

UDC 78.01

“ONE’S OWN” AND “SOMEONE ELSE’S”: BAROQUE / 20TH CENTURY

Ketevan Bolashvili, PhD, Associate Professor

Vano Sarajishvili Tbilisi State Conservatoire

Tbilisi, 0108, 8-10 Griboedov str.

The article aims to research such an important and actual to different epochs or style directions issue of artistic thinking, which is related to different forms of self-expression of a composer, in particular, the construction of the artistic text on the basis of "one's own" and "someone else's" musical material.

It should be noted that the creative method of citation, in its broadest sense, is present in the European professional music from the very beginning, but is gaining special importance in the two, chronologically distant from each other, epochs - Baroque and the 20th century. Different forms of citations are found in each of them and, what is interesting, the attitude of authors towards "someone else's" texts also differ. The article analyses the citation principle at different levels, in particular, as a component of the musical language, as a whole text, as well as at the levels of the form, genre and style.

It is noteworthy, how the author's attitude towards "someone else's" text is manifested and how it is changing in various historical epochs, what is its artistic aesthetic goal, to what extent, how and in what conditions "someone else's" is assimilated by "one's own" and in what cases it is not. Thus, it also becomes the relationship of the text and the context.

The conclusion is based on the carried out comparative analysis, what is similar and what is different in the works of the 17-18th and 20th century composers in connection with the issue of the study.

Keywords: Baroque Music; 20th century Music; "One's own" and "Someone else's"; Intertextuality; Text and Context in Music; Creative Method based on Citation-Allusion.

The text, its relationship with another text and the links formed between them are of interest to researchers of different fields - philologists, art historians, philosophers, psychologists, sociologists and others. Here we can mention just a few names of the authors – R. Barthes, M. Bakhtin, H.-G. Gadamer, R. Jakobson, M. Aranovski, etc. [for example, see Barthes, R. (1973); Gadamer, H.-G. (1960); Aranovsky, M. (1998); Bakhtin, M. (1979); Jakobson, R. (1975)]. The specificity of the object of the research generated a multitude of researchers, and the broadness of views about it led to the formation of special terminology necessary for the description and analysis of the phenomenon, which quite precisely and clearly reflects the essence of the phenomenon and all its specific manifestations. Hence, it is difficult to find a new perspective of the research in this area. Therefore, the report is devoted not to general problems, nor to the study of a specific text, but to the characteristics of using and understanding “one’s own” and “someone else’s” texts in the music of the 17th-18th cc. and the 20th century – the two, historically remote, epochs. The aim of the report is to identify the differences and similarities between them.

You will most probably agree that, notwithstanding pronounced historical and stylistic differences, the contemporary music, in its broadest sense, which starts in the first decade of the 20th century on the one hand, and, the Baroque, emerged in the 17-18th centuries on the other hand, are united with such general characteristics as: merging of different styles, instability in the fields of genre and form creation, radical change of the instrumentarium, the advantages of polyphonic thinking, special attitude towards “One’s own” and “Someone else’s” texts, this being the object of the present research, and a wide use of citation principle (however with different aims).

Before I start the comparison of these two epochs in the context of the selected problems, I should note that, in general, the juxtaposition “one’s own – someone else’s” is the defining principle of the existence of the universe, which allows various relationships – enables communication among cultures, personalities, authors. This type of communication can be intra-epochal or cross-epochal. Thus, “one’s own – someone else’s” is one of the most important cultural archetypes, which define such general principles, as individual and general, special and universal, and, also, more specific: stabilization – destabilization, or originality – borrowing.

If we review the concept “one’s own” and “someone else’s” from general aesthetic position, similar, related concepts can be applied to them, namely:

- **one’s own** – specific, definite, close, mine/ours;
- **someone else’s** – alien, different, indefinite, distant, his/hers/theirs.

But in the arts, and namely in music, “someone else’s” is not always alien. In this connection, we may quote Bakhtin saying, “one text is the reflection of all texts” [Bakhtin, 1979]. This is the key idea, which was later developed by R. Barthes, Ju. Kristeva, M. Aranovsky. On its basis they created a term and a concept – ‘intertextuality’ and described the relationships between texts and made their differentiation in the new text and its context depending on the type of implication.

In the literary text, naturally, it is not particularly difficult to differentiate from each other various intertextual phenomena – citation, allusion, plagiarism, etc. But in music it is much more complicated to separate them so clearly. But nevertheless, the juxtaposition “one’s own – someone else’s” is the basis of the European professional music. More specifically, in relation to music, we talk not so much about the opposition, as about the co-existence, as in the European professional music during centuries taking “someone else’s”, using someone else’s text was not prohibited, but, to the contrary, it was obligatory, because the only cradle of the European professional music – the church was regulating its dominion in this manner and this was one of the main signs of professionalism. Accordingly, “someone else’s” here is not “alien”, but it is “one’s own”, the specific support, which determines the existence of an artistic, in this case musical, text.

Here I mean early Middle Ages, when it was unimaginable to **create** a musical piece, in the modern sense. It already existed in the form of a hymn and it was possible to add only a small ‘comment’ to it, first by jubilation, then by duplication of a voice, later adding a new voice, etc. My goal here, of course, is not to focus on these well-known-to-all facts, but it is necessary to remind them, in order to show genetic links of composers of different epochs and their approach/attitude to “someone else’s” text.

Compared to prior epochs, in the Baroque, the freedom from the canons is incredibly big and it is much easier to create “one’s own” than before, but the attitude to “one’s own” and “someone else’s” text is still undifferentiated, undivided. That's why the Baroque epoch is seldom the object of analyses for the intertextuality researchers.

The use of obligatory canonical text of the hymn (i.e. “someone else’s”) in the works of sacred genres is possible much more freely in the Baroque epoch than in the Middle Ages and even in the Renaissance. In addition, there is a new practice – free manipulation with “someone else’s”, in principle “alien” text in the secular music, for example, its interpretation as building material for “one’s own”, or even as “one’s own” – not to say anything about the stereotypical melodic-harmonic and rhythmic models characteristic for the epoch, which migrate from work to work, from the works of one composer to the works of another.

To show the attitude of the Baroque composers to “one’s own” and “someone else’s” text I present different interpretations of chorale in the sacred works (*geistliche Musik*) of German composers:

1. Chorale = cantus firmus;
2. Chorale melody is divided;
3. Chorale melody is the basis of free fantasy.

A similar attitude can be found in someone else's non-canonical text, i.e. while using different methods of variation towards the theme, on the one hand, and on the other hand, as it is known, the

practice of “rewriting” the works of one author, making it “one’s own”, was widespread. One of the most well-known examples of this practice is producing one’s own work by J.S. Bach on the basis of A. Vivaldi’s *L'estro armonico* concertos. As Bach noted: “for my own pleasure” (A. Vivaldi, *Violin Concerto*, op. 3, No. 10 = J. S. Bach, *Konzert für vier Cembali*, BWV 1065).

A question may arise here: who is the author of the piece? The correctness requires referencing both authors, but it is possible to name only one of them, as the identity of the text here is quite relative and there are two different works of two different authors. We have an analogous example in the 20th century music as well, particularly in the case of Webern’s orchestration of Bach’s six-voice Ricercar (Ricercar a 6 from *Das Musikalische Opfer*, BWV 1079). This is Webern’s composition on Bach’s text. It should be noted that in the 20th century music Webern’s Ricercar is an exception among various arrangements and transcriptions. This is due to the fact that, based on Bach’s text, likewise as Bach, based on Vivaldi’s text, created his own composition, conditioned by his own creative individuality and his way of thinking.

The examples of such appropriation of someone else’s text (and making it “one’s own”) are specific for music and occur in different epochs with different intensity. They are specific, because, for example in literature, using someone else’s text in such a manner, of course, would be evaluated as plagiarism. Thus, in a musical composition, unlike a literary work, the **identical** text can create **non-identical** artistic work, due to a different **context**.

In the Baroque epoch, there were not many ways of 'parodying' text, but the same can not be said about the 20th century music. In this epoch the juxtaposition of the concepts “one’s own” and “someone else’s” is much more intense, while the methods and techniques to express this juxtaposition are much more abundant: modeling, citation, collage, allusion and other terms illustrating different examples of the use of the text.

Unlike the Baroque, in the 20th century music the borrowed unit may be not only a text, or its element – musical idioms, intonations migrated from text to text – but the musical language, which is unthinkable in the Baroque due to the system of unified thinking. The examples of language – as a borrowing unit, are especially frequent in Neoclassicism. I can mention here the typical for the Baroque musical language harmonic, melodic etc. elements and the ways of development of musical thought with Stravinsky, Hindemith, de Falla, Prokofiev, Shostakovich. But this kind of attitude towards the language can be found within other styles as well, where modeling is not the general objective. For example, it is possible to use the dodecaphonic series in the non-dodecaphonic composition or in its part, among them in the so-called auto-citation form. In particular, in Berg's *Lyrische Suite* the ton row (from the first part) used only once in the second part performs the function of the content and citation of a structural element from the previous part. Or in Boulez *Structures I*, the use of the order of notes and rhythmic progression of the second movement – *Mode de valeurs et d'intensités* (Mode of Durations and Intensities) from Messiaen's *Quatre études de rythme* (Four Rhythm Studies) as the rows, etc. If Berg uses a variety of citation, Boulez's attitude towards “someone else’s” text is close to *cantus firmus* principle.

The organized atonality and the co-existence of traditional genres and forms in Schoenberg's, Berg's and partially Webern's works can be considered as one more, specific for the 20th century, variety of the relationship of “one’s own” and “someone else’s”. The new musical language and the traditional form of the genre create the very type of relationship that indicates the juxtaposition of two beginnings: language – one’s own, genre and form – someone else’s¹.

Due to the format of the report and the time-constraints I do not focus on such a thoroughly studied phenomenon, as citation/collage, however, for the sake of the issues raised in this report, I should note, that:

¹ Schoenberg's version of relationship of musical language, form and genre led to the severe criticism from Pierre Boulez in his article *Schoenberg est mort* ('Schoenberg is Dead'), as Boulez thought that the 'father' of a new musical language, Arnold Schoenberg did not adequately solve the existing problem.

1. In music, unlike literature and fine arts, from which these terms were originated, frequently it is almost impossible to separate these two phenomena – citation and collage;

2. The implication of someone else's text in a concrete composition, i.e. in "one's own", no matter what we call it, can be used:

a) With the function of "someone else's" text, even when this "someone else's" is "one's own". Here are two examples for clarification: Handel's citation in the Fourth Symphony of Ives, where someone else's = alien, and Berg's auto-citation in *Lulu* from *Wozzeck*, [1095] (as in Mozart's *Don Giovanni*) where alienated = one's own;

b) With the function of "one's own text", for example, Tristan-chord in Berg's *Lyrische Suite* is "appropriated" someone else's. Even more complex form of appropriation of someone else's text occurs, for example, in the *Second Symphony* of Ives, or in the third part of Berio's *Sinfonia*, where "one's own" and "someone else's" are integrated in a unified musical material and transform into **a creative method based on citation-allusion**.

Thus, notwithstanding the variety and differences in the forms and types of using "one's own" and "someone else's" in the two epochs reviewed by me, I can make a final conclusion, that the elements of the juxtaposition given in the beginning: one's own/ours/familiar on the one hand, and someone else's/their/alien, on the other hand, are not always so clearly separated from one another. Depending on the author's idea and attitude towards "someone else's" text and the artistic idea and creative task of the composition, it is possible for "someone else's", i.e. alien, to become "one's own" and vice versa. Therefore, "someone else's" can remain as such, can become "one's own", be appropriated, and, moreover, under certain conditions, it is possible for "one's own" to become "someone else's", alien.

References:

1. Barthes, R. Analyse textuelle d'un conte d'Edgar Poe. In: Sémiotique narrative et textuelle, éd. Cl. Chabrol. Paris: Larousse, 1973, p. 29-54.
2. Barthes, R. Le Plaisir du Texte. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1973
3. Boulez, P. Points de repère; textes réunis et présentés par J.-J. Nattiez. Paris: Seuil, 1981.
4. Gadamer, H.-G. Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Verlag, 1960.
5. Арановский, М. Музыкальный текст. Структура и свойства. Москва: Композитор, 1998.
6. Бахтин, М. Эстетика словесного творчества. Сост. С. Г. Бочаров. Москва: Искусство, 1979.
7. Якобсон, Р. Лингвистика и поэтика. In: Структурализм: "за" и "против". Москва: Прогресс, 1975.

Article received: 2017-05-05