

Andraž Jež

ZRC SAZU Institute of Literature and Literary Studies

andraz.jez@zrc-sazu.si

“Music, much as people take snapshots during vacation”: An Outline of Mimetic Prospects in Musical Modernism

Abstract

It has often been said that after 1900 formal modernism diminished the role of the mimetic (i.e., imitation or representation) in all arts. This article opposes such a general conclusion. Formal modernism in art did not represent any general relationship to the mimetic; rather, it questioned the traditional relationship to forms of representation within each particular art form. Although a traditional notion of mimesis indeed makes it possible to see a good deal of literature and the visual arts as less mimetic after 1900, twentieth-century music discovered unprecedented representational possibilities, which are illustrated with the case of *musique concrète*. In the last section, the article reflects on its thesis with a comparative perspective on the postmodernist turn in various arts.

Keywords: twentieth-century art, contemporary music, modernism, postmodernism, avant-garde, *musique concrète*, minimalist music, photorealism

How do we understand mimesis today?

The recognition of the decline of the mimetic derives from the traditional and still prevailing view, one that equates mimesis “with . . . some form of copying reality.” Its important proponent in the twentieth century was Erich Auerbach, whose groundbreaking *Mimesis* (1946) was sometimes criticized for hardly ever touching on the problematic of mimesis, but instead focusing on an ahistorically conceived realist narration (Isomaa et al. 2012: x–ix). On the other hand, (post)structuralists—most notably Roland Barthes, who discussed the “reality effect” in 1968—treated art’s imitative function with the required subtlety. However, they became so immersed in “verbal structures” that their analyses—as its critics noted—

disregarded the ties between a text and reality, “closing the literary world in the ‘prison-house of language’” (Isomaa et al. 2012: ix). Instead of these two options, post-classical narratology and similar theories (more recently also cognitive studies), deriving from Paul Ricœur’s analyses of the narrative (1983–1985), have considered mimesis “a mediating phenomenon between literature and lived experience” (ibid.).

Synthesizing studies of the last two decades continue to perceive mimesis as more than just an imitation. Stephen Halliwell’s referential *The Aesthetics of Mimesis* (2012) identified two basic concepts that, in different variations and mutual combinations, prevailed throughout the “tradition of aesthetic mimeticism from its beginnings in Plato and Aristotle” (ibid.: viii): the first concept is “the idea of mimesis as committed to depicting and illuminating a world that is (partly) accessible and knowable outside art, and by whose norms art can therefore, within limits, be tested and judged,” and the second is “the idea of mimesis as the creator of any independent artistic heterocosm, a world of its own” (ibid.; Halliwell 2005: 5). Halliwell stressed the importance of the second concept—which Władysław Tatarkiewicz (1980: 268) had already traced at least to Aristotle in the 1930s—for art in general, and he thus opposed the generally prevailing understanding of mimesis as merely (or, at best, mostly) imitative.

The authors of the book of proceedings *Rethinking Mimesis: Concepts and Practices of Literary Representation* from 2012 (among them Halliwell himself) rely on such a notion of the creative nature of mimesis, and they productively reflect it through the ideas of mimesis as mediation started by Ricœur’s analyses (Isomaa et al. 2012: x–xii). The book thus “stems from its focus on the notion of mimesis interpreted as the real within the imaginary” (ibid.: xi). Note that I find the concept of mimesis as creative and mediating between the material world and our ideas of striking relevance—and at least partly overlapping with the theses and conclusions of this article. The main premise of the article, however, takes into account the other concept: mimesis as an imitation—first because this concept generally still prevails outside expert circles, and second because its lasting impact also majorly affected the positions against which this article polemicizes.

In literary theory, mimesis is broadly understood as an “imitative representation of a certain event, activity, thing, state, or person” (Dolar et al. 1981: 144). Such a view has often been applied to art in general, not least because of comparable relations in the visual arts. As formal modernism drastically affected the representation of the material world in literature and the visual arts, many have contrasted modernism and mimesis. The idea of the irrelevance of mimesis after 1900 actually extended well beyond the arts; among artists themselves as well as among theoreticians, discussions on modernism have sometimes even implied a gradual dis-

solution of mimesis in European culture on a large scale (or, even more broadly, in consciousness) around 1900. This presentation seeks to prove such notions inadequate, especially when it comes to music.

The decline of imitation in modernism?

As early as 1910/11, the American poet Ezra Pound wrote that “In every art I can think of we are dammed and clogged by the mimetic” (1973: 42). He distinguished between “symptomatic” and “donative” artists, the former representing reality faithfully, and the latter—welcomed by Pound, one of the early modernist poets—intervening in reality in a creative manner (ibid.: 25).

Decades later, some art thinkers still associated contemporary art with diminishing mimesis or representation. In 1984, Arthur Danto, an American analytic philosopher and an influential art critic for the magazine *The Nation*, equated art and representation. Hence, he ascribed representation’s (supposed) lack in the twentieth century to the death of art. As has already been noted, his findings were not applicable to music (Adajian 2012). However, Susan Sontag, an American author with a clear aversion toward the analytical method in philosophy, also wrote in her groundbreaking *Against Interpretation* (1966), that “in modern times . . . most artists and critics have discarded the theory of art as representation of an outer reality,” which she too found inadequate (2013: 245). In her condemnation of the interpretative approach, she claimed: “What is needed, first, is more attention to form in art” (ibid.: 251). However, it is exactly the formal criterion that contradicts her own conclusions; to see how, such accounts should be taken seriously and applied to music.

Nevertheless, the reflection of the mimetic in music often follows the aforementioned findings from literary and art theory. Even Carl Dahlhaus, one of the greatest connoisseurs of contemporary music, considered imitation characteristic of the music of older periods. He detected a strong notch in the nineteenth century, and he especially understood Beethoven’s *Pastoral Symphony* (*Pastoral Sinfonie*, 1808) as an early example of the rejection of imitation. Instead of merely imitating nature (*natura naturata*), the new, more subjective compositional style was tending toward *natura naturans*, or nature in creation (1985: 21–25). This article relies on the same “imitative” concept of the mimetic and also applies it to music—but it develops it diametrically opposite to the prevailing view.

The prehistory of modernism

The modernist break in art was, first and foremost, a subversion of the existing formal models of what was perceived as art. The attitude of innovation was not particularly new for the ever-changing art of the bourgeoisie. Rather, the break was a sudden radicalization of earlier artistic development; that is, a continuous dialectic alternation of the discontinuities, yet this time the new discontinuity was unprecedentedly sharp. Why was it around 1900 in particular that the discontinuity went well beyond a mere departure from previous stylistic trends and virtually rebutted some basic components of art as perceived through ages? What follows in this section is a complex but necessary passage for understanding the wider context in which formal modernism appeared (and, decades later, ceased in its pure forms).

The continuous process of discontinuities, prevailing in the arts of the urban centers of the global North, was more or less parallel to wider European and American capitalist development. The move away from feudalism between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries (especially since manufacturing was being “updated” in industries with catastrophic results) brought about the decay of art patronage (Hobsbawm 1962: 260; Hauser 1999: 41, 44–46). Patronage as a feudal art institution had for centuries helped reproduce art that had corresponded to so-called poetics. Poetics featured prescribed models of what was beautiful in which art and how to attain it. These models corresponded to the seemingly immutable values of Europe’s aristocracy.

For centuries, artists were henceforth more or less talented craftsmen representing the power and the values of their own patrons. The idea of art as largely an inner expression (or a subjectivism), as transgressing its own boundaries (or a formal riot in art), as being socially critical (or a social riot in art), or even as a self-sufficient sphere serving beauty only (or *l’art pour l’art*)—all these various ideas that today are seen as intrinsic to art, if not natural, were largely alien to artists throughout most of the feudal centuries. Although the French rococo of the first half of the eighteenth century perhaps unsystematically pioneered it in the visual arts (Hauser 1999: 29), the concept of *l’art pour l’art* was nonetheless still incomprehensible to contemporary English Whig and Tory bourgeoisie writers (ibid.: 41).

The ideas of fetishized subjectivism, of a formal and social riot in art, as well as of *l’art pour l’art*, could only gain wider prominence after capitalism took its new turn. It was after English industrialization shaped its own artistic opposition: Romanticism. Artists, formerly financed by the patronage, were suddenly thrown into a chaotic market. As Hobsbawm (1962: 260–261) noted, the Romantic poets had to develop entirely new

strategies of displaying themselves, and they thus became outrageous, untamed geniuses. After centuries, the prescribed beauty suddenly felt dull and uninspired in the Romantic geniuses' attitude. The expression of the formal and political riot, of the personal and, slightly later, of the esthetic, rapidly became common tropes. Poetics was largely replaced by esthetics.

However, this was just a prehistory of the formal modernism, which could only appear later, in the specific conditions of the imperialist stage of capitalism after 1871, when the world became "an even more dangerous place" because of "the tacit equation of unlimited economic growth and political power, which came to be unconsciously accepted" (Hobsbawm 2001: 318). The hostility among different countries—often contributing to the western European colonial plunder of the global South—was deepening and finally escalated with the First World War. Concurrently, class stratification was still growing and severely cut social bonds in Europe and elsewhere. A sensible individual could not but feel an enormous sense of isolation, distrust, and impotence.

This deeply pessimistic outlook (or its cultural logic) gained unprecedented proportion against the perpetual backdrop of social and political turmoil, the turnarounds in natural sciences accompanying the second industrial revolution (less than half a century after the groundbreaking theory of evolution, the theory of relativity, and the so-called old quantum theory appeared), as well as turnarounds in philosophy (Marx, Engels; Kierkegaard, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche; Husserl) and psychology (Freud's theory of the unconscious). Increasingly more individuals and groups (among them artists) were starting to question the very foundations of the societies they were living in. However, they felt—as well as expressed—their doubts very differently.

Many reflecting individuals oriented toward their own inner, hidden worlds or simply unspoiled esthetic worlds, constantly threatened by the same capitalist reality that shaped them. Many others, however, oriented toward the systemic critique of the world that necessitated such epistemological egotism. The latter reflection (and its art) often leaned toward a social change (a leap outside the arts). The former reflection (and its art) often turned toward a formal change (a leap within the arts)—also in the case of the modernism. Although these reflections often opposed each other, throughout the most of twentieth century there were many artists that, in different art forms, dynamically combined both (e.g. Mayakovsky, Breton, Neruda, García Márquez; Picasso, Rivera; Nono, Rzewsky).

Technical innovations as catalyzers of formal modernism: the case of music

In understanding the modernist break, one should also consider three important innovations of the two industrial revolutions: the phonograph, photography, and the changed status of now daily and widely available newspapers. In the case of literature and the visual arts, these innovations—daily newspapers, read on a massive scale, and the camera—interfered in an area previously dominated by art. With the rapid domestication of new technologies and their representational power, audiences could suddenly easily see through the illusion of the “lacking” mimetic representation in literature and the visual arts. The distance from previously effective artistic practices was thus possible only after the non-artistic medium evoked the same illusory representation even more convincingly. The new technology, however, had quite a different effect on music. This is no wonder because the role of representation in music had been different from other art forms from the outset. To prove this point, I focus precisely on selected developments in contemporary music below.

Throughout history, European notated music had never relied on the faithful reproduction of sounds as physical phenomena, nor sounds as people hear them. On the contrary, even in feudal times, musical discourse had been a complex self-referential system that inevitably tamed and modified its representation. Especially from the mid-eighteenth century onward, a new, simplified tuning was circulating widely, and it soon became standard in Europe. It further stylized the musical system and detached it from pure intervals and natural aliquots. This formal system, now even more abstractly removed from natural sounds, was nothing but an “equal temperament.” This is precisely the tuning that the European ear has ideologically internalized as natural and that is still the harmonic backbone of almost all Western music.¹

Until 1900, traditional musical discourse had never sought to minimize or even eliminate its essential difference from what was “mimetically” depicted. When Ludwig van Beethoven represented nightingale (with flute),

¹ According to the composer Kyle Gann (1998): “Equal temperament—the bland, equal spacing of the 12 pitches of the octave—is pretty much a 20th-century phenomenon. It was known about in Europe as early as the early 17th century, and in China much earlier. But it wasn’t used, because the consensus was that it sounded awful: out of tune and characterless. During the 19th century ... keyboard tuning drifted closer and closer to equal temperament over the protest of many of the more sensitive musicians. Not until 1917 was a method devised for tuning exact equal temperament.”

quail (oboe), and cuckoo sounds (two clarinets; Jones 1995: 11) in his *Pastoral Symphony*, he diligently translated bird singing into traditional frames of musical discourse; he articulated it in tempered tuning, steady rhythm, and harmonic patterns. Even around 1800, the great German classicist was undoubtedly aware of the enormous difference between birdsong, as perceived by the human ear, and his own adaptation of it. (Note that it was exactly the *Pastoral Symphony* that Dahlhaus saw as a milestone in music becoming less imitative!) However, until the end of the nineteenth century, music was consensually accepted as music only if it filtered all outside elements without residue—hence, only if it was sufficiently abstract (or non-representative). Only after dodecaphonic intervention—which shook the age-long abstract notation system by creating one even more abstract—were there numerous modernist moments in which Western music, for the first time in its history, enthusiastically embraced sounds as they were outside music: hence, mimetically.

The phonograph, phonograph, and other machines that recorded, stored, and disseminated music since the 1860s had technical as well as social implications even before the advent of actual electronic instruments. Whereas the only occasion to hear an orchestral composition in the previous eras were rare and hardly accessible court or bourgeois concerts, the new machines democratically made possible the quick dissemination of old and new compositions as well as their repeated listening ad nauseam. Whereas traditional notation had required special skills in juxtaposing different sounds, a concert recording captured many unavoidable yet unregulated non-musical sounds. The sound of a tuning orchestra, sounds from the audience or musicians' glitches, and so on had always accompanied performances, but no one had perceived them as musical. Suddenly, the concert records inextricably rendered these incidental sounds integral to music. Playing music on these machines added a number of secondary inevitable sounds to the reception. These included the hum of the turntable rotating and the constant sliding of the needle across the disc, not to mention the sounds emitted by scratches on the surface of the disc during playback.

It is no wonder that soon after 1900 musicians were becoming increasingly aware of sound as potentially integral material or a source of music. Multimedia avant-gardes paved the way: first around 1910 the Italian futurist writers and musicians discovered *arte dei rumori*, the art of noise, and even designed special instruments (*intonarumori*) to produce various noises. Moreover, for well over a decade after 1917, a growing number of musicians (e.g., Arseny Avraamov) and other artists (e.g., Dziga Vertov) in Soviet Russia extensively experimented with sounds.²

² In his *Symphony of Sirens* (performed in Baku exactly one hundred years ago

Postwar radicalization of mimesis in modernist music: *musique concrète*

Internationally, however, the musical use of non-musical sounds only blossomed after the Second World War, starting in the 1940s and 1950s with European musical studios such as Club d'Essai in Paris, the Studio for Electronic Music (WDR) in Cologne, and the Polish Radio Experimental Studio in Warsaw. One of the earliest postwar streams of modernist music, *musique concrète*, was particularly interested in the electronic treatment of recorded non-musical sounds. *Musique concrète*, started in the late 1940s by the Paris radio engineer Pierre Schaeffer and composer Pierre Henry, indicates how an important portion of twentieth-century modernist music relied on an (even traditionally understood) mimetic approach.

Some treatments of the recorded sound were significant, sometimes, however, the composer's input was minimal. This overlapped with an important American compositional stream of the time; from the early 1950s on, John Cage and other composers of the so called indeterminacy notably influenced the modernist composers to abandon the purportedly rigid compositional rules (the more traditional as well as the dodecaphonic) and simply let the sounds occur spontaneously. Let me illustrate the latter with the case of Luc Ferrari, already a representative of the second generation of French concrete music, which overlapped with the New Left's 1960s neo-avant-garde. Ferrari was known for recognizable sources of sound in his narrative "anecdotal music" (Emmerson 2007: 77). In some compositions, such as *Almost Nothing I (Presque rien I)*, released in 1970, the electronic medium in production was limited to the imperceptible editing of pre-recorded material. Roger Sutherland wrote the following about this "electroacoustic postcard," as he called it:

Presque rien I is an extended portrayal, albeit in fast motion, of daybreak [and evening] on a beach in Algeria [actually Yugoslavia³]. There is virtually no

celebrating the fifth anniversary of the revolution), Avraamov "used navy ship sirens and whistles, bus and car horns, factory sirens, cannons, the foghorns of the Soviet flotilla . . . , artillery guns, machine guns, [and] airplanes" (Petrushanskaya-Averbakh 2015: 223). The inventive musical use of electronic instruments and non-musical sounds also had a remarkable impact on theater, radio play, and film; in particular, Vertov used the recorded industrial and incidental sounds, especially thoroughly (notably more than speech) in his experimental film *Enthusiasm* (1931).

³ It was recorded in Croatian Vela Luka (Kutschke 2008: 92). In Algeria, however, Ferrari recorded another thoroughly mimetic piece, *Promenade symphonique à travers un paysage musical* in 1976–1978. According to composer Tom Johnson (1982), "there was no actual distortion of the sounds. It's almost as if the piece

cutting and editing of the original material. Ferrari limits his artistic prerogatives in a somewhat Cageian manner, using only microphone placement and superimposition to create an interplay between diverse elements: the drone of motor boats, the surge of the waves, fragments of human speech and the noise of crickets. (Sutherland 1994: 51)

Ferrari himself, a classic example of a composer, interested in formal as well as social change, was clear about his radically mimetic, representative tendencies. He conceived an emancipatory prospect of democratizing different aspects of life:

I wanted to forge a language existing on a dramatic as well as a musical plane. The use of realistic elements allowed me to tell a story and allows the listener to invent his own images. I have called this “poor man’s *concrète* music” since practically no manipulation was involved and the tape could have been made in a non-professional studio. My intention was to pave the amateur *concrète* music, much as people take snapshots during vacation. (Ibid.)

In this respect, he was even closer to the traditional idea of “mimetic,” or imitative, music than Schaeffer and Henry, and especially from his second-generation peers, Bernard Parmegiani and François Bayle, notable for their complex electronic treatment of prerecorded sounds. However, all of the aforementioned used non-notated sounds in a far more mimetic manner than any composer before 1900 could even think of.

At this point, the article can return from the musical realm to a wider comparison: the New Left’s neo-avant-gardism around 1970 often radicalized modernist formal approaches. It affected part of modernist literature in quite a surprising way. Although early modernist literature was often less imitative than its forerunners and despite the neo-avant-garde produced some of the most non-representative literature, in the same intellectual milieu literature sometimes took a more mimetic approach than ever before, at a price of its verbal idiom.

Concrete/visual and sound poetry (a significant part of the neo-avant-garde), although developed already around 1900, was notably radicalized in 1960s (both politically and formally). Even here, an unexpected form

was the soundtrack for a scene in a small desert town. At first it didn’t seem to me as if much was happening compositionally, but gradually I realized I was actually hearing a whole lot of scene and cast changes. It was just that the composer had blended separate takes so seamlessly that everything flowed together. It is an extraordinary mixing job, and I found the piece fascinating. [Ferrari] told me, however, that it had offended a number of people for whom the term *musique concr[è]te* was not supposed to include tape pieces of this sort.”

of mimesis emerged: whereas earlier forms of concrete poetry (Apolinaire, Kruchyonikh, Marinetti, etc.) had functioned at the crossroads of the verbal and visual, the neo-avant-garde poem (by de Campos brothers, Szombathy, Bentivoglio, Katue, etc.) was often nothing else than a telling (obviously mimetic) photography or a traditionally mimetic drawing, or a recorded nonverbal sound. While the majority of modernist visual arts departed from the traditionally conceived mimetic imitation, as captured by photography, neo-avant-garde modernist literature (though often exhausted by verbal imitation) often moved in its proximity.

The second shift of mimesis in the wake of postmodernism: photorealism and musical minimalism

To additionally complicate matters, nonetheless, one American stream of painting, contemporary to the 1960s neo-avant-garde, brought about the most mimetic approach that the visual arts have ever seen: photo- and hyperrealism, in which even an educated eye can sometimes barely distinguish an oil painting from its photographic source. At first glance, photorealism seems comparable to Luc Ferrari's *musique concrète*: both represent concrete material from reality more faithfully than had ever been the case in their respective arts, while trying to hide the technical treatment of it—and often a personal approach.

In the course of art history, however, they can also be seen as mutually opposing: *musique concrète* was, at least in a sense, a radicalization of the previous modernist development: it turned farther away from the traditional, pre-modernist musical patterns, which had by default been abstract. By contrast, photorealism was largely a negation of the modernist development in the visual arts: it reacted to the 1950s American abstract expressionism (of Pollock, Rothko, and others; Fichner-Rathus 2011: 299; Lindey 1980: 23) and returned to the traditional, pre-modernist visual patterns, even enhancing their concrete representational power.

In this respect, photorealism was closer to American minimalist music (such as Riley's, Reich's, or Glass's) than to any purely modernist *musique concrète*; whereas both visual photorealism and musical minimalism turned closer to the pre-modernist patterns, the status of the mimetic as imitation was redistributed once again: photorealist painting abandoned the most outrageous abstractness of the modernist visual arts and returned to the mimetic. On the other hand, minimalist music with its recognizable rhythm (a repetitive pulse) and melodies (usually in equal temperament) abandoned the most outrageous mimetic music (such as *musique concrète*; Schwarz 2008: 10–11; Sutherland 1994: 226) and, at least in this particular

respect, returned to a similar amount of abstraction that had been in music before 1900.

Nonetheless, at least initially both photorealism and especially minimalism were still rooted in a daring experiment,⁴ so self-evident to the formal modernism in all arts. The paradigm changed in the mid-1970s, when all art forms drew even closer to their late nineteenth-century bourgeois norms, whether they were mimetic or abstract: both minimalists and photorealists were hailed (or loathed) as the pioneers or at least forerunners of the postmodernist partial return to the traditional dimensions in each art.⁵

Conclusions

With a reflection of the formal development of the arts from the late nineteenth century to the mid-1970s postmodernist turn, it is safe to assume that mimesis, even if understood as nearly mere imitation, was not flushed away with modernism but was instead redistributed. The arts to which it had traditionally been a central dimension turned away from the imitative and representative (especially visual arts and literature), whereas among important formal modernist leaps that awaited music (for ages an abstract and not directly representative system) especially after the Second World War, it drew closer to (intentionally radical) imitation.

The decline of mimesis in modernism is an even less plausible idea if one considers mimesis in the subtler manner of Halliwell or other contemporary researchers, as that deriving from Aristotle—hence not as imitation, but as a creative force of mediation between the world and one’s perception of it. If such a notion of mimesis might not be equally valid for

⁴ Photorealism nonetheless relied more on contemporary American (modernist) pop art (Fichner-Rathus 2011: 299; Lindey 1980: 23; Taylor 2010: 15, 21) than traditional European painting before 1871. Minimalists’ first works, although immediately rejected by modernist composers such as Boulez, were also far from backward-leaning academism. As an English conductor of early as well as contemporary choral music, wrote, early Reich was “every bit as [modernist] ‘avant-garde’ as anything that had preceded him” (Hillier 2004: 3–4).

⁵ Postmodernism of the art praxes of the 1960s is hence understood in this article as “modernism after modernism,” and not simply as antimodernism. Judging from the earliest art streams commonly denoted as postmodernism (American metafiction and the “Latin American Boom” in literature, minimalism and Zappa in music, photorealism in painting), the definition is pertinent at least formally, even despite an incomparable ideological regression of the majority of postmodern(ist) philosophy (and much postmodernist art following the late 1970s). In the early 1980s, Hal Foster distinguished between “postmodernism of resistance” and “postmodernism of reaction” (1983: xii; Potter 2002: 19–20).

the entire history of arts, as its proponents sometimes suggest, it is doubtlessly applicable to modernism in its mission to creatively update formal approaches to artistic representation.

References

- Adajian, Thomas. 2012. The Definition of Art. In: Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Dahlhaus, Carl. 1985. *Realism in Nineteenth-Century Music*. Cambridge: CUP Archive.
- Dolinar, Darko, et al. 1981. *Literatura*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Emmerson, Simon. 2007. *Living Electronic Music*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Fichner-Rathus, Lois. 2011. *Foundations of Art and Design: An Enhanced Media Edition*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Foster, Hal. 1983. Postmodernism: A Preface. In: Hal Foster (ed.), *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Post-Modern Culture*, pp. xi–xii. London: Pluto Press.
- Gann, Kyle. 1998. An Introduction to Historical Tunings. Available at: <https://www.kylegann.com/histune.html>.
- Halliwell, Stephen. 2002. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hauser, Arnold. 1999. *The Social History of Art Volume III: Rococo, Classicism and Romanticism*. London: Routledge.
- Hillier, Paul. Introduction. 2004. In: Steve Reich. *Writings on Music 1965–2000*, pp. 3–18. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 1962. *The Age of Revolution: 1789–1848*. New York: New American Library.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 2001. *The Age of Empire: 1875–1914*. London: Abacus.
- Isomaa, Saija, Sari Kivisto, Pirjo Lyytikäinen, Sanna Nyqvist, Merja Polvinen, & Riikka Rossi. 2012. Introduction: Rethinking Mimesis. In: Saija Isomaa, Sari Kivisto, Pirjo Lyytikäinen, Sanna Nyqvist, Merja Polvinen, Riikka Rossi (eds.), *Rethinking Mimesis: Concepts and Practices of Literary Representation*, pp. vii–xviii. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.
- Johnson, Tom. 1982. Ruffling Feathers: Luc Ferrari. Available at: <https://editions75.com/tvonm/articles/1982/ruffling-feathers-luc-ferrari.html>.
- Jones, David Wyn. 1995. *Beethoven: The Pastoral Symphony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kutschke, Beate. 2008. *Musikkulturen in der Revolte: Studien zu Rock, Avantgarde und Klassik im Umfeld von '1968'*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Lindey, Christine. 1980. *Superrealist Painting and Sculpture*. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- Petrushanskaya-Averbakh, Elena. 2015. A la recherche d'une sonorité utopique. In: David Ayers et al. (eds.), *Utopia: The Avant-Garde, Modernism and (Im)possible Life*, pp. 215–228. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Potter, Keith. 2002. *Four Musical Minimalists: La Monte Young, Terry Riley, Ste-*

- ve Reich, Philip Glass. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*
- Pound, Ezra. 1973. I Gather the Limbs of Osiris. In: William Cookson (ed.), *Ezra Pound: Selected Prose, 1909–1965*, pp. 19–43. New York: New Directions.
- Schwarz, K. Robert. 2008. *Minimalists*. London: Phaidon.
- Sontag, Susan. 2013. Against Interpretation. In: Neil Jomonville (ed.), *The New York Intellectuals Reader*, pp. 243–252. New York: Routledge.
- Sutherland, Roger. 1994. *New Perspectives in Music*. London: Sun Tavern Fields.
- Tatarkiewicz, Władysław. 1980. *A History of Six Ideas: An Essay in Aesthetics*. Warsaw: PWN / Polish Scientific Publishers; The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Whittall, Arnold. 2008. *The Cambridge Introduction to Serialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.