

Glivinsky Valery,
Senior Doctor of Musicology
(New York, USA)
val@glivinski.com

STRAVINSKY'S DIALOGICITY

Stravinsky's dialogicity is considered in the article in the broader cultural context of the era of "the end of the Renaissance and the crisis of humanism" (N. Berdyaev). The activation of dialogical potencies in European culture from the late 19th and early 20th centuries found in the works of Russian masters the most complete and consistent objectification. Stravinsky's cultural "standing outside" (M. Bakhtin), cultural "wandering" (V. Bibler) turn him into a personification of the creative universality of the 20th century.

Key words: *Stravinsky, dialogue, standing outside, wandering, universality, Berdyaev, Bakhtin, Bibler.*

Гливинський Валерій Вікторович, доктор музикології (Нью-Йорк, США).

Діалогічність Стравінського.

Діалогічність Стравінського розглядається в статті у широкому культурному контексті епохи "кінця Ренесансу та кризи гуманізму" (М. Бердяєв). Активізація діалогічних потенцій європейського мистецтва кінця ХІХ – початку ХХ століть знаходить у творчості російського майстра найбільш повне й послідовне вираження. Культурна "позазнаходжуваність" (М. Бахтін), культурне "мандрівництво" (В. Біблер) Стравінського перетворюють його на уособлення творчого універсалізму ХХ століття.

Ключові слова: *Стравінський, діалог, позазнаходжуваність, мандрівництво, універсалізм, Бердяєв, Бахтін, Біблер.*

Гливинский Валерий Викторович, доктор музыкологии (Нью-Йорк, США).

Диалогичность Стравинского.

Диалогичность Стравинского рассматривается в статье в широком культурном контексте эпохи "конца Ренессанса и кризиса гуманизма" (Н. Бердяев). Активизация диалогических потенций европейского искусства конца ХІХ – начала ХХ веков находит в творчестве русского мастера наиболее полное и последовательное выражение. Культурная "внезаходимость" (М. Бахтин), культурное "странничество" (В. Библиер) Стравинского превращают его в олицетворение творческого универсализма ХХ века.

Ключевые слова: *Стравинский, диалог, внезаходимость, странничество, универсализм, Бердяев, Бахтин, Библиер.*

With every passing day Stravinsky's central position in the musical culture of his time stands out all the more clearly. The 20th century, especially its first half, can be defined as "the time of Stravinsky". It is precisely in the creative work of the Russian master many artistic tendencies of his time found their most complete and consistent expression. Many, but not all. Just as in the late Renaissance period when the most general artistic ideas of the time were expressed not only by Palestrina, but also Lasso, and just as the first half of the 18th century is primarily associated with the

creative work of Bach and Handel, the first half of the 20th century belong not only to Stravinsky, but also to Webern.

It seems that it is not Schoenberg, but Webern, who, by the sharply delineated originality of the sound world he created and by the esoteric nature of his general artistic position, presents a true historical alternative to the exoteric Stravinsky, who was open to diverse artistic influences. Stravinsky, like Lasso and Handel, is an extraverted artist, inclined to change his place of residence and travel around the world, sampling many musical cultures and interacting with a huge number of people. In contrast, Webern personifies the introverted creative type, who confines himself to the boundaries of his own country and is less inclined toward moving about, preferring instead to remain within a rather narrow circle of like-minded individuals.

Despite the difference in their internal psychological make-up, both extrovert and introvert types share similarities in their higher creative manifestations. Traversing different paths, they arrive at a common goal – the creation of a personal and unique artistic micro-world, through which the macro-world of the culture they have been raised in reveals its essential features. In our profound conviction, it is precisely the micro-worlds of Stravinsky and Webern, complementing one another, are the most adept at creating a reliable picture of European music in the first half of the 20th century for future generations.

Webern passed away in 1945, Stravinsky in 1971. The life of the Austrian master chronologically coincided with an era that he came to personify. The Russian master, on the contrary, outlived his time. It is namely this circumstance that puts a special stamp on Stravinsky's creative output of the 1950s-1960s. The mentality of the artist, who stepped into the role of "living history," and the forms of his musical self-expression in a new musical language situation – these, as well as many other aspects of his late work – are inextricably linked with the fundamental traits of the composer's artistic thought, which manifested themselves in the first half of the 20th century. One such trait was the Russian master's predisposition to dialogue, predetermined by the conditions of his creative formation.

Stravinsky's creative formation coincided with an overall crisis of artistic culture in Europe. In his historical-philosophical conception, N. Berdyaev defines the 19th century, especially its second half, as the "end of the Renaissance and the crisis of humanism." The outstanding Russian philosopher broadly interprets the concept of the Renaissance, implying by it the whole period of New Time (1300s–1900s) in European culture. Beginning with the 14th century, the history of Europe, according to N. Berdyaev, is permeated with the spirit of humanism. He sees in the phenomenon of humanism a deep internal contradiction, conditioned by the aspiration of human individuality toward self-affirmation, which essentially negates the view of a person as an image and a likeness of God. The hypertrophy of the individualistic principle inevitably leads to "...demoralization [corruption] of the person, because a person, who has set out on the path of exclusive self-affirmation, when he stops recognizing a higher principle, when he recognizes himself as a self-contained being, destroys himself by an inescapable internal dialectic, negates himself." The triumph of individualism, shaking human personality and placing in doubt basic humanistic

values, finds, in N. Berdyaev's opinion, its most complete objectification in the philosophy of F. Nietzsche. [2, p.p. 116, 108-110, 119-121].

The root of many woes of European culture of the late 19th and early 20th centuries N. Berdyaev sees in the weakening ability toward dialogue. "When a person recognizes nothing except himself, he stops feeling himself, because in order to feel himself, he has to recognize and not himself, in order to be an individuality until the end, he has to recognize not only another human personality and individuality, has to recognize a divine personality," emphasizes the Russian philosopher [2, p. 120].

The dialogue as interaction of different substances is one of the fundamental traits of human existence and thinking. Outside a dialogue with another human being, with the surrounding world, a person cannot consist as a social, rational creature. "To think means to become a different person (or a natural object – rock, wood) such that both you and the other person (rock, wood) remain in their places, stay the same, but your becoming an "object" in reality proceeded as internal dialogue of "I" and the "other I" [3, p.p. 378-379].

Developing the many-centuries tradition of European philosophy (beginning with antiquity), V. Bibler insists upon "the decisive role of logic of dialogue in the development of creative thinking." The author is convinced that the form of an internal dispute is the only logical form of creative thought: "I assert something. 'I' reject this something and put forward a different assumption. I, in reply, strengthen my initial arguments, but at the same time 'I' develop my reciprocal assumption... In short, I think" [4, p.p. 8, 70].

Orienting himself on the formula "logic of creativity = logic of inner dialogue, conversation of internal collocutors," V. Bibler examines the dialogical intellect of New Time as a systemic phenomenon, based on:

- dialogue of intellectual abilities (reason-mind-intuition);
- dialogue of the theoretic and philosopher within a single theoretical creative mind;
- dialogue of a theoretical and aesthetic mind, flowing out of unity and contradictions between theoretical and artistic creativity;
- dialogue of the culture of thinking of New time and any other culture (ancient, Middle Ages, near future).

The many tendencies in the development of European musical art on the cusp of the 19th and 20th centuries were based on the activation of its dialogic potentiality. Thus, the dialogue between the stages of "today" and "the day before yesterday" in the development of European music conditioned from an aesthetic and language point of view the classical tendencies of the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, as well as a later neoclassicism. Involving in the dialogue the oldest layers of European folklore permitted composers of a neo-folkloristic orientation to give the musical language of the 20th century a more universal, "supra-individual" character. A dialogue-polemic and a dialogue-denial by several 20th century composers of an artistic heritage of the 19th century predetermined the radical-innovative character of their creative aspirations, leading to the creation of language and compositional systems, fundamentally different from traditional tonality. A completely new phenome-

non was the persistent interest by a number of figures from Europe's musical culture at the turn of the centuries to the art of non-European civilizations. Dialogue with the cultures of the East, Asia, Africa, North and South America helped to overcome the egocentric self-isolation of European music.

Stravinsky's central position in musical culture of the 20th century is defined by many factors. One, however, merits special attention. This is the reflection in his compositions of the entire variety of dialogical forms of musical culture contemporaneous to him. Indeed, in one form or another, Stravinsky's creative work correlates both to the musical "day before yesterday" and the oldest forms of folklore, to the new language systems and culture of non-European civilizations. Thus, the Orient theme (in a European interpretation, naturally) found its embodiment in the opera *The Nightingale* and in *Three Japanese Lyrics*. The stylistics of jazz was the foundation for *Ragtime for 11 Instruments*, *Piano-Rag Music* and *Ebony Concerto*. The poetics of ancient Slavic folklore defined the artistic countenance of a majority of compositions in his Russian period. A revival of the ideals of pre-romantic art formed the foundation of aesthetics in the neoclassical stage of Stravinsky's creative evolution. Even the achievements of "sound technique progress" (a term used by M. Aranovsky) in 20th century music were not alien to the composer, who turned to serialism in his 70s.

The variety of dialogical forms, peculiar to the Russian master's creative output, is by no means accidental. It is laid in the nature of the composer's creative personality, which entered into dialogue with the widest circle of world musical culture. The culture of the East, jazz, the oldest strata of folklore, the musical art of the Renaissance, Baroque and Classicism, the serial technique – all these formed a circle of phenomena, opposing Stravinsky's unique individuality at various stages of his creative evolution. A dialogue with them defined the tendency of artistic yearnings of the composer and unique quality of his creative method.

For a comprehension of the dialogical foundations of Stravinsky's creative method, one of the most important ideas of M. Bakhtin – the idea of standing outside – plays a fundamental role. In his "Response to a Question from the Editor of *Novy Mir*," M. Bakhtin writes the following: "In the sphere of culture, standing outside is the most powerful lever of comprehension. A strange culture only in the eyes of another culture reveals itself more fully and more deeply (but not in all its entirety, because other cultures will come, which will see and understand even more). One meaning reveals its depths, encountered and touched with another, foreign meaning: a dialogue is started between them, which overcomes the reserve and one-sidedness of these meanings, of these cultures" [1, p. 354].

The Bakhtinian idea of standing outside stems from the understanding of culture as a dialogue of cultures. M. Bakhtin views any culture as "a phenomenon, not having its own volume, existing only on the edge, that is, only in the context of an intercultural dialogue." An intercultural dialogue as an actual form of discovering the semantic abundance of any culture is realized not in and of itself, but in the bright field of consciousness of an artistically thinking individual. Such possibility springs from the ability of creative consciousness to go out onto the periphery of its own culture, to overcome its boundaries and break out into intercultural space. A decisive

condition of soaring in intercultural space is, as V. Bibler justly noted, "knocking out from usual civilized, formational and social connections and dooming to communication of the street and station." Only one who "turned out to be an outsider of civilization and became its wanderer" [4, p. 154, 110] is capable of professing intercultural dialogue. One of the brightest examples of wandering in the intercultural space of the 20th century was the life and creative work of Stravinsky.

Having left Russia in 1914, Stravinsky found refuge in Switzerland over the course of the following six years. Beginning with 1920, France replaced Switzerland for almost two decades, and in 1939 the composer took up permanent residence in the USA. Continuing his concert tours throughout his life, attending premieres of his works in the greatest cultural centers of the world and frequent changes of residence condemned Stravinsky to a perception of culture of different countries and peoples "from the street, not from home; from the train station, not from 'the workplace'" [4, p. 109]. The border of cultures, in each of which he passed for being both "native" and "foreign" simultaneously, was the composer's destiny. From this angle of vision let us examine a few facts of the composer's biography.

The premieres of the ballets *The Firebird*, *Petrushka* and *The Rite of Spring*, which brought Stravinsky fame throughout Europe, took place not in his homeland but in Paris. His epochal discoveries in the area of compositional technique, resulting from a deep comprehension of the consistency of folkloric intonation, were not even valued for their quality by such a generally recognized expert of Russian popular-song art as A. Kastal'sky [6, p.p. 207-213].

Over the course of many years, Stravinsky closely communicated with a number of outstanding representatives of French artistic culture. Thus, he enjoyed a close friendship with Debussy and Ravel. Collaboration with Picasso yielded brilliant fruits in the production of *Pulcinella*. Based in France, Stravinsky became an indisputable artistic authority for a young generation of French composers. Representatives of "Les Six" respectfully nicknamed him "Tsar Igor." However, Stravinsky's attempt in 1936 to gain membership in the French Academy of Fine Arts through a competition was unsuccessful: the fortunate competitor turned out to be F. Schmitt, gifted but not nearly as talented as the Russian master.

The move to the USA brought Stravinsky a settled life and a solid financial situation. The press coddled the world famous composer; his name often appeared in the society pages and he experienced no shortage of lucrative commissions. However, the spirit of commerce, permeating all aspects of life in the USA, including musical culture, turned out to be deeply alien to Stravinsky. Forced to accept the rules of the game, he could never completely adapt himself to the American way of life for as long as he lived. Having twice changed his citizenship, he remained forever a "citizen of the world".

These facts from Stravinsky's biography testify to his position, by no means a leading one, in the context of a number of European and non-European musical cultures. Having spent time in the thick of events and living for a long time in the greatest musical centers of the world, Stravinsky was not destined to become a key figure in the development of any particular national culture. The fate of the composer's ar-

tistic legacy on his homeland can serve as obvious confirmation of this: only in the 1960s did Stravinsky's creativity began to have a perceptive influence on the development of Russian music. Thus, characterizing the beginning of the 1960s in Soviet musical culture as a time of "stylistic demarcation", G. Grigor'eva justly pointed out that the creative work of Stravinsky became for the young generation of domestic composers, along with the artistic discoveries of Boulez, Stockhausen, Nono and Berio, "a powerful stimulus of imaginative and stylistic reorientation" [5, p. 56].

In the preceding three decades the name of the composer and his creative work were considered anathema in the USSR. To be sure, it is impossible to discredit the ideology of the "iron curtain," which tightly sealed off Soviet culture during the 1930s–1950s from any kind of outside influence. However, the reasons for the prolonged "oblivion" of Stravinsky's music in his homeland are seemingly much deeper than that.

The interpretation of typically national images in a universal, common to all mankind key, peculiar to the compositions of the Russian creative period, and the tendency of neoclassicism, which determined the direction of Stravinsky's artistic quests in the 1920s–1940s, caused the composer to feel a remoteness from the "grounded" processes of development which had nurtured his native musical culture. As a distinctive periphery of Russian music, not directly connected with its vital, topical and immediate problems, the creative work of Stravinsky, at the same time, emerged as one of the most significant phenomena of 20th century world musical culture on the whole. The figure of the composer came to be the personification of one of the most important properties of contemporary creative personality – that of universality. The composer is infinitely far from a carefully cultivated individual manner of musical expression. He constantly enters into dialogue with different phenomena of musical culture of the past and present, and it is precisely in this that he finds himself. The dialogic nature of Stravinsky's creative method was at the basis of the composer's neoclassicism (1920s–1940s). It even predetermined the distinctive nature of artistic decisions in a later period of his creativity (1950s–1960s).

References

1. Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *The Aesthetics of Verbal Art*. Moscow: Iskusstvo [in Russian].
2. Berdyaev, N.A. (1990). *The Meaning of History*. Moscow: Mysl' [in Russian].
3. Bibler, V. S. (1975). *The Thinking as Creativity. Introduction to the logic of mental dialogue*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury [In Russian].
4. Bibler, V. S. (1991). *Michail Michaylovich Bakhtin and the Poetics of Culture*. Moscow: Progress [In Russian].
5. Grigor'eva, G. N. (1989). *Stylistic Problems of Russian Soviet Music in the second half of 20th century*. Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor [In Russian].
6. Kastal'sky, A. D. (1973) *From the Notes // I. F. Stravinsky: Articles and Materials*. Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor [In Russian].