening. Silent, inward listening, “immersion in atmospheres steeped in sound and on the other hand literary and illustrative reinterpretation of musical movement”, is seen by Besseler as the final stage of degeneration, which could almost make one forget “the original meaning of music.”

3. Critique and a New Beginning: The History of Listening as The History of Culture

In 1974 Wolfgang Dömling took stock by exploring, comparing, and analysing various approaches to a history of listening, including Besseler’s. “The problem with the history of music listening”, concludes Dömling, is “obviously circularity”.⁹ The history of music listening “is a complex web of historical, social, and individual conditions”; one ought to call it a “phantom” or a “mirage”.

That for Dömling the question of music listening is self-evidently a “a subject for sociomusicology” is a clear indication of the fundamental shift in perspective that took place in the last third of the twentieth century — a shift away from music listening as a function upstream or downstream of the work, and into the cultural contingency of multifactorially determined individual experiences of the listeners. Dömling’s critique marks a turning point in musicological engagement with music listening, even though from today’s point of view not

all of his points appear completely justified. In the case of Bessler, Dömling ignores the phenomenological and hermeneutic slant of the earlier texts and considers them together with Bessler's later works.

In his habilitation lecture of 1925, which was still clearly oriented on the phenomenological hermeneutics influenced by Martin Heidegger and Willibald Gurlitt, the charge of circularity falls short of the mark. The flowing rhythm here is by no means a tautological sign of "rhythmically flowing listening", but of an existence in which humans and music merge in co-enactment. In the same way, the new stylistic focus on vertical harmony does not point to a "vertical principle", but to a new, conscious way of looking at things, which separates human listener and music. Naturally, such bringing into line of material and a pre-individual principle through which musical forms become the expression of philosophemes or forms of existence, assumes certain causal relations, which today appear to us hermeneutically arbitrary. However, to be accurate, and also fair to the structure of Bessler's argument, we do not have a problem with the inherent circularity, but with the causal linking of style, work, expression, and existence, which is highly speculative.

At the same time Dömling's verdict on the notion of a history of music listening ushered in a longer phase in which issues pertaining to the history of listening were abandoned. It was only in the 1990s under the influence of a cultural studies reorientation of the discipline that there was a new boom in research on the history of listening. In the English-speaking world this new departure is particularly associated with James H. Johnson and his study *Listening in Paris* (1995),¹⁰ which focuses on the phenomenon of audiences falling silent, taking the example of Parisian audiences' reception of Beethoven around 1800. In 1998 Rob C. Wegman looked back at the first years of this new phase.¹¹ The new research on listening conducted in the 1990s was distinguished above all by the fact that it detached itself from the work and saw more in listening than "the mere postlude to the compositional process". However, the new approaches not only abandoned the concept of the implicit listener, but also the intention of uncovering how people actually listened. A methodology that makes its objective "actual listening" assumes the existence of a private, pre-linguistic, pre-conscious, at least not yet predicated "pure experience" over which language, conceptions, and cultural expectations are laid like "layers of falsification". That these layers of cultural appropriation and, as Wegman writes, the "discursive practises" of listening were re-evaluated and became the actual subject of study, represented the real "conceptual breakthrough" of listening studies in the 1990s. In Wegman's wake, who had queried the very existence of such an experience of music ("the experience itself"), came Karol Berger, who in 2005 responded to

Carolyn Abbates' demand for more awareness of pure experience: "There is no such thing as pure experience, uncontaminated by interpretation."¹²

Wegman's term "discursive practise" brings together two methodological concepts, which can both describe listening as the subject of cultural negotiating processes. Using the model of "music practise" following Christopher Small, listening can be understood as one form of music activity among others: music making, singing, composing, and dancing.¹³ The *practise* model emphasises above all the active and performative aspect: "listening" is not a passive operation, but the interplay of rehearsed cultural attitudes and actions. Here Bessler provides important input insofar as he understands listening as musical co-enactment. However, according to the practise model, this co-enactment is not a lost ideal, nor one to be resurrected from a pre-modern age that is succeeded by putative aesthetic contemplation. Rather, every kind of reference, however passive, quiet, or contemplative it may seem, is understood as active behaviour, as action by listening actors, insofar as the acting subject ascribes cultural and/or individual meaning to what is heard. Accordingly, Tia DeNora and Arild Bergh write: "listening needs to be theorised as a form of social practise, even if it takes place in solitude."¹⁴

The second model, the "listening discourse", starts less from the assumption of actual human actions and more from the assigning of cultural meaning and from standardisations, but can certainly be brought in line with the practise model. Martin Kaltenecker describes the theoretical foundations and functioning of a discourse history of music listening that follows Michel Foucault's discourse analysis.¹⁵ To Wolfgang Dömling's scepticism, who regards an independent history as a "complex web of historical, social, and individual conditions" and dismisses it as a phantom, Kaltenecker replies: "This history can be written if the four [...] approaches — circumstances, auditoria, *dispositifs*, discourses — are combined and critically balanced out."

Like Foucault, Kaltenecker understands discourse as a body of critical statements on a specific theme that exhibit a certain cohesion and a systematic relatedness to each other. Thus, according to Kaltenecker, the body of writings, for example, which circulated increasingly as of 1770 and describe "concentrated listening" with comparable (coherent) terms and categories, can be defined as a specific listening discourse. Listening discourses develop their normative power and their influential effects on various levels. Firstly, certain attitudes and practises are rehearsed, prescribed, and transmitted: the obligatory listening in silence to a concert, which is demanded and if necessary enforced by sanctions, shows the influential effects of a discourse of concentrated listening. Secondly, the designing of

appropriate venues as institutionalisation can be understood as a further step in activating the listening discourse; and lastly, Kaltenecker anticipates that this has feedback effects on compositional practise: discourses are reflected in music works where they can be read insofar as they include an implicit listener. For Kaltenecker, however, the “implicit listener” is not the sole premise in a history of listening, but is understood as one veritable, important discourse element amongst others. According to his model, discourses can function to a certain extent as a basis for explaining works, explaining their form, explaining them as expressions of a particular practise, using categories that “stand above or beside technical and manual ones”. Yet discourses can never cover all elements of a work, for like all interpretative access they are based on selection. The discourse model always provides only partial explanations, provokes counter-discourses, and contradicts universalistic historiographic narratives.

4. Outlook: New Paths to a Phenomenological History of Listening?

The approach oriented on cultural attribution of meaning and practises has transformed musicological research on music listening since the 1990s. The recently published *Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries*¹⁶ evidences that historical research of music listening is now established at the heart of the discipline and offers an impressive synopsis of its perspectives, including behaviours and codes of conduct for various social occasions, architecture of venues, musical programme policy, new social spaces, and — obviously — the constantly increasing number of new music media. The heightened cultural and social focus of the new listening studies exhibits in some parts not only diversification, but also tendencies to reformulate certain questions and patterns. One such pattern concerns concentrated listening and the questions of when the audience went silent, how silent it actually was, and to what social status this was connected. This can be exemplified by Katharine Ellis’ compilation of the different interpretations of a watercoloured pen and ink drawing, which has attracted a relatively large amount of attention among researchers: Eugène Lami’s *Andante de la Symphonie en La* of 1840. The picture portrays seven men in a Paris audience, who are obviously members of the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy. Whereas for James H. Johnson (as well as Nicolas Cook and Richard Taruskin) the artist has captured the concertgoers in the new inward-looking mood of being completely absorbed in listening, Cormac Newark detects a number of levels of inattentiveness, and to distinguished art historian Alessandra Comini it is obvious that Lami’s drawing is in fact a

caricature. These divergent positions all centre on the normative power of absorbed listening, which is variously affirmed, relativised, or exposed as a modish pose of the upper classes.

What above all else made listening into a notorious revenant in musicology — the naive and hybrid interest in what happens between listener and music during the act of listening; in short, listening as an experience — has, in the course of such discursive differentiations, been lost sight of, although it in no way must contradict their theoretical premises. As something that does not obstruct everyday acts of interpretation, but is itself negotiated discursively, listening as “experiencing” is capable of connecting to historical discourse methods. Here I would like to offer some methodological consequences: a phenomenological history of listening, which withstands the temptation of recounting changes in listening through time as an overarching tale or as uncovering an immanent logic, and which does not submit its findings to any cyclical, progressional, or degenerative narrative, does not inscribe it with any normative ideas about what music or music listening actually is, must proceed in extremely small steps, has to be meticulous, scrupulously historical, and above all the methodology must be multifactorial. It must focus on single cases, consult the broadest possible range of different sources, take material and practises just as seriously as individual cultural, situative, and psychological dispositions, parts of which will necessarily remain unpredictable. Further, it must re-engage with music works, while exercising caution regarding implicit listener suggestions and avoiding rash speculation about style and effect. I see an opportunity here, if compositional resources could be treated discursively in metatexts over and above their frequent use in similar contexts, or are framed discursively by the specific context of the work, for example, by texts set to music, specific social functions, or occasions for compositions.

I have presented a possible perspective for such a phenomenological new departure in discursively and praxeologically oriented listening research on various occasions taking the example of the immersive listening discourse in the late eighteenth century; that is, a discourse that brings together music listening as a comprehensive spatial experience with the rapt listener transported to a virtual otherworld. This phenomenological historical listening discourse, whose origins lie in the “sensibility” of protestant reception of church music may be comprehended multifactorially on the one side (a) with regard to the many descriptions of rapt listening experiences and their metaphorical references to the angels singing; (b) the discourse-historical roots of this rhetoric in mystic descriptions of ecstatic music experiences and their transmission via the emphasis of sensuality in German Pietism; (c) via the actual spatial acoustics and atmospheric performance circumstances of the listening situations described as tending towards a delocalised sound quality that is spatially comprehensive,

frequently subject to strong reverberations, and with obscure visibility conditions; (d) via specific compositional resources, for example, chord progression tokeys within the circle of fifths that lie far apart, which in contemporary theoretical texts are especially connected with “spatial distance” and “rapt experience of space”.

In a similar way further types of listening experience can be described like the tendency to listen as a “fragmentary, surface-disseminated phenomenon”¹⁷ that Lawrence Kramer believes he has observed in connection with digital audio media, or the inattentive listening at a concert that discursively remains entirely in the dark; a phenomenon which, as Christiane Tewinkel has pointed out,¹⁸ in spite of its undoubted ubiquity has been excluded from cultural consciousness by a negative discourse for it runs counter to the norm of quiet, immobile, concentrated listening. To address such traces of a suppressed discourse or to retrace the negative discourse to which inattentive listening was subjected and maybe still is — this is clearly also on the agenda of a phenomenologically oriented history of music listening.

Translated from the German by Gloria Custance

Notes

¹ *Arnold Schoenberg: Letters*, ed. Erwin Stein, trans. Eithne Wilkins and Ernst Kaiser (London: Faber and Faber, 1974), 243 (letter of 12 May 1947 to Hans Rosbaud).

² Adolf Loos, “Die kranken Ohren Beethovens”, in A. Loos, *Sämtliche Schriften*, vol. 1, ed. Franz Glück (Vienna: Herold Verlag, 1962) 326–327.

³ Arnold Schoenberg, “Composition with Twelve Tones” in *Style and Idea: Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg*, ed. Leonard Stein, (New York: St. Martin’s Press 1975) 216–244.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Hermann Heiss, “Die elektronische Musik und der Hörer”, in *Der Wandel des musikalischen Hörens*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Neue Musik und Musikerziehung Darmstadt, vol. 3 (Berlin: Merseburger, 1962).

⁶ Cited by Heiss in *Die elektronische Musik*, 1962, 42; however, he does not provide a full bibliographic reference for the quotation. Translated from the German by Gloria Custance.

⁷ Heinrich Besseler, “Grundfragen des musikalischen Hörens“ [1925], in *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters* 32 (1926): 35–52.

⁸ *Ibid.* 35.

⁹ Wolfgang Dömling, “‘Die kranken Ohren Beethovens’, oder gibt es eine Geschichte des musikalischen Hörens?” *Hamburger Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft* 1 (1974): 184.

¹⁰ James H. Johnson, *Listening in Paris: A Cultural History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995).

¹¹ Rob C. Wegman, “‘Das musikalische Hören’ in the Middle Ages and Renaissance: Perspectives from Pre-War Germany”, *Musical Quarterly* 10, 1 (1998): 434–454.

¹² Karol Berger, “Musicology according to Don Giovanni, or: Should we get drastic?” *Journal of Musicology* 22, 3 (2005): 490–501, 497.

¹³ Christopher Small, *Musicking: The Meaning of Performing and Listening* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1998).

¹⁴ Arild Bergh and Tia de Nora, “From Wind-up to iPod: Techno-cultures of Listening”, in *The Cambridge Companion to Recorded Music*, eds. Nicholas Cook et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) 102–115, 102.

¹⁵ Martin Kaltenecker, “Zu einer Diskursgeschichte des Hörens”, in *Geschichte und Gegenwart des musikalischen Hörens*, eds. Klaus Aringer, Franz Karl Praßl, Peter Revers, and Christian Utz (Freiburg: Rombach, 2017) 21–42.

¹⁶ *The Oxford Handbook of Music Listening in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, eds. Christian Thorau and Hansjakob Ziemer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

¹⁷ Lawrence Kramer, “Classical Music for the Posthuman Condition”, in *The Oxford Handbook of New Audiovisual Aesthetics*, eds. John Richardson, Claudia Gorbman, and Carol Vernallis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) 48.

¹⁸ Christiane Tewinkel, “‘Everybody in the Concert Hall Should Be Devoted Entirely to the Music.’ On the Actuality of Not Listening to Music in Symphony Concerts”, in Thorau and Ziemer, *Oxford Handbook of Musical Listening*, 477–499.