

Session 2 → opening remarks

CD - written not for us! Eavesdropping on a very specific philosophical conv. in divided Germany, ca. 1965 - 1977

- E/W Germany + Berlin (Frei Universität)
- post-1968 → cultural left (Red Brigades, Maoists, etc.) out to overturn institutions, radically opposed to traditional academic approaches (hist/musology) and 'all non-socially committed academic withdrawals such as aestheticism + "formalism"
- Gegenkongress
- Plus → Suspicion of Germanic art music tradition (stained, appropriated) → How could we dare to praise these things as mere "style" "philosophy" "craft." (Position of left → to "expose" their complicity)

One major site of attack

→ Regarding music (esp 19th 20th) as

AUTONOMOUS (existing in its own world of

AS A "WORK" → STABLE TEXT beauty, apart from social significance) -

∴ Hot-button wedge issue (art = old-fashioned, conflict) + "beauty" etc.

∴ Defending autonomy is tricky → keeps music "clean"?

The right to look at music (+ enjoy it) as MUSIC.

All tied in w/ Germanic history (incl. 3rd Reich + new divided nation)

and with Germanic philosophy + social thought -

Esp → Various strands of Marxism + neo-Marxism

→ Antihumanist Structuralists (esp Foucault) (incl. Adorno - Habermas)

→ German historical/sociological tradition (Dilthey, Weber)

→ Jugend, Heidegger, Jass - Gadamer

→ Russian formalists

AND MUCH MORE

"Autonomy"
"Beauty"
"the work"
"aesthetic presence"

decided as
superstructural
bourgeois concepts

Words that
we might
pass over
with a shrug
in this
discourse

Autonomy: Dahlhaus

Dahlhaus, *Foundations*, 109 (*Grundlagen*, 175): "For our purposes a musical creation [Gebilde] is autonomous [als autonom zu bezeichnen, wenn:]

- 1) if it manages to raise and enforce a claim to be heard in its own right [um seiner selbst willen gehört zu werden], thus giving form precedence over function, and
- 2) if it constitutes a work of art in the modern sense, i.e. a work freely conceived and executed with no influence on the part of a patron or purchaser as regards its content or external form [um Werke, also, die als freie Kunst ohne Einfluß eines Auftraggebers auf Inhalt und Erscheinungsform entstanden sind]."

3) Also [modifying 1 and 2 above]: music that is autonomous is supposed to be listened to for its own sake instead of accompanying or embellishing an extramusical event. This invites work-immanent interpretation as a [primary] manner of understanding. (Dahlhaus, "The Musical Work of Art as a Subject of Sociology," *Schoenberg and the New Music*, p. 237)

Related:

- a) Among those who had an interest in perpetuating the "autonomous-art" system in the nineteenth century, social "function" was actually considered a term of reproach (*Foundations*, 110); works that were self-evidently functional tended to be scorned.
 - b) "Art" typically exempted itself from marketplace values in the nineteenth century (*Foundations*, 110, 111)—thus suggesting to some that it might be an alternative to them.
 - 1) For example, in some interpretations art actually became the *model* for non-alienated labor (*Foundations*, 110, 114) [especially within certain sectors of humanist-socialist thought].
 - 2) "Art music" often worked against its own economic interests: it resisted market principles insofar as it shied away from replicating commercially successful models (*Foundations*, 110, 111, 116, 145).
-
-

Autonomy: Supplements to Dahlhaus

- 4) Following Kant, an autonomous work or an autonomous rational being is one that is "able 'to give the law to itself' [this is the literal, etymological meaning of "autonomous"], as opposed to being 'heteronomous' by accepting a pre-given law from a source external to its capacity for free decision. . . . What is essential to art [that claims autonomy] is its radical separation from other kinds of truth, by virtue of its irreducibility to being judged in terms of anything but itself [for example, in terms of religion, science, or philosophy]" (Andrew Bowie, in David Cooper, ed., *A Companion to Aesthetics* [1992], p. 33)

Cf. Niklas Luhmann, "The Work of Art and the Self-Reproduction of Art," p. 196: "The 'aestheticization' of art [i.e., its autonomy] requires in addition [to the time-honored arousing of 'astonishment'] that only the work of art itself can answer the questions that it raises and that neither knowledge of its style nor of its function is sufficient as an answer. 'Astonishment' is thus relieved of all kinds of functions of directing attention in the interest of religion, morality, and politics. . . ."

- 5) Bowie, p. 35, paraphrased: In confronting the specifics of a text or utterance (a poem, a piece of music, a painting), if we attend to the text's internal textures, idiosyncrasies, and specifics (its "deviations" from everyday conventions), and if we are convinced that inviting us to experience those deviations—the special, performative uniqueness of *this* utterance—is what the utterance is most fundamentally about, then we are treating the work as "aesthetic" or autonomous. If, on the other hand, we believe that we can and should see through or "correct" the deviations in order to explain or decode what the work is *really* communicating, then the claim of autonomy will collapse and the "correction of the deviations will have a higher truth status than the text itself." In this latter model the internal meaning of a non-verbal text, for example—such as instrumental music—will be subordinated to the language of philosophy, religion, social analysis, and so on. [Bowie concludes that the German Romantics—early nineteenth century—tended toward the former view, while Hegel and Hegelians tended toward the latter.]

To which one might add:

- 6) Autonomous art (in any period) is that which, as an apparently *primary* invitation, calls forth (or demands) the complementary creation/assemblage of an educated audience of connoisseurs—an "educated public" or an educated group or sector of the public—that is willing to treat the presented artwork as autonomous. Notwithstanding the obvious circularity here, the suggestion is that the concept of autonomy is inextricably linked to the concepts of education, training, and connoisseurship, and it requires both leisure time and the willingness to use leisure time to pursue these ends. We are dealing, albeit in various gradations of strength, with elite repertoires for a special, committed public. (It would follow that autonomous art must in part exist to serve the personal or social interests of that public—that that public in question must have an interest in accepting the autonomy postulate. Is this a conclusion that begins to challenge the autonomy postulate itself?)

and (related):

- 7) Among that community of connoisseurs, the consensus will generally be that, among a plurality of ways that one might attend to an artistic utterance, this savoring of inner relationships and "made-ness" is the appropriate and superior way.

RUSSIAN FORMALISM

RUMANIAN POETRY. See ROMANIAN POETRY.

RUNE (or *futhork*, as it is named from the first letters of its series). A character of the Old Germanic alphabet, probably derived partly from Gr. and partly from Lat. characters. From about the 4th c. A.D., rs. were widely used for inscriptions on such objects as weapons, coins, and memorial stones; they also occur in Anglo-Saxon, Icelandic, and Norwegian poems, where the individual letters are to be translated into the body of the verse as common nouns. Certain rs. (e.g. in Eng. the r-words *wyn*, *thorn*, *ethel*, *dæg*, and *man*) were introduced into native scripts with the advent of Christianity, and served thereafter as regular characters or, more occasionally, as a kind of shorthand. From early times rs. were associated with incantation and magical practices (the word itself meant "whisper, mystery, secret counsel"). The surviving Old Germanic poems which use them as special letters are either gnomic-didactic in character (e.g. the OE *R. Poem*) or else recall more superstitious uses, as when the OE poet Cynewulf signs his works with the rs. for his name woven into the verses so that his readers may pray for him.—H. Arntz, *Bibliographie der Runenkunde* (1937), *Handbuch der Runenkunde*, 2d ed. (1944), "Runenkunde," *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss*, ed. W. Stammler, v. 3 (1957); R. Dérolez, *Runica Manuscripta* (1954); R. I. Page, *Rs.* (1987); R. W. V. Elliott, *Rs.: An Intro.*, 2d ed. (1989).

J.B.B.; T.V.F.B.

RUNNING RHYTHM (common rhythm). Term coined by Gerard Manley Hopkins to denote the standard rhythm of Eng. accentual-syllabic verse measured, in traditional prosody, by feet of two or three syllables. The rhythm is said to be rising if the stress occurs at the end of the foot (iamb, anapaest), falling if the stress occurs at the beginning of the foot (trochee, dactyl) (see RISING AND FALLING RHYTHM). If the stress occurs between two unstressed or "slack" syllables (amphibrach), however, Hopkins calls it "rocking rhythm." Even though Hopkins describes these distinctions as "real and true to nature," his own rhythmic alternative, sprung rhythm (q.v.), whose feet, for scansional convenience, always take the stress on their first syllable (falling), is equally "the most natural of things," despite appearances.—"Author's Preface," *The Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. W. H. Gardner and N. H. MacKenzie, 4th ed. (1967).

P.F.; C.S.

RUN-ON LINE. See ENJAMBMENT.

RUSSIAN FORMALISM. A school in Rus. literary scholarship which originated in the second decade of the 20th c. and was championed by unorthodox philologists and students of lit. such as Boris Eichenbaum, Roman Jakobson, Viktor Šklovskij, Boris Tomaševskij, and Jurij Tynjanov.

The main strongholds of the Rus. Formalist movement were the Moscow Linguistic Circle, founded in 1915; and the Petrograd "Society for the Study of Poetic Lang." (*Opojaz*), formed in 1916. The initial statement of the Formalist position is found in the symposium *Poetics: Studies in the Theory of Poetic Lang.* (1919) and in *Modern Rus. Poetry* by Jakobson.

The Formalists viewed lit. as a distinct field of human endeavor, as a verbal *art* rather than a reflection of society or a battleground of ideas. They were more interested in the poetry than in the poet, in the actual works than in their alleged roots or effects. Intent upon delimiting literary scholarship from contiguous disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and intellectual history, the Formalist theoreticians focused on the "distinguishing features" of lit., on the artistic devices peculiar to imaginative writing. In Jakobson's words, "the subject of literary scholarship is not lit. in its totality, but *literariness*, i.e. that which makes of a given work a work of lit."

According to the Formalists, imaginative lit. is a unique mode of discourse characterized by an "emphasis on the medium" (Jakobson) or "perceptibility of the mode of expression." In literary art, esp. in poetry, it was argued, lang. is not simply a vehicle of communication. From a mere proxy for an object, the Word becomes here an object in its own right, an autonomous source of pleasure as the multiple devices at the poet's disposal—rhythm, meter, euphony, imagery—converge on the verbal sign in order to dramatize its complex texture.

In defining the locus of "literariness," the Formalists, most notably (Sklovskij) took issue with a time-honored theory which proclaimed the use of images as the outstanding characteristic of imaginative lit. It is not in the presence of imagery, urged the *Opojaz* spokesmen, but in the *use to which it is put* that this differentia should be sought. If in informative or didactic prose a metaphor aims to bring the subject close to the audience, to drive home a point, in literary art it serves the opposite function. Rather than translating the unfamiliar into the terms of the familiar, the poetic image (defamiliarizes) or "makes strange" the habitual by presenting it in a novel light, by placing it in an unexpected context.

These methodological assumptions were tested in acute studies of rhythm, style, and narrative structure. Probably the most fruitful field of Formalist endeavor was the theory of versification. To the Formalists, verse is not merely a matter of a set of mechanical rules or even of external embellishments, such as meter, rhyme, or alliteration, superimposed upon ordinary speech. It is an integrated type of discourse, qualitatively different from prose, with a hierarchy of elements and internal laws of its own—"a speech organized throughout in its phonic texture." The notion of rhythm as a *Gestaltqualität*, a structural property

New Princeton
Encyclopedia
Poetry and
Poetics

RUSSIAN FORMALISM

operative at all levels of poetic lang., helped elucidate a crucial problem of poetics—that of the relationship between sound and meaning in verse.

The Formalist approach to lit. was a far cry from that single-minded concern with "social significance" and "message" which dominated so much 19th-c. Rus. lit. crit. Consequently, the Formalist research in the masters of Rus. lit. resulted in dramatic re-examinations. Gogol's famous story "The Overcoat," hailed by its contemporaries as a moving plea for the "little man," became under the pen of Boris Eichenbaum primarily a piece of grotesque stylization. Puškin, viewed this time at the level of style and genre rather than of *Weltanschauung*, appeared as a magnificent culmination of 18th-c. Rus. poetry rather than as the father of Rus. romanticism. And the moral crisis of the young Tolstoy was reinterpreted in largely aesthetic terms as a struggle for a new style; as a challenge to romantic clichés grown stale. In dealing with current literary productions, the Formalist critics favored inventiveness, aesthetic sophistication, a search for new modes of expression. In visual arts they encouraged such trends as constructivism and cubism (qq.v.).

At first the Formalist spokesmen extravagantly overstated their case. In their early studies Jakobson and Sklovskij played down the links between lit. and society and denied the relevance of any "extra-aesthetic" considerations. Eventually, in the face of a concerted attack on the part of Soviet Marxists, they made an effort to combine aesthetic analysis with a sociological approach to lit. But this attempt at synthesis came too late. In 1929–30 the methodological debate in the Soviet Union was rudely discontinued by Stalin. With Soviet crit. being whipped into orthodoxy, Formalism was suppressed as a heresy. Consequently, since 1930 "Formalism" has been in Soviet parlance a term of censure, connoting undue preoccupation with "mere" form, bourgeois "escapism," and like offenses.

If in Russia the Formalist movement was stopped in its tracks, however, during the Thirties its influence was felt in other Slavic countries, esp. Czechoslovakia and Poland. The theorists of so-called Czech structuralism grouped around the Prague Linguistic Circle (see STRUCTURALISM, Prague School), Dimitry Cizevsky, Jan J. Mukařovský, René Wellek, and, last but not least, Roman Jakobson, who had lived in Prague since 1920, restated the basic tenets of Rus. F. in more judicious and rigorous terms.

Viewed in a broader perspective, Rus. F. appears as one of the most vigorous manifestations of the modern trend toward structural analysis of lit. and art which made substantial inroads into Eng. and Am. literary study through the 1960s. Formalist doctrine has many points of contact with Am. New Criticism (q.v.), esp. its "organicist" variant, as represented by Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren. Brooks' emphasis on the organic unity of a poem (see ORGANICISM), with the con-

comitant warning against the "heresy of paraphrase," his keen awareness of the "ambiguity" (q.v.) of poetic idiom and "the conflict-structures" resulting from this ambiguity, such as irony and paradox (qq.v.)—all this is closely akin to the later phase of Formalist theorizing. Perhaps one should add that the affinity between these two schools of thought rests on analytical procedures rather than on criteria of evaluation. While the majority of Anglo-Am. New Critics have worked toward some flexible yet absolute standards applicable to lit. of various ages, the Rus. Formalists frankly espoused critical relativism.

In the last three decades, the influence of Rus. F., esp. in its mature structuralist version, has made itself felt on both sides of the Atlantic. If Prague structuralism was afforded little scope in the postwar period for testing of its hypotheses, one of its chief architects, Roman Jakobson, having settled in the U.S., elaborated a new dimension of structural poetics by exploring the ways in which poetry makes use of grammatical oppositions. In post-Stalinist Russia, a group of scholars based respectively in Moscow and Tartu (Estonia), notably Vsevolod Ivanov, Jurij Lotman, Vladimir Toporov, and B. Uspenskij, have been engaged in a concerted effort to tackle problems of lang., lit., and culture along structuralist-semiotic lines (see STRUCTURALISM, Moscow-Tartu School). A somewhat different brand of structuralism came in the 1960s to dominate much of the critical discourse in France (Roland Barthes, Gérard Genette, J. A. Greimas, Tzvetan Todorov), owing in no small measure to the increasing awareness of the Rus. Formalist legacy, an awareness furthered by the anthologizing and interpretive activities of Todorov (see STRUCTURALISM, French and American Schools). See also CRITICISM; INTERPRETATION; POETICS; THEORY.

Poetika. Sborniki po teorii poetičeskogo jazyka (1919); V. Šklovskij, *O teorii prozy* (1925); B. Tomaševskij, *O stixie* (1929); R. Jakobson, *Selected Writings*, 7 v. (1962–85), esp. "Linguistics and Poetics" and "Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry" in v. 3; "Slavic Epic Studies" in v. 4, and "O češskom stixie" in v. 5; K. Pomorska, *Rus. Formalist Theory and Its Poetic Ambiance* (1968); J. Striedter, *Texte der Russischen Formalisten*, 2 v. (1969–72), *Literary Structure, Evolution, and Value* (1989); E. M. Thompson, *Rus. F. and Anglo-Am. New Crit.: A Comparative Study* (1971), "F" in Terras, *Readings in Rus. Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*, ed. L. Matejka and K. Pomorska (1971); F. Jameson, *The Prison-House of Lang.* (1972); *Formalist Theory*, ed. A. Shukman and L. M. O'Toole (1977); R. H. Stacy, *Defamiliarization in Lang. and Lit.* (1977); A. Hansen-Löve, *Der Russische Formalismus* (1978); F.: *History, Comparison, Genre*, ed. A. Shukman (1978); V. Erlich, *Rus. F.: History-Doctrine*, 3d ed. (1981); P. Steiner, *Rus. F.: A Metapoetics* (1984); *Rus. F.: A Retrospective Glance*, ed. R. L. Jackson and S. Rudy (1985). V.E.

Carl Dahlhaus, *Foundations*, Chapter 8:
 “The Relative Autonomy of Music History”

- 108-12 Initial *entrée*: identifies “relative autonomy” as a category that was part of the intellectual tradition of those who now criticize the concept (most notably, Germanic Marxists c. 1970). Problematizes the definition of “autonomy”: search for a middle course. Objects to a casual identification of “autonomy” with the “bourgeoisie” and mercantile values—on both the production and reception side of the issue. Non-autonomous works can come to be treated autonomously in later ages. The point: to insure that “autonomy”—even “relative autonomy”—will stick as a valid historical consideration, that it will not be dismissed out of hand.
- 113-16 But how should a historian use the concept—what kind of emphasis should be placed on it? Initial consideration of sharply differing Marxist constructions of the concept: as moral precept; as bad faith (mere ideological delusion), as the foreshadowing of a concrete utopia. Autonomy: moral or immoral? Considerations of each of these constructions. Problems associated with the “double truth” claim made by Marxists.
- 116-21 Arguing on behalf of “methodological pluralism”: **five objections** to the Marxist “hierarchy thesis” (society as essentially = economic base + superstructure)
- 1) Hierarchy thesis prematurely (and dogmatically) closes off other, more flexible, pluralistic options of analysis and inquiry. Flaws: *dogmatism*, arbitrary *decisionism*, and *irrelevance*. (Also introduces “accent theory” of selective highlighting, p. 117)
 - 2) Base-superstructure hypothesis needs verification.
 - 3) Driving forces of history probably change from age to age. (Not all ages are economically determined.)
 - 4) “Reductionism”: the search for deep roots and ultimate causes leads one, in practice, into explanations that actually seem irrelevant (not worthwhile) to the matter at hand.
 - 5) Other factors drive history besides economics and the means of production: achievement, status, *Bildung* (self-formation through education), etc.
- 121-26 Retraces the ground of 116-21 from a slightly different perspective: **five objections** to the Marxist “totality postulate” (the insistence that all superstructural analysis must be brought back persistently to the “real history” in the base)—again, arguing in the defense of methodological pluralism and the validity of the self-standing artwork:
- 1) The aims of the totality postulate are unrealizable in actual practice: whoever tries to reduce complex issues to the same principles inevitably produces the same stereotyped explanations for everything. (Introduction of idea: “History” vs. “Histories,” CD supporting the latter.)
 - 2) Social histories may be of value, but they are not histories of *music*.
 - 3) The notion of “context” may be expanded infinitely: what are its practical limits?
 - 4) Central problem: noncontemporaneity of the contemporaneous.
 - 5) “History” in its entirety can never be grasped.
- 126-29 THE SOLUTION: ONE OF CD’S “CREDO” PASSAGES (grounded in ideas of the Russian formalists, but updated, problematized, and modernized): embrace of at least “relative autonomy” and the notion of artwork responding to artwork. CD will revisit and expand the arguments of Ch. 8 in Ch. 9: the point will be to expand the *contra* argument beyond Marxism *per se*—to extend it to *any* structuralist system.

845b: PRESENTATION PROCEDURE

Normally, each set of readings will be considered or discussed for about forty to fifty minutes. For each set, one seminar-participant will take on the role of the presenter, launching the discussion; the others will be respondents. The current schedule aims for two or three short presentations in each seminar-session.

AS PRESENTER: deliver a 7- to 10-minute quasi-formal talk (no longer!) to the seminar. You may want to read the draft of a short paper, or you may prefer to work from notes. Whatever your decision, your information must be organized, interesting, significant, and efficient.

1. You are responsible for having immersed yourself in the content/world of that set of reading materials. Submit it to careful study; whenever desirable seek additional sources to clarify what we have all read. You may wish to seek out copies of selected books/articles mentioned to get a sense of what they are like. Everyone else will also have read "your" set of readings, but in general you are expected to have done the task more thoroughly.
2. Choose an important paragraph, central point, or constellation of central points within the assigned set. Search for the key paragraph or page that unlocks the whole or that presents or exemplifies the basic argument in succinct form. Do not select a side-issue to the main point. Why is your choice an important one?

Once you have selected carefully, engage its ideas critically. This can be done from a number of standpoints: perhaps from the perspective of what we have already read as a class (how are the controversies and debates shaping up? weaknesses, strengths?; who would agree? disagree? on what grounds?); perhaps from the standpoint of the discipline of musicology or music theory as a whole: practical implications?; etc. Remember: we have all read what you have read. What can you tell us that will advance our understanding of the reading or that will react to it in a way that will be productive and illuminating? Whenever possible, take an informed position regarding the content: avoid bland, banal, or tepid presentations. (On the other hand, nobody is expecting you to rush to judgment.)

3. Suggestions. We might be interested in such things as:

- a) Practical applications: Why could such a point be important to (your own?) work in musicology/theory or to musicology/theory in general? (If it's not important—or if it's all too obvious—choose another point.)
 - 1) When appropriate, provide some concrete examples of how this could be helpful in a given repertory, a given piece, a given musical problem, and so on. (If this is self-evident—as it often is—do something else unless you have a new, perhaps unforeseen angle to present.)
 - 2) What are the risks, the possible abuses, the potential pitfalls or likely criticisms from such an approach?
- b) What can you tell us about the paragraph/point that might help us to understand it more thoroughly? (Would a fuller explanation be helpful?) Are there crucial ramifications of the issue that less thorough readers are likely to miss? If you decide to make your presentation an “explanatory” one, first assure yourself that we are likely to need the explanation you are providing. Sometimes we do not.
- c) Offer a critical analysis of the reasoning that most fundamentally underpins your reading-set. Can the argument be accepted at face value? Is it overstated? Outdated as a result of more recent—and more appropriate or sophisticated—modes of thought? Manifestly biased? Does it overlook anything?
- d) What would be the expected counter-argument from traditional empirical musicology/theory? Or from Dahlhaus? Or from...? What grounds would you use to assess these arguments?

3. You are expected to submit a formal paper/essay one week after each of your three seminar presentations—with copies distributed to everyone in the seminar: 1200 to 1500 words.

AS RESPONDENT:

- 1. It might be appropriate to respond to the position/argument made by the presenter, particularly if a strong position was taken.
- 2. Be prepared to indicate the aspect of the reading-set that most caught your attention or that seems most provocative or promising for historical or theoretical work. What was your response? What was provocative about it to you? Do the arguments seem up-to-date? Dated? Etc.
- 3. Be prepared to relate the reading-set to positions taken in work that we have already read.
- 4. Be prepared to make a general assessment of the utility to music history or theory of the methodology outlined in the essay. Which things won't work? Which will?