

RIEMANN

. . in the case of music hearing we are actually dealing with an *accumulation*. For the musician, listening to a piece of music is by no means *only* something temporally flowing, which is over once the final cadence arrives; rather, if he has listened correctly, it is a finished whole within a kind of spatial existence that stands before his soul/mind at the end. Everybody uses the metaphor of construction of a musical piece, speaks of the piling up of motives, etc., and in doing so sets up no mere futile comparison. Rather, the motives grasped by the skilled listener are building blocks, nay, the smallest selfenclosed units of the art work, which he does not stack up in his memory one behind another, rather, which after he has understood them as they flow by temporally, he collates one to another. He actually first constructs as a whole from these parts a number of smaller wholes (thematic patterns), which are collated with one another yet again and that which has come into being temporally finally stands as an actual *spatial thing*, for which the use of the term symmetry app

Riemann's music-psychological arguments reflect similar conceptions of the musical mind as a cognitive agent:

Once again I must emphasize the fact that understanding a large complicated composition requires both practice and good will. Both a grasp of detail and a *conscious ability to trace* the way in which the whole work hangs together, i.e., a good memory and synthetic activity of the mind are needed if the work is not to disintegrate into a series of loosely connected single impressions, none of them very powerful, instead of each supporting, highlighting, and intensifying the other either by analogy or by contrast. (Riemann, 1888, p. 42; Appendix [3])