

## **A Philosophical Investigation of Multi-Modality**

### Second assignment

When a classical music composer such as Franz Liszt composes a piece of art he is certainly thinking. The problem that lies ahead of us is discovering, through the musical piece, what he was thinking about when he wrote the notes that, combined, structure the musical work.

I personally don't think that this is possible. While the listener can surely make up his own interpretation of the work that is being examined he can never truly get exactly the same meaning as the composer originally tried to deliver. The reason for this isn't just a single flaw in the equation but rather a set of different problems that work as a whole to accomplish the goal of destroying the original meaning, as if it were an intellectual and a malicious beast.

I cannot list all those problems since I am not omniscient but I can try to elaborate some of the difficulties the listener runs into while interpreting music. First of all we must always keep in mind that the composer composes a piece that is, more often than not, made for the sheer purpose of expressing his feelings. That work then travels maybe 200 years in time and is then performed by a performer such as Bill. That performer has his own ideas about the piece, how it should be played and what it should deliver, but that doesn't necessarily have to be the correct interpretation of the piece. After that the notes fly through the atmosphere and hit the audience like a wave of mystery and the audience finds themselves in the position of the judge.

What this tells us is that the meaning of music goes from the composer, to the performer and then to the audience. The audience will then try to interpret the music as they see fit and eventually they come to a conclusion. A conclusion that must differ from the one the composer originally came to.

Music is a universal language, but it has acquired that title because of the fact that it has no definite meaning, no right answer. As long as the meaning of music remains as mysterious and liquid as it seems to be, there will always be a burning bridge between the composer and the listener.

But then again, who can rightfully claim the right meaning of a song? Even though the composer thought of something very particular when writing a certain piece of musical history then it doesn't have to imply that he got the meaning right. The music that comes forth must be universal and as such it cannot have a single right meaning.

Thus it is my conclusion that since music is universal in context to language and meaning then it can't have a single right meaning because of the fact that if people, and they most certainly do, interpret the same music differently, then the answer must be that music is in the "eye" of the beholder.