

Nationality vs Universality

Nationality vs Universality:

Music Historiographies in Central and Eastern Europe

Edited by

Sławomira Żerańska-Kominek

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Nationality vs Universality:
Music Historiographies in Central and Eastern Europe

Edited by Sławomira Żerańska-Kominek

English Language Editors: John Comber and Tomasz Zymer

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2016 by Sławomira Żerańska-Kominek and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-8578-9

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-8578-2

This publication was financed with the support of the Institute of Musicology, University of Warsaw and The Fryderyk Chopin Institute, Poland.

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Sławomira Żerańska-Kominek	
The Musical Work-Concept as Discourse and Consumption	1
Reinhard Strohm	
Central and Eastern Europe in History and in Musicology	14
Irena Poniatowska	
“The Greatest Before Chopin”: In Search of the Heroes of Early Polish Music	29
Paweł Gancarczyk	
Constructing the Figure of a National Composer: The Case of Jacobus Handl-Gallus (1550–1591) in Central European Music Historiography of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries.....	40
Marc Desmet	
Changes in Music Historiography in Relation to Chopin	65
Zofia Chechlińska	
Stanisław Moniuszko as a National Prophet: Facts and Myths	73
Agnieszka Topolska	
The Nationalist Effect of Wagner’s Operatic Charisma	89
Michael Fend	
From Tragedy to Romance, from Positivism to Myth: Nejedlý’s Conception of the History of Modern Czech Music.....	99
Miloš Zapletal	
The “Question of Nationalism” in Hungarian Musicology during the State Socialist Period.....	125
Lóránt Péteri	

National or Universally Germanized? The Formation of Musical Life in Twentieth-Century Finland as a Transcultural Process	145
Vesa Kurkela	
The Significance of the Ancient Greek, Byzantine and Modern Greek Folk Music Traditions in the First Music Historiographies of the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century and the Period up to the Second World War in Greece	155
Spiridoula Katsarou	
Zdeněk Nejedlý's Historical Narrative and Ideological Construction of Czech Medieval Music History	175
Hana Vlhová-Wörner	
Richard Rybář's Theory of Music Historiography in the Context of Central European Musicology	196
Janka Petőczová	
Racism in Nazi Historiography and Concepts of Music Theory	212
Andrzej Tuchowski	
The Historiography of Border Regions: From the National to the Palimpsestic View: The Case of Silesia	239
Krzysztof Stefański	

PREFACE

ŚLAWOMIRA ŻERAŃSKA-KOMINEK

Considered as the central discipline of musicology, music historiography has served for several decades as the testing ground for the exploration of new research trends and inspirations. The “new musicology” of the 1990s subjected all the basic components and premises of the historian’s methodology to thoroughgoing criticism. What was criticized first and foremost was the understanding of history as a succession of works produced by great creative personalities, great traditions and groundbreaking innovations. A particularly heated debate in the field of non-classical historiography concerns the concept of a musical work as an autonomous text and the notion of musical style as a central category used to organize a historiographic narrative. The metaphor of origin and development, fundamental to Western historiography, has been challenged, leading scholars to dispute the use of chronology and periodization as tools to explore cause-and-effect links between musical events such as musical works and styles. The use of large-scale narration to explain the various mechanisms and aspects of Western music development has been questioned, as has the purpose of historical description, hitherto defined as the search for, and discovery of, a single timeless and objective spiritual truth manifested in music. What has been negated in this manner is the entire historiographic method of description which, by favouring a holistic, collectivistic view of society, dehumanizes history and deprives the world of its subjective, mental dimension. This external, “God’s-eye” or demiurgic view of the world has now been equated with the worldviews and ideologies of violence and enslavement.

With the global and universalizing historiographic perspective brought into question, a refocusing of attention has been postulated, with a new focus on local realities and day-to-day musical life. Of special interest to this “new historiography” are the various symptoms and dimensions of the ideologization of the historical past and its contribution to the construction of current social identities. Representations of memory function, therefore, as a symbolic authority, which determines a community’s aims and directions and affects its present. The effort of constructing historical

memory by providing readers with selective narrations of music history manifests itself most clearly in national historiographies developing outside the mainstream of Western music historiography, which for various reasons helped create their own symbolic authorities. The mechanisms and determinants of the different versions of knowledge about the Central and Eastern European musical past (sometimes extreme in their ideologization and mythologization) presented in those “peripheral” historiographies form the topic of this collection of papers written by an international group of scholars.

The publication opens with articles by Reinhard Strohm and Irena Poniatowska. Drawing on Michel Foucault’s discourse analysis, Strohm (“The Musical Work-Concept as Discourse and Consumption”) proposes to define music historiography as a discourse built on three basic and interrelated concepts: nationality, “composership” and the musical work. The category of the musical work, though criticized by “new musicology”, may, in the author’s opinion, become a useful instrument in the search for national identity, as opposed to cultural and social globalization. Irena Poniatowska’s essay (“Central and Eastern Europe in History and in Musicology”) may serve as an introduction to the rather complex issue of defining and delimiting Central-Eastern Europe from a historical-cultural perspective, and especially to the question of its peripheral distinctiveness from mainstream Western European music.

Musical “myths” or historiographic narratives are usually centred on creative individuals—eminent composers, who are ascribed the qualities of cultural heroes, that is, of creators and teachers of culture working for the good of their communities. Composers are elevated to the rank of heroes; a nation’s founding myths are constructed around such towering figures, and their lives are frequently used as epoch markers in the national cultures of Central and Eastern Europe. These processes are elaborated upon in the first section of our book, and the series of six essays dedicated to this topic opens with Paweł Gancarczyk’s “The Greatest before Chopin: In Search of the Heroes of Early Polish Music”—an attempt to elucidate the mechanisms of the heroization of Polish fifteenth- and sixteenth-century composers in Polish music historiography modelled on the Western “great names” approach. A case of questing for a national hero through complicated redefinitions of his national identity is represented by Marc Desmet in his “Constructing the Figure of a National Composer: The Case of Jacobus Handl-Gallus (1550–1591) in Central European Music Historiography of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries”. Zofia Chechlińska (“Changes in Music Historiography in Relation to Chopin”) discusses the position of Chopin—the greatest hero in the history of Polish

music—in nineteenth-century music historiography. Agnieszka Topolska's paper "Stanisław Moniuszko as a National Prophet: Facts and Myths" is devoted to the reception of the work and figure of Stanisław Moniuszko, Poland's main composer after Chopin, whose life and work became the subject of a narrative developed and cultivated for many decades, presenting him as a national prophet. Richard Wagner's self-created image as a hero and the nation's leader, conveyed both through the content and ideological message of his operas and through large-scale promotional and marketing work, advertising his own music, has been subjected to analysis by Michael Fend ("The Nationalist Effect of Wagner's Operatic Charisma"). Miloš Zapletal's "From Tragedy to Romance, from Positivism to Myth: Nejedlý's Conception of the History of Modern Czech Music" presents the contribution of Czech music historiography to defining and establishing the figure of the hero of Czech national music.

Seven of the papers collected in this publication discuss the methodology of writing music history in Central-Eastern Europe. As all the authors demonstrate, the most widespread method of constructing historical narrative has depended on a symbolic appropriation of the past, a goal-oriented and selective interpretation of the past, which has played a key role in collective self-identification and served as a crucial tool in the process of moulding desirable social and political attitudes in the contemporary reality. Historiographies differ not only in the facts of the musical life that they describe (as is obvious), but also, and most importantly, in their strategies of historical description, which vary depending on their purpose, the latter being determined in turn by the current socio-political situation of the given nation. Lóránt Péteri describes the modelling of "national music history" in post-Stalinist Hungary ("The 'Question of Nationalism' in Hungarian Musicology during the State Socialist Period"), which was radically different from the concept of national music as defined by Finnish historiographers. Vesa Kurkela ("National or Universally Germanized? The Formation of Musical Life in Twentieth-Century Finland as a Transcultural Process") proposes a revision of the hitherto presented concepts of national music by pointing to the multinational and European sources of music in Finland. A rooting in European antiquity was the main point of reference for the national history of music in Greece, developed in sharp opposition to the oppressive Turkish civilization. This topic is discussed in Spiridoula Katsarou's "The Significance of the Ancient Greek, Byzantine and Modern Greek Folk Music Traditions in the First Music Historiographies of the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century and the Period up to the Second World War in Greece". Hana Vlhová-Wörner's article "Zdeněk Nejedlý's Historical

Narrative and Ideological Construction of Czech Medieval Music History” focuses on the concept of medieval Czech music as expounded by Zdeněk Nejedlý, one of the most influential Czech historians, while Janka Petőczová analyses the profile of the historiographic writings of the Slovak musicologist Richard Rybář, with particular emphasis on the sensitive issue of Slovak national identity and its distinct qualities (“Richard Rybář’s Theory of Music Historiography in the Context of Central European Musicology”). Among the music-historiographic traditions of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the German music historiography of the Third Reich represents a special case, as it reflects a racist deformation of the national ideology that informed European historical thought during that period. This topic is discussed by Andrzej Tuchowski in his article “Racism in Nazi Historiography and Concepts of Music Theory”. Krzysztof Stefański’s paper “The Historiography of Border Regions: From the National to the Palimpsestic View: The Case of Silesia” sheds more light on the ideas of national history, underlining their utilitarian and political nature, especially strongly manifest in border regions, whose national status is complex and heterogeneous.

The papers included in this publication were mostly presented during the international conference “Nationality vs Universality. Music Historiographies in Central and Eastern Europe”, held in September 2014 in Radziejowice (Poland), financed by the Fryderyk Chopin Institute (NIFC).

THE MUSICAL WORK-CONCEPT AS DISCOURSE AND CONSUMPTION

REINHARD STROHM

Discourses influencing music historiography and practice

The historiography of music is not only a description of aspects of the past, as are all historiographies: it serves as the foundation and legitimation of present-day practice in musical performance, composition and reception. A strong historical narrative of music can relate to the practical musical world of its readers—critically, ideologically and practically. The mental categories we use in order to describe our musical past are not entirely separable from the shape we give to our own musical world. Thus a research interest in the national traditions in music, for example, will often relate to questions of national identity in the musical world of the researcher. It would be naïve to expect that musical practice only follows the calls of ambition and emotion, whereas historiography only describes its subjects according to purely scientific criteria. The ambitions and emotions that determined European music historiography in the twentieth century crystallized in three clearly identifiable “discourses”: nationality, “composership” and work-concept.

The theory of discourse, developed by Michel Foucault, belongs to the science of the systems of knowledge, but it extends the concept of knowledge by admitting aspects of social psychology, communication theory and traditions of verbalization, such as rhetoric. On the other hand, Foucault’s concept of discourse involves relatively strict conventions, exclusions and priorities. A discourse is not what is correctly said about a subject within an objective system of preconditions, but anything that can be said about it under certain rules and conditions. These rules and conditions characterize the discourse in its particular historical context.

We have to analyse them if we want to know what a particular discourse is or how far it extends.¹

I regard music historiography as a discourse (rather than a scientific demonstration), and I now propose to investigate the three categories of nationalism, composership and work-concept as partial discourses within music historiography. These three categories underlie certain rules and principles which ensure their functioning in the world of musical thought and practice. Certainly none of them is a purely scientific criterion, but each is a mixture of reasoning, social interest, traditions of verbalization and propaganda (ideology). They all concern the interaction of art with society and are seen as bridges between the world of invention and the world of social necessities. Nationality, composership and work-concept instil the characteristic flavour of competitiveness and emulation into the pursuit of beauty and harmony. As discourses rather than rational principles, they are open to exaggeration and ideology. On the other hand, they enable the appreciation and enjoyment of art. Thus they have a direct impact on musical practice today.

This paper focuses on the (sub-)discourse of the work-concept only, and attempts to illustrate its effects in both historiography and musical practice.² Musical works are a conceptualization of music which not only occurs both in the past and the present, but also surrounds present-day musical production and reception like a *raison d'être*, a norm. Exclusion or constraint (for example, exclusion of non-work music) is always implied. Yet I argue here that the musical work-concept, which after the imposed exclusions enables particular kinds of writing on music history, also enables the continued production of objects (artefacts) that qualify for such history writing: the discourse produces its own subject matter to talk about. The production of musical works and their historiography, taken together, act as social mediators: they build bridges between the world of invention and that of social necessities. They serve a type of musical consumption.

¹ Michel Foucault, *L'archéologie du savoir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969); Foucault, *L'ordre du discours* (Paris: Gallimard, 1972).

² I have discussed the subject of composership in music historiography in "Komponisten, Werkinterpretation, Geschichte", in *Bach und die deutsche Tradition des Komponierens: Wirklichkeit und Ideologie. Festschrift Martin Geck zum 70. Geburtstag: Bericht über das 6. Dortmunder Bach-Symposium 2006*, ed. Reinmar Emans and Wolfram Steinbeck (Dortmund: Klangfarben Musikverlag, 2009), pp. 9–25. See also Michael Talbot, "The Work-Concept and Composer-centredness", in *The Musical Work: Reality or Invention?*, ed. Michael Talbot (Liverpool University Press, 2000), pp. 168–86.

Discourse restrictions and their advantages

The discourse about musical works and composers forms the basis of our concepts of nationality and universality in music—in fact, of our concept of music *history*. A national tradition in music—the self-projection of a community into history—arises not from the fact that composers created certain kinds of music, but from the way this fact is debated and integrated into social life. To replace the objective fact with the discourse about it may seem tantamount to eschewing the need for philosophical truth. But it has two significant advantages.

First, according to Foucault, discourses work by the restriction of topics or *are* restrictions of topics.³ In his inaugural lecture, *L'ordre du discours*, Foucault emphasized the function of discourses, which is to exclude or suppress knowledge in order to achieve categorial unity. One principle of exclusion concerns authorship: a systematic view of written texts is possible by following authors' names, excluding everything else. Foucault calls the limitation of the discourse to the author principle a *raréfaction*, that is, a restriction.⁴ Virtually the same cognitive effects apply, in music historiography, to the principles of composership and nationality as major discourses. They help to order and understand artefacts of the musical past by naming the reasons or circumstances of their existence: composers and nations are where the musical artefacts “belong”. If you have to know about authors, works, nations etc. in music in order to understand music's social and historical manifestations, you experience a premise and a restriction that enables understanding and meaning.

Secondly, the musical work-concept may have been criticized for privileging immutability, written fixation, exclusivity and consumerism. But the discourse about it is alive; it is even performative. Discourses are made and remade all the time and, what is most significant, they actually enable creations that suit them. Thus the discourse of the musical work already enabled Chopin to do something with Polish folk music that made it significant, consumable by modern society. It increased the possibility of a national identity for Polish music. Some time before Chopin, lutenists and harpsichordists came up with the idea of arranging the music of courtly or popular dances for a domestic instrument so that it could be enjoyed without the dancing, a process that was possible at the price of transforming the incidental court music into individual “pièces”,

³ Foucault, *L'ordre du discours*, pp. 11–15.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 28–31.

something like works, which could be played and listened to in isolation. (Our standard term “piece”, as applied to music, actually originated in that context of courtly entertainment music, in France under King Louis XIV.) These transformations of a non-work practice into a repertoire of musical pieces aided the re-use of old music and consumption in private. Another example of the discursive performativity of the musical work-concept is the tradition of *cantus firmus* composition. It is “work on myth” (Blumenberg), associated with strong creativity and the power to transform, yet it carries the appeal of immutability, ancestry and exclusivity to ever new musical consumers.

The work-concept enables a certain historiography

The musical work-concept enables certain kinds of music historiography.⁵ Scholarly writings about the musical work and its social context seem to fall into two traditions. One of them—the older philosophical tradition, with Max Weber, Roman Ingarden, Theodor W. Adorno, Carl Dahlhaus and Leo Treitler—not only investigates the ontology of the musical work itself, but also addresses general aesthetic and social aspects of music in terms of the musical work. Regardless of these authors’ definitions of the musical work or of their opinions about its social and aesthetic relevance, they formulate their observations as pertaining to *the musical work*, even when they could just as well speak of “music” in general. When one of these authors wishes to say, for example, “music is socially mediated”, he or she is likely to say, “the musical work is socially mediated”. This is often not a critical distinction but simply a manner of speaking. In terms of rhetoric, it could be called a *synecdoche, pars pro toto*, because there is also a lot of music that does not have the character of musical works.

The other tradition is that of empirical sociologists and ethnologists of music, who use socio-analytical and anthropological methodologies. They do not formulate their observations as pertaining to musical works, even when their research concerns Western music. Tia DeNora, for example, who in her book *Music in Everyday Life* exemplifies and explains the empirical methodology in music,⁶ relates her interviewees’ comments about all sorts of music, be it popular music or Schubert or Brahms, with equal attention. She never implies that a particular observation could not

⁵ The following paragraph is derived from Reinhard Strohm, “Werk-Performanz-Konsum: der musikalische Werk-Diskurs”, in *Historische Musikwissenschaft: Grundlagen und Perspektiven*, ed. Michele Calella and Nikolaus Urbanek (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2013), pp. 341–55.

⁶ Tia DeNora, *Music in Everyday Life* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).

be made (whether by her or by her interviewees) about any other type of music. The ontological guise in which the music appears has no bearing on the situation. In fact, ontological differences in music are not normally addressed by empirical musicologists. When it comes to the musical work-concept, they avail themselves of a different rhetorical figure, namely *ellipsis*—omission.

My question here applies not to the opinions which these authors have formed about the musical work or indeed about musical composership, but to the manner in which they speak about music, to their discourse. Whereas the philosophical school of musicology was convinced that generally valid statements about music could be made by addressing musical works alone, while the interpretation of non-work music, including popular or non-Western music, was an exception to the rule, the empirical school apparently believed that the requirements of musical works and authors could be integrated into an all-inclusive sociological discourse without further ado.

A prominent pair of musical scholars, Carl Dahlhaus and Alphonse Silberman, went on record from the 1960s onward with an engaged debate about the significance or non-significance, respectively, of the musical work-concept.⁷ To Silberman, in his *Sociology of Music*, the type of music (whether it was works or non-works) was irrelevant for a sociological discourse—all that mattered were the users of the music. Dahlhaus replied, not always directly, by maintaining the significance of author and work as an indispensable part of Western music sociology.

The musical opus in history

There follows a very brief survey of the appreciation of the musical work-concept in history. It will emerge that this appreciation is actually a discourse, which has functioned in history very much according to the principles of discourse identified by Foucault: restriction of topics, exclusion and identity of authors—to which we may add transformativity and consumerism.

⁷ Alphonse Silberman, *A Sociology of Music*, trans. Corbet Stewart (New York: Humanitas, 1963); already drafted in his *Wovon lebt die Musik: Die Prinzipien der Musiksoziologie* (Regensburg: Bosse, 1957). On Dahlhaus, see Strohm, “Der musikalische Werkbegriff: Dahlhaus und die Nachwelt (Versuch einer Historisierung in drei Phasen)”, in *Carl Dahlhaus und die Musikwissenschaft: Werk, Wirkung, Aktualität*, ed. Hermann Danuser et al. (Schliengen: Argus, 2011), pp. 265–78.

In the Festschrift for Mirosław Perz in 2003, I maintained that we owe the musical work-concept to the humanists of the early Renaissance in Italy, Poland and soon after also France and Germany, who consciously transferred the idea of “opus” and authorship from classical literature to the other arts, including music.⁸ These early discourses belonged to a Renaissance context of the reorganization of the arts, augmenting the medieval *artes liberales* system with the *studia humaniora* and even the so-called “mechanical arts”. In this process, the relationship between musical performance on the one hand and creation on the other was being discussed already around 1440–1450 by Martin le Franc and Enea Silvio Piccolomini. Johannes Tinctoris, in his *Complexus effectuum musices* (ca. 1475), explicitly contrasted the “immortal glory of the greatest composers” with the merely “transient reputation and wealth acquired by performing musicians”. The art of composition, which the Germans soon started to call *musica poetica*, became a privileged concept, a normative symbol of consummate education and technical perfection; it enabled the self-performance of privileged social groups and environments. Typically, a completed composition, worked out to the last detail and detached from the variations of performance (*opus perfectum et absolutum*), would be printed and disseminated, its authorial rights would be subject to legal claims, and its readership would be sought among humanist-educated intellectuals. Although virtually any sort of music could be made to appear as such an *opus* or as a printed collection of *opera*, even church hymns, organ versets or peasant songs, the discourse allowed for a musical self-fashioning of the Renaissance privileged classes.

The peculiarly musical tradition of marking composers’ works with “opus numbers” began in the sixteenth century and for a long time it ran in tandem with the widespread use of the term “opus”. Whereas this term, independently of any numbers, evoked (in its numerous connotations) greatness, individuality, novelty and classical style status, the numbering had partly different functions. Opus numbers were, however, neither

⁸ This and the next paragraph draw on the following publications: Strohm, “‘Opus’: An Aspect of the Early History of the Musical Work-Concept”, in *Complexus effectuum musicologiae. Studia Mirosłavo Perz septuagenario dedicata*, ed. Tomasz Jeż (Cracow: Rabid, 2003), pp. 309–319; revised repr. in *Musik des Mittelalters und der Renaissance: Festschrift für Klaus-Jürgen Sachs zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Rainer Kleinertz, Christoph Flamm and Wolf Frobenius (Hildesheim: Olms, 2010), pp. 205–217. See also especially Reinhard Kapp, “Werk und Geschichte (als eine Art Einleitung)”, in *Werk und Geschichte: musikalische Analyse und historischer Entwurf – Rudolf Stephan zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Thomas Ertelt (Mainz: Schott, 2005), pp. 7–48.

primarily a publisher's device nor merely a pragmatic scheme to keep the printers' shelves in order. They were typically composer-centred and probably often requested by the composers themselves. Heinrich Schütz already kept a mental list of his own works, having assigned opus numbers to all their printed editions, although they had been issued by different publishing houses.

Scholars have contrasted the Renaissance notion of a musical "opus", as the product of a composer's labour and as a published commodity, with the aesthetics of absolute music, observing a "conjuncture" of the material with the idealist notions after 1800.⁹ But the reverse is true as well: the value orientation and aesthetic aspirations with which earlier composers attempted to make their *oeuvres* immortal in print was later pragmatized and trivialized in publishers' catalogues, market-oriented anthologies and so-called "sheet music". Just compare the opus numbers of Chopin with those of Carl Czerny: the artefacts are different (Czerny's catalogue contains many non-work items), but the marketing strategy is the same.

Social functions of the work-concept

As stated above, the tension or rivalry between the work-concept and the practice of musical performance had already been observed in the Renaissance discourses, as exemplified by the sixteenth-century formula of the *opus absolutum*: the idea of a musical work that is immutable and thus detached from its performances.¹⁰ Combinations of art and authorship with the performative function had been known from classical antiquity: Cicero, an orator experienced in practice, had written down his forensic orations as crystallized performances. Yet he introduced the important qualification that they were no longer subject to performance variation once they had been edited and put down in writing. Narrative and discursive types of literature have also been popular in modern times, from printed dinner conversations to epistolary novels. Listening to music in early modern times usually focused on the ephemeral performance skills;

⁹ Philip Tagg, "'The Work': An evaluative charge", in *The Musical Work: Reality or Invention?*, ed. Michael Talbot (Liverpool University Press, 2000), pp. 153–67 at 161–3.

¹⁰ The Wittenberg cantor Nicolaus Listenius wrote about the musical *opus perfectum et absolutum* in the context of *musica poetica* (the discipline of composition) in his *Rudimenta musicae* of 1533 and his *Musica* of 1537. That the term *absolutum* meant a detachment from performative changes, not a mark of superior value, has not been understood by some commentators on the musical work-concept.

in courtly ceremony, music was classified as an embellishment or *divertissement*. In the twentieth century, it almost became the norm in popular music that composed and carefully rehearsed pieces were presented as if they were improvised on the spot. Why, then, did a certain section of musical practice nevertheless promote the status of the *opus absolutum*, aspiring to an ostentatious independence from mere performances? This aspiration had a social meaning: the music is intended to be fixed and transmittable; it must provide a cultural continuity that confers hegemony and dignity on the social groups who cultivate it. The “works” could be consumed in the guise of a genealogy; they were anchored in public annals and memories, accessible to a relatively small segment of society. What was nevertheless performative was the constant endeavour of posterity to reinscribe those works as witnesses of their respective social self-assertion. Thus the consumption of independent musical art-works had become a self-fashioning performance of social groups with their particular preferences and lifestyles.

Not surprisingly, this function is likewise conferred on the works even before they are composed. One mechanism to ensure the continuity of the work-status is the humanist discourse of *imitatio* and *aemulatio*, which prescribes the ways in which famous forerunners are to be respected. Music quoting older music is a hallmark of the Western tradition. Nevertheless, the work discourse also requires certain controlled steps into the unknown. On 28 February 1778, Mozart wrote to his father about his new aria “Non so d’onde viene” (K 294) that it did not at all resemble the celebrated setting of the same words by J. C. Bach. Similarly, he mentions in the same letter a setting of “Ah, non lasciarmi, no” (K 295a) for which his inspiration came from Baldassare Galuppi.¹¹ Regardless of the actual difference which he then achieved in these compositions, the procedure has contributed to a change in the reception of the earlier works. Now it is necessary to hear the Mozart settings against those of Bach and Galuppi, respectively, and posterity has become aware of Bach and Galuppi through Mozart. Some of the casual, performative impact of these operatic arias has gone, and some additional items have been added to the chain of retrospective evaluation. Here it can be seen how the practice and theory of the musical work-concept has influenced composerly attitudes and, at the same time, changed the historical status of the composers’ creations.

¹¹ Wolfgang Plath, “Mozart und Galuppi. Bemerkungen zur Szene ‘Ah, non lasciarmi, no’ KV 295a”, in *Festschrift Walter Senn zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Tiroler Landesmuseum, Erich Egg and Ewald Fässler (Munich: Katzbichler, 1975), pp. 174–8; Manfred Hermann Schmid, “Text versus music? Metastasio’s Ah! non lasciarmi, no and Mozart’s aria K.486a”, in *Mozart-Studien* 11 (2002), pp. 73–115.

In the nineteenth century, the work-discourse openly proclaimed itself as the rule and a mark of progress, for example in Eduard Hanslick's treatise *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* (1854), while the ears of privileged audiences were still largely trained to expect musical *divertissement* only. The two attitudes famously clashed in the first performances of Wagner's *Tannhäuser* in Paris, in 1861, for example. This is no surprise, because opera had always been a ceremonial genre in which even the audiences contributed a semi-performative and consumerist behaviour to the musical practice. On the other hand, the invention of "opera" itself had launched the first strong claim for authorship and work-status in the Renaissance theatrical practice that otherwise was often improvised. The earliest Italian *favole pastorali* were even printed in full score.¹² The opera subjects of Orpheus and Tannhäuser have in common a focus on the creative artist, whose art reaches beyond earthly life, whereas he himself is destroyed: a lesson in the disembodiment of the musical art that migrates from performer to work and outlasts its creator.

Autonomous and absolute music

Some musicologists are quite happy to identify the work-concept with that of musical "autonomy" or even with the idea of absolute music.¹³ The frequently emphasized turn in the social mediation of music around 1800 is supposed to have freed music from social function. But let us first remember that "autonomy" is not a fixed quality of a certain type of music, but part of a floating discourse and practice, as it depends on contexts, paratexts, discourses and historical-cultural contingencies. Then, artistic autonomy and social function can in practice co-exist, and even usually do. When Beethoven had composed the *Missa solennis*, a work intentionally without a function in the Catholic liturgy, he dedicated it to the hearts of the audiences, as it came from the heart. This was by all means a social function.

Misunderstandings are usually generated by the erroneous assumption that musical "autonomy" does not significantly pre-date 1800. Bourgeois concert life of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is often interpreted as having no actual social function, other than the enjoyment of music.

¹² The name of the new genre, derived from the Latin *opus*, was introduced a generation later and applied to theatrical works in general, but it also guaranteed that the connection with the classical concept of the art-work was not neglected.

¹³ David Clarke, "Musical Autonomy Revisited", in *The Cultural Study of Music: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Martin Clayton et al. (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 159–170 at 161.

The pious legend, unfortunately introduced by Jürgen Habermas, that the eighteenth century was “the first time when people got together for the sole purpose of listening to music” is factually and conceptually wrong, at least insofar as this practice is used as an indicator of “musical autonomy”. Factually, because this practice is known even in Greek antiquity and presumably possible in many world cultures, including very ancient ones; conceptually, because music in its own structures does not necessarily predetermine what is done with it. What eighteenth-century audiences listened to in concerts without any external functions were rhapsodic solos and fantasias, dances, sacred choruses, folk music, military music, concertos and operas. Thus music created for specific social functions could always be re-used exclusively for listening. Conversely, “autonomous” music has been used for social functions as a matter of course. If a composition was in sonata form or had an even more complex internal structure, could it not adorn the inauguration of a dictator or archbishop?

The writings of some German and French Romantics have been quoted as expressions of a desire to free music from social functions.¹⁴ What those writers meant, however, was to reject a particular type of pre-established social *meaning*—not function—which was traditionally the imitation of nature. E. T. A. Hoffmann’s comments on meaning in music are clearly intended to refute such pre-established meanings of the musical performance, not its social functions. It is true that he wishes to free the great composer, within the work-and-author discourse, from the obligation to serve socially ordained meanings; the composer was expected to express only himself and his ideas. This was in fact a new link-up between the composer and the public; the social function of music now became a dialogue between bourgeois audiences and great musicians’ self-expression. It implied, for example, the habit of looking over the composer’s shoulder and comparing his new works with earlier ones; it was part of the same social discourse that attributed dignity to a society cultivating music. In this light, the “idea of absolute music” is the idea that what society does with music is absolute and suffers no contamination. Musicologists who pronounce their verdicts on these historical social circumstances actually “perform” a discourse that Western society can no longer do without.

¹⁴ For example in Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works. An Essay in the Philosophy of Music* (Oxford University Press, 1992), ch. 1.

The work-concept as consumption and product rarefication

The discourse of the musical work is in my view a performance, a self-fashioning of privileged social groups. It means that the existence and the right-to-be of musical works of art is continuously asserted and developed, creating an environment in which the consumption of such works is enabled and assured. This social performance, which naturally also includes musicological research, is potentially self-perpetuating: not only does it enable the composition of “works” suitable for such self-fashioning, but it also enables the audience reception of the works *as works*. And the other way round, the reception is made easier by that restriction of choice to the kind of listening that insinuates that the music has to be work-like.

If somebody from another planet visited a London or New York symphony hall and ordered the dinner menu during the performance, this would not be justifiable by the fact that the music played was a banqueting suite by Telemann or a *Finalmusik* by Mozart. This audience member would only have re-amalgamated two types of conspicuous consumption which the rules of the work discourse had separated.

In the consumer society, access to the product must be made more desirable by making it appear special, select, even rare. The process is analogous to Foucault’s discourse restriction. Restriction shortens the way to the product, but also makes it more precious. The prohibition of having dinner in the symphony hall—a rather recent and contingent rule—declares the object of consumption to be a specialty (“not to be consumed in connection with other goods”) for the sake of making it desirable. Many ingredients of the musical work-discourse are aimed at this effect: above all the so-called “canonization” of the musical repertory, a genuine discourse restriction imposed upon the artefacts; or the idea that the composer has written the work especially for you, making consumption appear as part of an intimate dialogue, an exchange of meanings.

The sociologists Alphonse Silbermann and Pierre Bourdieu have also investigated the significance of musical consumption for their audiences themselves.¹⁵ Following Silbermann, the recipients can be classified in socially differentiated groups according to the music they listen to.

¹⁵ Silbermann, *A Sociology of Music*; Pierre Bourdieu, *Zur Soziologie der symbolischen Formen*, trans. Wolfgang Fietkau, 6th edn (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997), ch. V, “Elemente zu einer soziologischen Theorie der Kunstwahrnehmung”.

Bourdieu and others see the consumer as personally or collectively “constructed” by the music they consume. In both these panoramas, the work-and-author discourse takes on a significant role in the social process of self-assertion and hetero-definition.

In musical modernism, the consumption of musical works (or whatever has taken their places in musical practice) appears to be possible on condition of possessing musical-theoretical knowledge. This is a very high hurdle to cross for access to the music. The maxim, however, that expert listening is necessary for an “understanding” of the works distorts the real meaning of what is going on. Intellectual or theoretical understanding of music may in fact be necessary in order to consume the works, but the works have been created in order to make such understanding necessary. The social accessibility of this music has been restricted in order to differentiate listeners and to maintain a challenge to potential consumers.

In defence of the musical work-concept

It may be that the discourse of the musical work and the peculiar type of consumption which it affords are unnecessary, retrospective and anti-democratic restrictions on the general human access to art. The opposite, however, may also be maintained. The work-concept may allow the appreciation of art in the first place, and at least until recently it may have served as an invitation to the world of art such as no other discourse could achieve. This potential of the work-discourse may also be carried on to a more contemporary plane. Let us compare a musical practice where the discourse did not matter with one where it did. At the time when Chopin was born, there was enough Romantic piano music around in the Western world for domestic entertainment and concerts. Some of it was virtuosic, some was of a popular or folkloristic character. There was no shortage of supply, and no great hurdles to cross for audiences to “understand” this “salon” music. Chopin was not needed to make audiences appreciate the style. But some of the music he heard in his youth, including some music from Poland, is now lost, and we have his works instead. Of course, most of us would not wish to undo this deal. As in the case of Mozart, Bach and Galuppi, we now hear older Western piano music, including national Polish music, though the filter of Chopin’s ambitious transformations of it. The point is that musicians of different ages have had very different means of rescuing music from oblivion and at the same time setting their stamp on it, from the printed dance tablatures of the Renaissance to the sound recordings of modern ethnomusicologists. Under the discourse of the work-concept, consumption can be refreshed and newly challenged; new

inventions are required to ensure consumer satisfaction. This is not only how novelty is introduced, but more generally how music as such can survive. Composing new music may in fact be a way of preserving music itself, not just its appreciation by the cultivating classes. New music is never *necessary* by nature to the consumer society, even if it has been cleverly integrated into its needs. But it serves the survival of music in society. The same applies to the music of the past or of different cultures. The musical work-discourse, especially when applied to many different musical cultures, might be seen as upholding artistic initiatives of difference in an otherwise reprocessed world. Although it has long been a specifically Western phenomenon, it may yet find its place in an intercultural struggle against historical, social and cultural globalization.

CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE IN HISTORY AND IN MUSICOLOGY

IRENA PONIATOWSKA

The term “Central and Eastern Europe” is hard to define unequivocally in geographic, historical, political and cultural terms, since all those aspects are interdependent and constitutive of the concept. The boundaries of Central-Eastern Europe can only be defined by “the great common situations that reassemble people”, as Tadeusz Kisielewski writes.¹ It is the shared historical fortunes that help to forge a cultural community. In relation to the term “Central Europe”, Kisielewski mentions the “philosophy of a paradoxical centre” (György Konrád’s term), but that notion—as he claims—concerns a specific area.² The difficulty of interpreting the historical and cultural boundaries to this region inspired Milan Kundera to write “The Tragedy of Central Europe”,³ and also brought about the collective work *Traumland Mitteleuropa?*⁴

Central Europe consists of Austria (although etymologically “Österreich” means “Eastern Kingdom”), Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, Bukovina, Transylvania, Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina (possibly also Trieste). Eastern Europe comprises Belarus, Ukraine and Russia. But is Germany Central or Western Europe? Geographically, it is at the centre of Europe, but culturally it belongs to the West. Prussia was Central and Eastern Europe. And Romania? Bulgaria? Historically, their development was determined by a different centre of influence than in the case of the countries named above.

¹ Tadeusz Kisielewski, *Europa środkowa – zakres pojęcia* [Central Europe: The scope of the notion] (Lublin: UMCS, 1992), p. 18.

² Ibid.

³ Milan Kundera, “The Tragedy of Central Europe”, trans. Edmund White. *New York Review of Books* 31, no. 7 (1984).

⁴ *Traumland Mitteleuropa? Beiträge zu einer aktuellen Kontroverse*, ed. Sven Pacpke and Werner Weidenfeld (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988).

Adam Krzemiński identifies the spheres of influence in Europe. The first is the tradition of Greece and Rome, of Judaeo-Christian morality, the ideas of the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, industrialization and finally the reign of socialism. The second is the enrichment (not the overpowering) of the culture of Spain by the influences of Muslim Moors; negative influences were introduced through several centuries of rule by Muslim Turks in the Balkans; the rule of the Mongolian khans in Russia also exerted a strong influence on that part of Europe. Russia and the Balkans did not maintain particularly strong relations with Latin Europe, and that facilitated a change in the foundations of culture in those regions of Europe in the direction of a specific type of Orientalisation, constituting a cultural and social regression compared to the West.⁵

We can also introduce a division into Europe linked to Ancient Rome and to Catholicism (the Latin alphabet) and Europe linked to Byzantium and the Orthodox Church (Cyrillic). Combining all these arguments, it should be assumed that Europe is shaped by three cultural realms: antiquity, Christianity (irrespective of the division into the Western and Eastern Church) and the Enlightenment ideas of progress, freedom, knowledge and the possibility of questioning recognised laws. And Central Europe, between those divisions, adopted values from various traditions, including traditions opposed to one another, with varying degrees of intensity. It had to resist the oppressive force of its neighbours and the force of the great centres of culture. Norman Davies reminds us that the map of Europe has changed continuously, and a historian—as a beachcomber, lifesaver and salvager of shipwrecks—studies the past landscapes of now-defunct states. Galicia, for example, was not merely a province of the Habsburg Empire, but above all a characteristic society formed by a great variety of nations, religious and linguistic groups, and rich, distinctive cultures, including Ruthenians, Poles, Jews, Hutsuls, Boykos, Lemkos from the Carpathian Mountains and highlanders from the Tatras.⁶ That multi-ethnicity and multi-culturality also concerned other regions of Central Europe.

In the field of music—and not only—the prevailing stereotype was that of an opposition between the centre and the periphery of European culture.

⁵ Adam Krzemiński, “Pajęczyna w środku Europy” [A web in the middle of Europe]. *Polityka* 1 (1987), pp. 12–13.

⁶ Norman Davies, “Galicja jako królestwo zaginione” [Galicia as a vanished kingdom], in *Kraków i Galicja wobec przemian cywilizacyjnych (1866–1914). Studia i szkice* [Cracow and Galicia with regard to civilisational changes (1866–1914). Studies and sketches], ed. Krzysztof Fiołek and Marian Stola (Cracow: Universitas, 2011), p. 8.

The centre, of course, comprised Italy, Germany and France, whilst the other countries or regions were the rim, or margin, of Europe. That resulted from the history of music, from the strength of the great musical traditions that dominated European music up to the nineteenth century. For the periphery, the West—the Renaissance, Baroque, Enlightenment and civilisation—represented a source of spiritual nourishment and an object of admiration. But during the nineteenth century the situation began to change diametrically. The lands of Central, Southern-Central and partly Eastern Europe belonged to four empires: the Russian empire, the Prussian-German state, the Habsburg monarchy and Turkey. But in many countries, a sense of enslavement or an attempt to demonstrate their ethnic-cultural identity prompted nations to pull themselves away from the periphery and attempt to rival the centre. National styles, or “schools”, arose in Poland, Russia and Bohemia, and later in other countries, including those not belonging to Central or Eastern Europe (Scandinavia, Spain). In Poland, from the time of the Partitions (from 1795), literature, music and the arts assumed the task of uniting the nation living in three different states—Russian, Prussian and Austrian. That became the dominant, and virtually the sole, inspiration, and perhaps even duty for literature and music. The three great poets Mickiewicz, Słowacki and Krasiński became the “holy” trinity of national bards, and Chopin was named the fourth bard,⁷ the poet of sound; he forged a national style, which found a lasting place in world culture. The explosion of literature and music in Russia, which harboured ambitions of rivalling the achievements of the West, led to a European career for the music of the Mighty Handful and Tchaikovsky. The rough modal harmonies of Mussorgsky delighted and inspired the French impressionists. But as Adam Zagajewski notes, “Russia [...] never knew the moderation—that is, the measure and rhythm—of a public life that harmonizes its politics with its culture”.⁸ It combined loftiness and slavery, greatness and a lack of respect for the individual, and that still remains true today. Geographically speaking, Russia belongs to the conglomerate of countries known as Central-Eastern Europe, but as a great empire it subjugated the nations of that conglomerate. During the nineteenth century, the idea of moving

⁷ Irena Poniatowska, “Chopin—czwarty wieszcz” [Chopin: the fourth bard], in *Topos narodowy w muzyce polskiej pierwszej połowy XIX w.* [The national topos in Polish music of the first half of the nineteenth century], proceedings of the International Academic-Artistic Conference on 20–21 November 2006, ed. Wojciech Nowik (Warsaw: Akademia Muzyczna w Warszawie, 2006).

⁸ Adam Zagajewski, “A High Wall”, trans. John Connelly and Joy Dworkin, *Cross Currents* 6 (1987), p. 21.

closer to the great culture of the West triggered an explosion of Russian art, including music, which revealed to the world creative possibilities not previously developed on a European scale, as well as the national identity of the Russians. The multi-national empire of the Habsburgs was guided by somewhat different norms of co-existence among nations. It should also be emphasized that during the nineteenth century the works of the Czech composers Smetana and Dvořák, including the latter's *Symphony from the New World*, also entered the world music literature. After the collapse of the Habsburg state, Austria became a small separate country.

During the nineteenth century, the ideology of Slavic culture was a powerful presence. It was a geopolitical mystification, yet the notion of Slavic Europe existed in historiography, relative to the notion of Central-Eastern Europe. Jerzy Kłoczowski locates its regions in Central-Eastern and Southern-Eastern Europe and in the lands of Kievan Rus'.⁹ In this context, we must turn to the philosophy of Johann Gottfried Herder, who identified Slavic geographic regions from the Adriatic Sea to the Carpathian Mountains, from the Don to the Moldova, but focussed on aesthetic-ethical digression and addressed the philosophical aspect of the history of Slavic culture. He ennobled the culture of those peoples and idealized the Slavs, who in the future would create a land of true humanity, as he wrote. He was well disposed toward Poland, although he witnessed the fall of the "noble state" during the eighteenth century and the feudal anarchy that led to catastrophe. His utopian perception of Russia and other Slavic nations can clearly be seen in his assertion from the *Journal of my Voyage in the Year 1769* that if the spirit of culture comes to those nations, "Ukraine will become a new Greece"—in the sense, of course, of the ideal Ancient Greece.¹⁰ But his unrealistic ideas in a sense enabled Slavic lands (including Poland) to rid themselves of their complexes with regard to their powerful hegemonic neighbours and spurred them to address their history and distinguish their presence on the map and in the culture of Europe.

In Germany, the notion of *Mitteleuropa* arose in opposition to the concept of Slavic culture. Helmut Loos recently devoted a study to the

⁹ Jerzy Kłoczowski, *Europa środkowowschodnia w historiografii krajów regionu* [Central-Eastern Europe in the historiography of the region's countries] (Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 1993), p. 34.

¹⁰ Johann Gottfried Herder, "Journal of my Voyage in the Year 1769", in *Herder on Social and Political Culture*, trans. and ed. F. M. Barnard (Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 90.

notion of Mitteleuropa.¹¹ It was first expressed by the Austrian minister Prince Felix of Schwarzenberg in 1848, while Loos states that politically it was born of the writings of Friedrich List (1789–1846), an economist whose concept of the development of the German economy was used by Bismarck and who provided an impulse for the American school of economics, which called the concept the “National System”. It was subsequently developed in the concept of national liberalism set forth by Constantin Frantz,¹² who went beyond the strictures of nationalism and proclaimed the ideas of federalism, but not the one instituted by the German nation in Mitteleuropa according to the Bismarckian model. However, his warnings against “Russian mongolism”, the true enemy of the German legacy in the East, and his anti-Semitism meant that these became the precursor of National Socialism, which evinced a specific interest in Mitteleuropa. The unification of the German principalities in 1871, driven by Prussia, contributed to the emergence of the idea of the “grossdeutscher Lösung”, and Mitteleuropa was an alternative to that solution. Above all, Friedrich Naumann’s economic and geopolitical reflections on Mitteleuropa from 1915 confirmed the cultural domination of Germany.¹³ This might be called a brutal instrumentalization of the Drang nach Osten, exploited by National Socialism. That is the account of Helmut Loos.¹⁴ As Tadeusz Kisielewski writes, it was Lubusz Land (Pol. Ziemia Lubuska, Ger. Land Lebus) that for 700 years constituted the bridgehead of the Drang nach Osten, from the time when it was sold to the March of Brandenburg. The Germans also colonized the lands between Gdańsk and Estonia, vying with Denmark and then with Sweden. In 1701, Brandenburg and East Prussia fused into the Kingdom of Prussia, which engulfed many German and Polish lands, representing a threat to the national identity of Slavic cultures.¹⁵

Naumann and other writers proclaimed the dominance of music, the highest of the arts—in accordance with the Romantic aesthetic—but also the hegemony of German music, documented in musicology, and its

¹¹ Helmut Loos, “Das Konzept ‘Mitteleuropa’ in der deutschsprachigen Musikgeschichtsschreibung”, in *Musikgeschichte in Mittel- und Osteuropa. Mitteilungen der internationalen Arbeitsgemeinschaft an der Universität Leipzig*, vol. xiv, ed. Helmut Loos, Eberhard Möller and Klaus-Peter Koch (Leipzig: Gudrun Schröder Verlag, 2013).

¹² Constantin Franz, *Die Religion des Nationalliberalismus* (Leipzig: Rossberg, 1872).

¹³ Friedrich Naumann, *Mitteleuropa* (Berlin: Reimer, 1915).

¹⁴ Loos, “Das Konzept ‘Mitteleuropa’”.

¹⁵ Kisielewski, *Europa środkowa*.

ascendancy in the world at large. That claim was based mainly on the art of composition and the history of musical ideas, with musical life, musical practice and cultural exchange passed over. There were only isolated remarks concerning the music of Central Europe, essentially confined to Austria, probably because it was difficult to overlook a German-speaking country with the great tradition of the Viennese Classics. Joseph Müller-Blattau is an example of a musicologist active in Königsberg identifying himself with the ideas of the Alldeutscher Verband,¹⁶ whilst active in Wrocław was the historian Hermann Aubin, a leading representative of the so-called folk (völkischen) Ostforschung, editor of the *Geschichte Schlesiens* (up to 1740). In the years 1929–1945, he treated Eastern Europe (without Russia?) as the regions adjacent to Germany. With a Darwinian justification, he asserted the supremacy of the Arian lord over the Slavic populace. In his concept, he set music as the highest and most German of the arts. In the same spirit, Arnold Schmitz wrote *Die Musik im Mittelalter* for the first volume of *Geschichte Schlesiens* (pub. 1938) and was pencilled in as the author of a monograph on the later history of Silesian music,¹⁷ but he distanced himself from the Ostforschung project as thus conceived, which, as Helmut Loos sees it, makes him an exception among German musicologists of that period.¹⁸

What is surprising is that in 1949—as Loos goes on to write—Aubin stood at the helm of the Herder-Forschungsrat, publishing, from 1952, the *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung*. He was only criticized for the ideology contained in the forty-fourth issue, in 1995. As part of Herder-Forschung, in 1962 the project arose for the series *Musik des Ostens*, led by Fritz Feldmann, and from 1982 by Hubert Unverricht (fifteen volumes by 1996).

Let us return to the inter-war period. After the First World War, nations freed themselves from empires, from the great powers. Many small states were created in Central Europe. Although perhaps relatively weak, we should not forget that these countries produced ideas in the realm of

¹⁶ Josef Müller-Blattau, “Die Tonkunst in altgermanischer Zeit; Wandel und Wiederbelebung germanischer Eigenart in der geschichtlichen Entwicklung der deutschen Tonkunst”, in *Germanische Wiedererhebung*, ed. Hermann Nollau (Heidelberg: Winter, 1926); Müller-Blattau, *Geschichte der Musik in Ost- und Westpreussen von der Ordenszeit bis zur Gegenwart* (Königsberg: Gräfe und Unzer, 1931).

¹⁷ This is attested by a letter from Aubin to Josef Nadler, repr. in Wojciech Kunicki, *Germanistik in Breslau 1918–1945* (Dresden: Thelem, 2002), p. 281, quoted in Loos 2013, p. 5.

¹⁸ Loos, “Das Konzept ‘Mitteleuropa’”.

culture that had influence on a global scale: in Vienna, for example, the technique of the dodecaphonic school (from 1905); in Prague, the writings of Franz Kafka and Jaroslav Hašek, as well as the structuralist movement in linguistics that influenced the humanities and also musicology; in Poland, an exploration of human existence, with the symbolism of the subconscious in Bruno Schulz, the “peculiarity of existence” in Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz, who initiated the grotesque theatre of the absurd, and the parodistic critique of contemporary culture in Witold Gombrowicz.¹⁹ Among the many composers of this region who became great figures of the world’s music history, one might just mention Béla Bartók, Leoš Janáček and Karol Szymanowski, Józef Koffler, the dodecaphonist from Lviv, also the Russian composers Sergey Prokofiev, Igor Stravinsky, Dmitry Shostakovich and Aram Khachaturian, as well as the Austrians Alban Berg, Anton Webern and Arnold Schönberg.

With regard to the term “Central Europe”, we might mention Jacques Ancel’s *L’Europe centrale* (Paris 1930) and also Oskar Halecki’s entry “Europa Środkowa” in the second volume of a Polish encyclopaedia of political science.²⁰ There were also attempts to define Eastern Europe, at least in geographic terms. This question was deliberated at congresses held in Brussels (1923), Oslo (1928) and Warsaw (1933), with that last one having an Eastern Europe section, although we must be aware of the historical relativity of the terms “Eastern” and “Slavic” Europe, as Jerzy Kłoczowski points out.²¹ During the Second World War, there were suggestions that a federation of Eastern European states be formed as a counterweight to Germany, but there was a lack of coordination and the proposal proved unfeasible. Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam sealed the division of Europe into the inferior East and the superior West. Fate mocked the concept of German hegemony, and part of Berlin, the centre of Prussian politics, became Eastern Europe. It came to such a pass that Beethoven, for example, was split into two: he became a West German and an East German. In 1970, two Beethoven congresses were held, in Bonn and in Berlin. I took part in both.

The Iron Curtain, or the “high wall”, as Adam Zagajewski called it,²² was a painful cultural scission. It meant that Central Europe, absorbed by the Soviet East (apart from Austria, from 1955 onwards), lived in a

¹⁹ Kundera, “The Tragedy of Central Europe”.

²⁰ Oskar Halecki, “Europa Środkowa” [Central Europe], *Encyklopedia Nauk Politycznych* [Encyclopaedia of political science], vol. 2 (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Społecznego i Instytutu Wydawniczego “Biblioteka Polska”, 1937).

²¹ Kłoczowski, *Europa środkowowschodnia*.

²² Zagajewski, “A High Wall”.